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I. INTRODUCTION

This report presents the activities developed in the July 2016 – June 2017 period (4th year of the project). The objective of the CEPID Project “Building Democracy Daily: human rights, violence and institutional trust” is to promote cutting edge and innovative research, as well as knowledge transfer, dissemination and education activities on legitimacy, trust in institutions, human rights and violence. Our focus is in the city of São Paulo, but our dialogues with researchers and literature from other countries and regions in Brazil enable as well national and cross-national comparisons.

In terms of research, we have studied, through longitudinal quantitative and qualitative surveys, the perceptions of adult residents, early adolescents and civil servants on the legitimacy and trust of local institutions such as the police, courts, local administration, and schools. We wish to identify the main factors that influence the perceptions of legitimacy in everyday interactions between these actors and institutions, and if there are changes in these perceptions over time. Our first findings are already being discussed through dissemination and education activities, such as publications, interventions in scientific events and media channels, as well as videos, short courses, and human rights education projects in schools.

Aside from regular knowledge transfer activities that NEV has promoted over its thirty years of existence, such as participation in public councils and organization of public events, courses and workshops, the research, dissemination, and educational activities of the CEPID Project have led us create new agreements and collaborations with public and private institutions, such as research groups, data-collection centers, newspapers and media channels, cultural centers and NGOs, technology foundations, public schools and colleges, police departments and public administration. This enables NEV to deepen its contributions to public policies, while seeking articulations that can generate deeper changes in values, behavior and institutional culture. The exchanges with these groups and institutions have enhanced NEV’s the chances for developing innovative research, knowledge transfer, dissemination and education activities on the legitimacy of institutions, and on the role that human rights and violence play in the production of this legitimacy.
The research project “Building Democracy Daily: human rights, violence and institutional trust” addresses three main problems:

I. How is the implementation of laws, rules and procedures perceived over time by citizens and civil servants, and how does this effect the legitimacy of key institutions for democracy?

II. How do citizens and civil servants interact with one another, and what effect do such interactions have on citizens’ and civil servants’ perceptions of laws, democracy, human rights and violence?

III. How do children learn about authority, laws, trust and respect for laws, rules and norms? In sum, how does the legal socialization process of children (early adolescents) take place? What role do different agents play in this process—parents, teachers, the peer group, religious authorities, law enforcement agents etc.? Finally, how does this process relate to their future conceptions of legal obedience and legitimacy?

We have analyzed these problems with three intersected studies, with their own instruments: the community survey, the civil servants questionnaires, and the São Paulo Legal Socialization Study. In the last year of the research, the center has been able to consolidate the analysis of the second dataset from the community survey, both in the control sample and key areas. We have also collected the first set of data from civil servants questionnaires, and the second wave of the early adolescents surveys is about to begin. At the same time, we have been investing in researcher mobility initiatives, co-authored papers with international partners who have been contributing to each area of the research, and participated in international congresses and forums.

The community survey focuses on the legitimacy of key institutions to democracy (such as the laws, justice, police, and municipality) from the perspective of the citizens of the city of São Paulo. Using a quantitative approach, we designed a survey and collected data for a representative sample of São Paulo city in 2015 with 1806 participants. The data from this survey concerning perceptions about the neighborhood and relationship with the community show that good indicators about stability and the satisfaction with the neighborhood, coexisted with low levels of interpersonal trust, social control, collective efficacy and interpersonal trust. With regard to perceptions of institutions and authorities, most interviewees recognize the obligation to comply with the laws, court and police decisions, but at the same time most believe that laws favor the powerful, there are low levels of trust in judiciary procedural justice and low levels of trust in the police.
The same questionnaire was applied in a longitudinal panel study held in 8 neighborhoods of the city. Up until now we have collected two waves of data for the longitudinal panel, both in 2015 and in 2017. 1200 residents were randomly selected in 2015, 150 of each key area. 77.3% of our sample remained in the second wave, thus completing a dataset of 928 individuals. The socioeconomic profile and the housing conditions of the interviewees evidence the socio-spatial hierarchy among the key areas. More structured upper-middle-class areas (such as Vila Andrade and Jardim Paulista) present more favorable indicators regarding the place of residence, while more vulnerable and poor neighborhoods (like Grajaú, Iguatemi, Cidade Ademar and Jardim Ângela) present greater perception of disorder and less interpersonal trust, which may contribute to the greater desire of the interviewees to leave the neighborhood. The contrast between the areas is also manifested in the relations with the institutions, especially with the police, so that when compared to upper-middle-class, residents of vulnerable areas present greater perception of misconduct and coercive approach by the police, are more fearful and tend to trust less in the police. A third wave of the panel is expected to 2018.

One of our objectives was to test procedural justice theory in São Paulo. Considering a context where criminal policies are essentially based on deterrence theory, would we find evidence that São Paulo citizens, when legitimating the authority, normatively comply with the law? In order to test this hypothesis, we had to adopt a reliable approach on measurement. This is the reason why we adopted a reflexive approach, measuring observable indicators whose association would theoretically be caused by a latent variable. We thus proceeded to a structural equation modeling aiming at testing the procedural justice hypothesis.

At first, results did not indicate a good fit – those who had a duty to obey the police would not be willing to comply more with the law. After a content analysis of an open-ended question about the motivation for obedience, however, we were able to create duty to obey categories.

It was then possible to see that most citizens would obey the police for coercive reasons, without leading to legitimacy. Once the results of the content analysis were included in the model, the fit was more adequate and it was possible to accept procedural justice theory. These results are summarized in a manuscript to be submitted to Dados – Revista de Ciências Sociais. Another manuscript detailing the idea of the duty to obey categories, written in coauthorship with our international partners, is to be submitted to Law & Society Review.

In the civil servants questionnaires, not only the debates on procedural fairness and efficacy were taken into account, but self-legitimacy was indicated as a fundamental concept in the literature and the pre-tests, given that the way they perceived their relations with superiors
and hierarchies seemed to influence their perceptions of the institution, their willingness to support it, and their relations with the public.

The Military Police questionnaire is composed by 99 closed questions and four open questions. The Civil Police questionnaire is composed by 97 closed questions and four open questions. All closed questions has a 5-point scale. The questionnaires were self-applied using the Survey Monkey online survey software. The survey took place between July 7th and November 8th, 2016. We used a convenience sampling - all police officers of the surveyed units were invited to participate in the study. After 39 visits to the Companies and 23 visits to the Police Stations of the eight key areas we collected 298 completed questionnaires answered by military police officers and 140 completed questionnaires answered by civilian police.

The data has already been organized and is being analyzed. We will replicate tests of international studies and propose new analyzes. The first question to be asked will be: is internal procedural justice related to the self-legitimacy of police officers in São Paulo? A review of the instrument is in progress for the possible conduct of the research with a controlled sample with police officers from all over the State of São Paulo.

The open-ended interviews with judges took place between January and March, 2017. The protocol was based on police officer’s protocols. Challenges in accessing judges led us to opt for snowball sampling. From known judges, we asked them to help us by indicating other people or mediating the contacts for new interviews. Six judges were interviewed, four from the Special Civil Courts (JECs), one of the Judicial Administrative Department of Justice of São Paulo (TJSP) and one appeal judge from the TJSP. Throughout the study, we improved the protocol including specific questions about the functioning of the justice system. The interviews are being transcribed and reviewed. We also request support from the Court of Justice to conduct more interviews and we are waiting for a response.

**The São Paulo Legal Socialization Study** interviewed 800 early adolescents born in 2005. The analysis of the data has reached some interesting findings. First, most of the preadolescents agree that they have the duty to obey parents, teachers and police. However, when analyzing the justifications for this perception of duty, it was possible to notice that motivations through consent are more frequent for parents and teachers, while coercive motivations are more frequent for police.

Another interesting finding was possible due the partnership with Kendra Thomas, assistant professor at College of Applied Behavioral Sciences, University of Indianapolis. Hierarchical linear modeling analysis revealed that participants are more willing to comply when
they see their parents as procedurally fair and legitimate. Moreover, the analysis show that
participants also comply considering whether the rules established by their parents respects
some limits of adolescents’ autonomy. Finally, compliance is related to the kind of disciplinary
techniques that parents apply as well.

When analyzing the quality of the contact and perceptions of the police reported by the
early adolescents, some socioeconomic variables, especially family income and type of school
(private or public), were significantly associated with the variable legitimacy of the police. The
group that presented the lower socioeconomic conditions and the higher exposure to violence in
the neighborhood perceives the police as less legitimate.

RESEARCH HIGHLIGHTS

In terms of research highlights obtained so far, we can list four of them:

1. UNEQUAL EXPERIENCES, PERCEPTIONS AND INTERACTIONS BETWEEN CITIZENS AND
   INSTITUTIONS IN THE CITY

   Preliminary analyses of the first set of data collected from the control sample of the city
   of São Paulo—what we call “residents’ survey”—suggest that, as expected, there are varied
   perceptions and frequency of contact with the municipal administration and law enforcement
   agencies (police forces and courts) across the city, with large variation according to age and
genre. The same was found for the samples collected from the eight key areas of the city of São
   Paulo selected for the research, which are around the neighborhoods of Cidade Ademar, Grajaú,
   Cidade Paulista, Pirituba, Vila Matilde, Iguatemi, Vila Andrade e Jardim Ângela. The data shows
   that the military police is the institution that the population has most contact with. At least 69%
   of the city’s population have had some contact with the police over their lifetime, 31% with
courts, and 25% with the municipal administration.

2. DIVIDED PERCEPTIONS OF LEGITIMACY AND “LEGITIMATE DISOBEDIENCE”

   Our preliminary analyses of data from the São Paulo city sample focused on exploring
   possible differences between normative and instrumental motivations for the citizens to engage
   in law-abiding behavior. We are examining how widespread the sense of duty to obey is in the
city, and the notion of a coercive obligation to obey. Our results so far suggest a fairly divided
population, with half of the citizens expressing an obedience grounded on coercion and
resignation and the other half obeying by consent. Another aspect that deserves attention is the
 possibility of a “legitimate disobedience” toward institutions, such as the police, from those who
consider disobeying the police authority as a result of what they perceive to be abuses and misconducts by the State.

3. OPENNESS FOR WORKING WITH POLICE FORCES AND JUSTICE

After having knowledge of the questionnaire, police commanders authorized lower-ranking police officers to participate in the survey, without any kind of restriction. The mobilization of concepts such as procedural justice and self-legitimacy allows us not only to understand the perceptions that police forces and judges have of their authority, and how it is formed within relations with superiors and the public. They also allow us to explore the implications on the civil servants notions of democracy, human rights and violence. The research not only made it possible to know, from the perspective of the operators that work on the street level, how their institutions function, but also allowed, after negotiation with superiors, the possibility to better understand training processes in police academies. These open venues in the corporations will lead NEV to a deeper understanding of the self-legitimacy process in the institutions, as well and to develop strategies and materials that can contribute more effectively to police training.


In the research conducted on the legal socialization of early adolescents, the data from the pilot study has shown that parents and teachers, as well as police, have an a priori legitimacy. This a priori legitimacy of certain authority figures again seems to vary according to the socioeconomic context.
II. The Research Programme

The research development and results so far

1. The Longitudinal Panel with Residents in São Paulo

During this academic year, the activities of the research team focused on data analysis and data collection of the longitudinal panel with adults living in São Paulo. Efforts of the research team consisted of analyzing and publishing results with data collected in 2015 - the four papers developed by the researchers are summarized in the first topic of this report. After collecting data for the second wave of the longitudinal panel in 2017, the research team engaged in an exploratory analysis. A discussion based on descriptive statistics can be found on the second topic. The third section explores the longitudinal data comparing information of the first with the second wave, particularly emphasizing the differences between those who had contact with key institutions. At last, the fourth section summarizes the activities developed by the research team during this academic year.

1.1. FINDINGS

Why do people comply with the law? What role do legal institutions play in order to stimulate law-abiding behavior? Criminological literature has been virtually consensual when it comes to the positive impacts that a normative recognition of the authority has on legal compliance (Tyler, 1990; Jackson et al., 2012). Whenever a citizen truly legitimates the law and their institutions, it is likely that such citizen will present a deferring behavior. Furthermore, the best strategy for the authority to enhance its legitimacy, according to the criminological literature, would be to have its agents acting based on the idea of procedural justice (Sunshine and Tyler, 2003). This is particularly strong with the police institution, since it is the arm of the State to which the monopoly of violence is delegated. The association between procedural justice and police legitimacy, as well as between police legitimacy and legal compliance, has been theoretically developed and empirically tested in plenty of countries.
The idea of encouraging law-abiding behavior through moral acceptance of the authority and procedural justice is primarily based on positive incentives. Citizens would normatively agree with the police, for instance, if officers treated them fairly, with neutrality and impartiality. However, this is not the only criminological theory concerning the role legal institutions play in guaranteeing compliance with the law. Deterrence theory assumes every individual is a rational actor, calculating gains and losses in every decision they make. Thus, the assumption is that citizens will engage in offending behavior if their gains be greater than their losses. Therefore, legal institutions should chiefly work with negative incentives, emphasizing to every individual the certainty and the severity of the punishment.

One of the first steps of the research program was to analyse criminal policies implemented in Brazil, especially in São Paulo. It was possible to verify that Brazilian criminal policies are extensively deterrence-based. Officers are trained to convince the general population that crime is not worth it, treating every individual as a potential criminal. Broadening of surveillance mechanisms, incentives for increasing number of arrests, indicators of police efficacy are some of the measures adopted by the police departments in Brazil, whilst no incentive towards a procedurally fair institution has been made. These results were summarized in a paper (in Portuguese) entitled “Police legitimacy: criminal policy beyond deterrence” (Zanetic et al., 2016).

The next step of the research was to empirically evaluate this issue. Does trust in a procedurally just police actually influence people’s duty to obey and normative alignment in São Paulo? Does the recognition of a legitimate authority influence a law-abiding behavior in a context such as the Brazilian one? However, one central question remained unanswered: how is it possible to actually measure those unobservable concepts?

There is an obvious gap between the theoretical construction of concepts such as police legitimacy and trust in a procedurally fair police and the operationalization strategies used to empirically measure the indicators. Recognizing and dealing with this gap is important in order not to make theoretical claims which are methodologically impossible. This can often be the problem of the formative approach on measurement: if one considers either a single item question or the simple sum of a number of questions in a questionnaire as the variable itself, a consequence is that the abstract concept is being reduced to an observable variable. In other words, there would be no gap between the theoretical construction and the empirical operationalization.
An alternative is the reflective approach on measurement. It consists of theoretically assuming that the concept, despite being unobservable, exists and causes association between a number of observable indicators. A measurement model is thus derived from this assumption in the form of a testable hypothesis, which can be accepted or rejected depending on the statistical fit of the model. For instance, one assumes the impossibility of indeed measuring the abstract idea of normative alignment with the police; however, one can assume that citizens who are normatively aligned with the police end up perceiving the police actions as in accordance with their own sense of right and wrong, as defending values they think are important, as having the very same expectations about the community, which all can be measured; at last, one tests a measurement model assuming that the association between these three indicators is caused by a latent variable named ‘normative alignment’, checking the statistical fit in order to accept or reject this model.

In other words, the reflective approach on measurement emphasizes - not neglects - the gap between the theoretical construction and the empirical operationalization. This methodological discussion, which was summarized on a paper (in Portuguese) entitled “How to measure what is not observable? Reflective approach and latent variable modeling in survey designs” (Oliveira et al., 2016), was important in order to choose the ideal analytical strategy to test the procedural justice theory in São Paulo, using the representative survey data. Assuming a reflective approach on measurement and using generalized structural equation modeling to analyze correlations between latent variables, it was possible to test effects of trust in police procedural justice on duty to obey the police and on normative alignment with the police (components of police legitimacy), as well as their effects on legal compliance.

Results, however, were not significant. The path from procedural justice to compliance through normative alignment was highly significant, but the one through duty to obey was not. Such results would contradict the international literature. Aiming at understanding the nature of the duty to obey responses, a content analysis was performed with the open ended following question - “why do think you have/do not have a duty to obey the police?”. Four response patterns were identified: rejection of authority; coercive obligation to obey; disobedient protest; and moral duty to obey. Once this newly created variable was incorporated in the generalized structural equation model, both paths were significant, thus accepting the procedural justice hypothesis. These results are summarized in a manuscript entitled (in Portuguese) “Predictors and impacts of police legitimacy: testing the procedural justice theory in São Paulo” (in revision, to be submitted to Dados - Revista de Ciências Sociais), developed by André Zanetic, Ariadne Natal and Thiago Oliveira.
Such results indicate, on the one hand, that in São Paulo some people are willing to obey the police because they are fearful, which is not a legitimate reason; and on the other hand, they indicate that some people are willing to disobey officers’ orders precisely because they legitimate the police institution. Not only do these findings help the comprehension of police-citizen relations in Brazil, but it also impacts decisively the international literature on police legitimacy. Upon deeper investigation about the nature of the four-category duty to obey variable, it was possible to identify statistical association between membership and legal compliance, attitudes towards violence, and satisfaction with democracy - those who support some human rights violation, who admit to engage in low-level offending behavior, and who are unsatisfied with the Brazilian democracy are the ones who primarily fall into the coercive obligation to obey group. These findings are summarized on a manuscript entitled “Duty, deference and dissent: unpacking police legitimacy and legal compliance in São Paulo” (in revision, to be submitted to *Law & Society Review*), developed by Jonathan Jackson (LSE), Ben Bradford (Oxford University), André Zanetic, Ariadne Natal and Thiago Oliveira.

### 1.2. EXPLORATORY ANALYSIS: SECOND WAVE DATA (2017)

From January to April 2017, we collected the second wave date of the longitudinal panel in eight key areas. Among the previous 1200 respondents, 928 remained in the sample and responded again, totaling a rate of 77.33%. The 22.67% loss is within our expectations (top acceptable loss would be 25%). Among the key areas, there has been some variation in the response rate, which can be visualized in Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KEY AREA</th>
<th>TOTAL IN 2015</th>
<th>TOTAL IN 2017</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JARDIM PAULISTA</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>75.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VILA ANDRADE</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>57.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VILA MATILDE</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>80.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIRITUBA</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>77.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIDADE ADEMAR</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>85.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JARDIM ÂNGELA</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>78.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IGUATEMI</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>81.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRAJAU</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>84.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>1200</strong></td>
<td><strong>928</strong></td>
<td><strong>77.33%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Among the 272 respondents who did not participate of the second wave, 54 (19.85%) formally recused to respond again the questionnaire, especially due to lack of time. It was not possible to contact 102 individuals (37.5%). The other 104 citizens (38.23%) moved out from the city of São Paulo and, therefore, were withdrawn from the sample. Four respondents had health issues which made it impossible for them to receive the investigator and other 7 people passed away during the period.

**SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS**

Sampling procedures in 2015 were employed so that the panel would be representative of each of the 8 key areas in São Paulo we had previously identified. 1200 citizens responded the survey, 150 in each region. 928 (77.33%) remained in the second wave of the panel, collected in 2017. Analysis of demographic and economic data allow us to identify both convergences and divergences among the key areas, which can be visualized in Table 2.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Jardim Paulista</th>
<th>Vila Andrade</th>
<th>Vila Matilde</th>
<th>Pirituba</th>
<th>Cidade Ademar</th>
<th>Jardim Ângela</th>
<th>Iguatemi</th>
<th>Grajaú</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>45.91</td>
<td>44.79</td>
<td>48.75</td>
<td>41.67</td>
<td>46.67</td>
<td>49.09</td>
<td>48.00</td>
<td>43.59</td>
<td>45.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>54.09</td>
<td>55.21</td>
<td>51.25</td>
<td>58.33</td>
<td>53.33</td>
<td>50.91</td>
<td>52.00</td>
<td>56.41</td>
<td>54.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Mean (SD)</td>
<td>41.9</td>
<td>16.34</td>
<td>47.19</td>
<td>16.55</td>
<td>49.47</td>
<td>17.41</td>
<td>41.6</td>
<td>15.21</td>
<td>4.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Elementary School (incomplete)</td>
<td>30.5</td>
<td>6.19</td>
<td>7.07</td>
<td>4.66</td>
<td>22.12</td>
<td>64.6</td>
<td>35.34</td>
<td>38.28</td>
<td>40.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Elementary School</td>
<td>19.83</td>
<td>32.56</td>
<td>4.66</td>
<td>14.17</td>
<td>9.48</td>
<td>58.14</td>
<td>34.48</td>
<td>35.94</td>
<td>24.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High School</td>
<td>30.93</td>
<td>43.33</td>
<td>32.56</td>
<td>20.68</td>
<td>34.87</td>
<td>17.50</td>
<td>21.87</td>
<td>33.34</td>
<td>31.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Superior Education</td>
<td>18.75</td>
<td>31.82</td>
<td>4.66</td>
<td>17.41</td>
<td>9.48</td>
<td>17.50</td>
<td>20.68</td>
<td>31.14</td>
<td>21.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income (Min. Wages)</td>
<td>More than 20 MW</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>16.67</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>From 10 to 20 MW</td>
<td>5.38</td>
<td>19.73</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>From 5 to 10 MW</td>
<td>11.91</td>
<td>14.85</td>
<td>23.76</td>
<td>10.68</td>
<td>9.26</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>6.67</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>6.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>From 2 to 5 MW</td>
<td>34.31</td>
<td>48.51</td>
<td>21.36</td>
<td>36.89</td>
<td>34.02</td>
<td>34.02</td>
<td>31.78</td>
<td>31.78</td>
<td>27.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>From 1 to 2 MW</td>
<td>30.60</td>
<td>28.76</td>
<td>16.67</td>
<td>31.07</td>
<td>39.81</td>
<td>42.27</td>
<td>40.74</td>
<td>42.06</td>
<td>33.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Less than 1 MW</td>
<td>14.60</td>
<td>8.91</td>
<td>21.36</td>
<td>36.89</td>
<td>34.26</td>
<td>34.02</td>
<td>42.27</td>
<td>40.74</td>
<td>40.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>50.32</td>
<td>80.21</td>
<td>57.41</td>
<td>65.71</td>
<td>35.36</td>
<td>30.29</td>
<td>33.33</td>
<td>34.55</td>
<td>34.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>12.18</td>
<td>5.21</td>
<td>9.26</td>
<td>13.33</td>
<td>12.73</td>
<td>17.00</td>
<td>18.80</td>
<td>13.64</td>
<td>13.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parda</td>
<td>31.90</td>
<td>7.29</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>30.56</td>
<td>16.19</td>
<td>45.45</td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td>40.17</td>
<td>50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indigenous</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>None</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
54.09% of the respondents are women and the average age is 41.9 (with an standard deviation of 16.34). Variables such as Education, Income, and Ethnicity demonstrate the complexity and the heterogeneity of the city of São Paulo. In Vila Andrade and Jardim Paulista, wealthier neighborhoods, about 60% of the respondents have superior education, whilst this rate is only 5% in the poorer regions of Grajaú, Cidade Ademar, Jardim Ângela, and Iguatemi. This inequality is especially seen when the variable Income is analyzed, with a distribution across key areas similar to the Education variable: the gap between rich and poor citizens is clearly spatially oriented. This economic inequality is also followed by the racial distribution: while Iguatemi (18.8%) and Jardim Ângela (17%) present the highest percentages of black people, richer areas present 2.50% (Vila Andrade) and 5.21% (Jardim Paulista) - the white concentration in both these neighborhoods is overwhelming: more than 80% of the citizens there are white.

Besides the socioeconomic status data, there are information about respondents’ residence as well, which may emphasize the results previously indicated. First, it is important to see that, with the exceptions of Vila Andrade and Jardim Paulista, every key area has a horizontal profile, with more than 98% living in houses. The average number of persons in a house also increases as the socioeconomic status decreases: 2.6 person per residence in Jardim Paulista and 4.23 persons per residence in Iguatemi.

**NEIGHBORHOOD**

Nearly 70% of the respondents have lived in the same neighborhood for less than 30 years. A greater demographic mobility is seen in richer key areas: 43.75% of the citizens who live in Vila Andrade and 41.67% who live in Jardim Paulista have been there only for 10 years, while this range goes from 11.43% to 24% in other regions.

An interesting analysis concerns the comparison, by key area, between satisfaction with the neighborhood and willingness to move out. At the same time, there are places where both variables converge (Vila Andrade, Vila Matilde, Pirituba), there are also regions where, despite recognizing improvements in their neighborhoods, people would actually like to move out (Grajaú, Cidade Ademar, Jardim Ângela, Iguatemi). The isolated case is Jardim Paulista, where willingness to stay in the neighborhood is slightly greater than the satisfaction with the place.

Another possibility for measuring the respondents’ satisfaction with their neighborhoods consisted of questions about both the presence and the quality of public services provided. This analysis can be visualized in Figure X.
For about 90% of the respondents, there is policing. This proportion is constant across key areas - with the exception of Iguatemi, where about a quarter of the respondents do not perceive the presence of policing in the neighborhood. With respect to the evaluation of the services, it can be noted that the satisfaction perception varies across key areas. Figure X helps the visualization of this phenomenon.

**Graph 2. Satisfaction with Public Services in the Neighborhood**
SOCIAL CAPITAL AND INTERPERSONAL TRUST

To measure social capital, we made questions related to neighborhood knowledge, social participation, and collective efficacy. For instance, 84.23% of respondents said they would certainly or most likely try to avoid that a child kept being hit by the parents - this is constant across key areas. This willingness to engage in action decreases a little when the focus are kids are illegally graffiting walls, with greater variation across key areas. And even though social participation in local level might be considered low, 18.23% of the respondents engaged in some protest or demonstration recently.

Interpersonal trust could reveal individuals willingness to create or strengthen social bonds. Therefore, under a positive perspective, it could contribute to social capital. On the other hand, low rates of personal trust tend to stop the constitution of social networks and are usually associated with high perceptions of fear.

VICTIMIZATION

Different experiences of exposure to violence were measured in this research. Victimization questions that were used are related with risk perception and fear of crime, and it can be split between direct victimization - when the experience refers to something that happened with the respondent - and indirect victimization - when the experience happened with someone else, but was also relevant to the respondent. The questionnaire used to collect data of the first wave had questions about situations the respondents might have experienced, first asking about their whole life, then asking about the last twelve months. Those questions were built looking to experiences like being menaced, physically and/or verbally hurt, suffering sexual violence, being kidnapped, having a friend or relative murdered, hearing shots, and seeing assassinated bodies on the street. The same questions were made for the second wave, now adjusting for “since when you responded this questionnaire for the first time in 2015”. Moreover, a question about having been victim of theft was added, following a suggestion made by Dr. Justice Tankebe (University of Cambridge).

The first wave showed higher rates on the questions about indirect victimization. The same pattern remained among the respondents in 2017, as indirect victimization was still higher than the direct one. Higher percentages were at the same questions which showed high scores at the first wave.
When indirect victimization data were analyzed according to key areas, it was noted that upper-middle-class neighborhoods (Vila Andrade and Jardim Paulista) have lower percentages than other areas in almost every question, and the difference is particularly high in the question about having a relative or friend murdered since the last interview in 2015 (more frequent in poor neighborhoods like Jardim Angela and Cidade Ademar).

Questions about direct victimization indicate that theft was frequent among upper-middle-class residents (this was the main form of victimization that directly affected this group of people), but theft is also prevalent in less privileged neighborhoods such as Iguatemi and Grajaú. In the areas of Pirituba, Jardim Angela and Cidade Ademar, physical assault appears as the most frequent form of victimization.
Victimization by the police was most frequent among residents of the low income areas of Jardim Angela, Cidade Ademar, and Iguatemi. In this particular case, Grajaú draws attention because it presents a different pattern from the other low-income neighborhoods (possibly because it is a peri-urban area in which contacts initiated by the police are less frequent).

FEAR OF CRIME

Fear of crime indicates a problem both for informal controls (inhibiting interpersonal trust, collective efficacy, and social capital) and formal controls (it indicates the lack of belief in the ability of institutions to certificate local security). In 2015, first wave data showed that people in São Paulo are highly fearful, mainly in questions regarding robbery and sexual violence. It also showed that most of those people are women. In the second wave, data show that most respondents think that violence in his/her neighborhood stayed the same in the last two years (43%), followed by 18.5% that think that it increased a lot. Among those who think it increased a lot, 62.8% are women.

When asked about specific situations of fear, 76.6% of all women answered they were very worried of suffering sexual violence, while only 43.5% of all men answered the same. Amongst people who self-declared themselves as ‘black’, 79.6% were very worried about having a close relative murdered, while amongst the ones self-declared as ‘white’ that rate falls to 69.8%. Those are the crossings that show most difference on the results.

Respondents were also asked about feeling safer after changing some habits. 61.3% answered ‘yes’ when asked if they had ever avoided walking carrying money because of fear of violence. 52% answered ‘yes’ when asked if they had ever avoided walking on the street at night.
because of that same fear. Data point to a higher feeling of safeness when the respondents said they actually changed their habits, with a ‘yes’ rate of 53.4%.

When data are analyzed by key area, fear and insecurity appear as common perceptions in all areas of the city, especially during the nighttime period. Residents of Jardim Angela were the ones most afraid to walk during daytime, while over 60% of those who live in Vila Andrade, Iguatemi and Grajaú didn’t feel safe to walk around in nighttime. The residents of Jardim Paulista stands out for below-average percentages in both periods.

POLICE

CONTACT WITH THE POLICE

The procedural justice theory established by Tyler and other scholars discusses the importance of the contact with the authority to build its legitimacy. According to Tyler, every contact with the police, for instance, is a “teachable moment” where officers can demonstrate their procedural justice and enhance the police legitimacy (Tyler et al., 2014). Thus, this section tries to explore some questions under this perspective.

The questionnaire addresses the self-initiated contacts of the interviewees with the police (when they actively seek the police) as well as the police-initiated contacts (when citizens are stopped by the police) in the last 2 years. In this period 26% of the interviewees sought the police and 25% of them were stopped by the police.

When observed according to key areas, the data indicate that residents of neighborhoods with better infrastructure (Vila Andrade, Vila Matilde and Jardim Paulista) initiated contact with the police more often. Regarding the police-initiated contacts, Cidade Ademar emerges as the area where most people were stopped, which may be related to the fact that there is a police battalion at that neighborhood.
When the respondents who had police-initiated contact were asked to assess the quality of these contacts, there are large differences between the key areas.

Questions about how respondents were approached by the police indicate that in higher class areas (such as Vila Andrade and Jardim Paulista), officers would not point their guns that often and people felt less threatened. The data demonstrate the variation of police attitudes based on where they were established and indicate a tendency to use coercive methods in areas of greater vulnerability. The usage of coercion during involuntary contact with the police may have an impact on police legitimacy.

**POLICE PROCEDURAL JUSTICE**

Tyler argues that the judgment of citizens on how authority acts in everyday life is a key element for ensuring legitimacy. His research shows that when people judge that authority is
exercised through fair and appropriate procedures, citizens will be willing to comply, cooperate and voluntarily accept the authority decisions. The assessments about the quality of the decision-making process and the quality of interpersonal treatment is what Tyler calls ‘procedural justice’, a concept that takes into account: opportunity to participate in decisions, neutrality, transparency and the interpersonal treatment (Sunshine and Tyler, 2003).

Questions related to trust in procedural justice by the police present a high percentage of missing data due to ‘I don’t know’ answers concentrated mainly in the more structured neighborhoods. These results may indicate less contact of upper-class residents with police.

Data show that perceptions of fair personal treatment (police treat well people like you) is the highest among all areas, but much higher in upper middle class neighborhoods (Jardim Paulista and Vila Andrade) and lower in poor neighborhoods (Iguatemi and Grajaú). Opportunity
to participate in decisions (the police pay attention to the information that people provide them with) is higher in lower-middle-class (Pirituba and Vila Matilde). Neutrality (‘the police make impartial and just decisions’, and ‘the police treat all people equally’) is higher in more structured areas (Pirituba, Vila Matilde e Jd Paulista), except in Vila Andrade. The transparency questions (‘the police explain clearly why they pull over or arrests someone’ and ‘the police recognize and correct their own mistakes’) show lower percentage in upper middle class neighborhoods (Jardim Paulista and Vila Andrade).

**POLICE EFFICACY**

Perception of police efficacy concerns an assessment of police performance and the institution’s ability to promote and ensure security. In the literature, Tyler (1990) sees efficacy as a utilitarian concept (with respect to valuing effective outcomes) and without a direct relationship with normative legitimacy. In contrast, Bottoms and Tankebe (2012) argue that for the police to be considered legitimate it must demonstrate the capacity to meet the objectives expected by society, so even though efficacy alone is not enough to ensure legitimacy, efficacy is a pre-condition for legitimacy.

In order to examine the issue of police efficacy, we ask the interviewees if the police is doing a good job in controlling the most common problems of security, in both services provided and in promoting safety.

*Graph 11. Police efficacy, by Key Area (Don’t know)*

The police efficacy questions also present a high percentage of missing data due to ‘I don’t know’ answers, which again were concentrated especially in the more structured neighborhoods. These results may be related to the type of contact and exposure to police work in the different key areas. The lack of knowledge is particularly higher in questions about the
services provided by the police, indicating that in everyday life, upper-class residents are less exposed and may have less contact with police work.

Considering the sample as a whole, when excluding the missing values the perception that police do a ‘very good’ or a ‘good’ job in the services provided was between 40% and 50% in all questions asked, and the response to emergency calls had a better rating.

When cleaved by key-areas, the data show that although in general the best evaluations are concentrated in the better structured neighborhoods, in this particular case Vila Andrade is out of this general trend. This happens both with performance of the police in providing services, and its the capacity to guarantee security and control crime. This may be related to the fact that the neighborhood of Vila Andrade faces more problems related to victimization and fear. The Iguatemi area is the one that has the lowest approval of police efficacy in every question.

POLICE LEGITIMACY

Legitimacy is vital for institutions and authorities because it provides justification for the exercise of power. Although definitions of legitimacy may vary substantially, a central idea for various authors is that legitimacy involves the recognition of an authority and of its right to issue commands and the consequent duty to obey (Beetham, 1991; Coicaud, 2002; Bottoms and Tankebe, 2012). According to Beetham (1991), in order to be considered legitimate, a power-holder must meet the following conditions: legality (power acquired and exercised according to established values), shared values (convergence between objectives and values between authorities and those who submit to them), and consent (recognition of the authority’s right to exercise power). In a democracy, for institutions and authorities to establish, maintain and
reproduce, they must be considered legitimate, and for this reason, legitimacy is also key to the power of the police.

Empirically the research explored each of the dimensions of legitimacy proposed by Beetham, and some of the preliminary results are reported below.

**LEGALITY**

In order to examine whether according to the interviewees’ perception the police respect and act in accordance to the law, questions have been made to estimate the existence of police misconduct in the neighborhood.

The questions about police misconduct are the ones that present the highest percentage of missing data due to ‘I don’t know’ answers in all the database. The general data show that the percentage of respondents who say they don’t know about police corruption stand out: 24% don’t know if officers accept bribes, 19% don’t know if they protect dealers, and 17% don’t know if they are honests.

When these data are cleaved by key areas, the highest percentage of people who claim ignorance about police misconduct are those living in more affluent and higher-income regions (Jd. Paulista and Vila Andrade). The lack of information on this subject is greater especially in the questions that refer to police corruption (if the police accept bribery and if they protect drug dealers). Police corruption is a sensitive topic that involves criminal charges, and it is possible that respondents were reluctant to answer this question or they don’t have enough evidence to deny or affirm categorically that there is corruption.

Considering the sample as a whole, when excluding the missing values, the perception that police ‘always’ or ‘almost always’ commit illegalities is between 30% and 40% in all of the questions asked. However, when cleaved by key areas it’s evident that the people with the greatest perception of police misconduct are those living in neighborhoods with more precarious
urbanization and social vulnerability (such as Cidade Ademar, Iguatemi, Grajaú and Jardim Ângela). While in the upper middle (Jardim Paulista and Vila Andrade) and lower middle class (Vila Matilde and Pirituba) the perception of police misconduct is lower. The question as to whether police officers act as if they were above the law stands out with the highest percentages in all areas.

**SHARED VALUES**

Also called normative alignment (Jackson et al., 2012), this is an element that confers justifiability for the possession of power through the perception that citizens' values are expressed in the day-to-day practices of those in power. Empirically, this dimension was explored through questions about the perception of proximity between the values of the interviewees and the community, and those expressed in the actions and values of the police.

In general, the perception of shared values with the police in the neighborhood reaches up to 40% ('always' or 'almost always' answers) of the interviewees. When data are segmented by key areas, the more structured neighborhoods like lower-middle-class (Vila Matilde and Pirituba) and higher-income regions (Jd. Paulista and Vila Andrade) present a higher perception of shared values with the police, while in the areas of greatest vulnerability (Iguatemi, Cidade Ademar e Grajaú) the perception of shared values is lower.

**CONSENT**

Tyler (1990) points out that the legitimate authority has the power to determine what is an appropriate behavior and can obtain consent regardless of personal interests or personal morality. Legitimacy involves acknowledging the right of the authority to make decisions and has as a component a moral duty to obey. In this sense, in order to measure consent, we made questions that explore the willingness to obey the police even when the police do not act as expected. When asked if they think they should obey the police even if they believe the police to be wrong, 73.5% of the respondents say yes; 65% of the interviewees agree strongly or in part that they have the duty to do what officers say, even if they don’t understand or agree with their
reasons, and 68% agree strongly or in part that they have the duty to do what the police says even if they don’t like the way they were treated (these percentages present little variation among the key areas).

So, on the one hand, responses indicate the existence of a considerable sense of duty in obeying the police, and this seems to be disseminated through the areas. However, the willingness to obey and even the recognition of the duty to obey can’t be understood as a synonym of consent. A person may also obey for reasons such as fear of suffering sanctions and lack of options. To explore the reasons for obedience we asked respondents who claim to obey, if their obedience is motivated by fear and the results indicate that 56% agree strongly or in part with that affirmation (with more people indicating obedience by fear in key-areas Iguatemi, Jardim Ângela and Jardim Paulista).

Fear of the police is one of the aspects that is little explored in the international literature and has relation with the Brazilian context. This theme was further explored through other questions about fear of the police in the neighborhood.
Although many interviewees acknowledge that other people are afraid of the police, less of them personally indicate fear. In part, this difference can be explained by a culture that believes that a good police force is the feared one, and that those who fear the police do so because they have something to hide. These data also vary according to the place of residence. Those who live in more structured neighborhoods (like Vila Andrade, Jardim Paulista) are less afraid of the police, while those who live in more precarious neighborhoods (such as Iguatemi, Grajaú and Cidade Ademar) feel more afraid of the police.

**INSTITUTIONAL TRUST IN THE POLICE**

Institutional trust often appears in Tyler's work as one of the components of legitimacy or as a sign of legitimacy. Trust is an act of faith and to trust means waiting for the other to act in a certain way. Institutional trust involves the expectation about how the authorities will act and this expectation is based on assumptions about the character and abilities of authority, which means that it also takes into account risks and uncertainties. When people say they trust the authorities, they indicate an expectation that the authorities will act honestly, having citizens' best interests at heart (Tyler & Jackson, 2013).

Overall, police trust rates are quite low. However, when data are analyzed according to key areas, those areas with better infrastructure (Vila Matilde, Jardim Paulista and Vila Andrade) tend to trust more, while those in vulnerable areas (Iguatemi and Grajaú) tend to trust less.

![Graph 17. Trust in the police, by Key Areas (Trust / Trust a lot)](image)

**COOPERATION WITH THE POLICE**

Ensuring the cooperation of the public is critical to the quality of police work. The police depend on people's willingness to report crimes, to provide information, and to participate in public discussions to help guide police work. Cooperation is voluntary, and the police cannot compel the population to do so, but it can encourage them to cooperate and legitimacy is a path to do it. The literature points out that when authorities are perceived as legitimate, the population would be more likely to cooperate with them.
To measure the willingness to cooperate with the police we asked the interviewees what they would do if they witnessed an armed man robbing a person in the neighborhood.

**Graph 18. Willingness to cooperate with the police, by Key Area (Definitely / Very Probably)**

The data indicate that, in general, the percentage of respondents willing to cooperate with the police is high. However, when the situation involves greater personal risk, such as identifying the perpetrator of an assault, the disposition to cooperate is lower. The analysis of the data by key areas indicates that the willingness to cooperate with the police is strong among those who live in more structured neighborhoods (such as Jardim Paulista, Vila Andrade and Vila Matilde) and lower in more vulnerable neighborhoods (such as Cidade Ademar, Grajaú and Iguatemi).

**SUPPORT FOR POLICE USE OF FORCE**

According to Tyles and colleagues (Sunshine and Tyler, 2003; Jackson et al., 2012), one of the most important antecedents of police legitimacy is the perception that the police act procedurally fair and within the law. In this sense, while providing justification for the exercise of power, police legitimacy could also have an effect in limiting the use of abusive force by the police. On the other hand, one of the possible consequences of police legitimacy is actually increasing support and willingness to giving more power to the police, which includes discretion in the use of force. Police violence is a serious problem in the Brazilian context and for this reason we explored the support for police abusive use of force.

We proposed three scenarios where police officers used force in an unreasonable and abusive way, and we asked the interviewees to evaluate the police action in those situations. In scenario 1, the police pursued, captured and decided to kill a fugitive from justice. Scenario 2 occurs during a demonstration in which some of the participants begin to break windows and to
throw fire in trash cans. The police shoot rubber bullets at the crowd, a girl is hit and goes blind. In scenario 3, the police enter a house without a warrant and torture a drug dealer for information.

The chart below brings together respondents who did not firmly reject police actions (those who responded that police action was 'excellent', 'good' and 'neither good nor bad').

![Graph 19. Support for abusive use of force, by Key Area](image)

The data show that scenario 1 (an officer killing a fugitive) is the one with the lowest support for abusive use of force in all areas, with less support in Jardim Paulista and greater support in Vila Matilde. The possible explanation for the lower support for the abusive use of force in this situation is that this is an extreme scenario that involves a fatality.

In scenario 2 (during the demonstration), the upper income neighborhoods (Vila Matilde, Vila Andrade and Jardim Paulista) are the most supportive the use of force against demonstrators. This may be related to critiques of these residents to groups that use property damage as a manifestation strategy (like black blocks).

In scenario 3 (drug dealer tortured by the police) the trend is reversed and the residents of the most vulnerable areas are the ones who most support the abusive use of force. This may be related to the greater vulnerability and exposure of residents of these areas to the violence of drug trafficking.

As for the police, the comparison of the data between the key areas indicated that more structured upper-middle-class areas have greater perception of good treatment by the police, less knowledge about police efficacy and police misconduct and more willingness to cooperate with the police. On the other hand, more vulnerable and poor neighborhoods point to greater perception of a coercive approach by the police, more fear of the police, more victimization by the police, greater perception of police misconduct, and less trust in the police.
JUDICIARY SYSTEM

Respondents were asked about general feelings concerning the Brazilian justice system. It’s important to highlight that only 12% of the sample said they had had any contact with the justice system. With this in mind, the results don’t reflect judgments about the treatment itself, but judgments concerning general perceptions about the judiciary system.

Graph 20. Had contact with court since last interview, by Key Area

The general perception of the treatment offered in Courts is negative. It is possible to visualize two main patterns. There is one where negative perception was clearly the majority, and there is another where there was a central tendency. Perception of accessibility, quickness and equality of treatment had skewed distributions. On the other hand, fairness, dignity and the capacity of listening to every side, despite some negative tendency, were concentrated in the middle category.

Despite the negative results, 80% of the sample said that they should obey judicial decisions even when they think the decisions are wrong. However, an exploratory analysis of another question shows that about 70% of the sample said they agree with the sentence “you obey the justice system because you fear the consequences”. Thus, it seems that there is no truly free consent concerning the Brazilian justice system.

DEMOCRACY

Overall, citizen support for democracy is high, with around 70% of respondents agreeing totally and in part that ‘Democracy may have problems but it is the best system of government’, but there are variations between key areas. In upper-middle-class areas such as Vila Andrade and
Jardim Paulista, support is around 90%, whilst in low-middle-income neighborhoods such as Vila Matilde and Pirituba it is around 70%, and about 80% in popular neighborhoods like Grajau, Cidade Ademar and Jardim Angela, having the lowest percentage in Iguatemi, where 60% express support for democracy.

![Graph 21. Democracy is the best system of government (Agree totally and in part)](image)

Although support for democracy as a system of government is high, the percentage of people satisfied with the Brazilian democracy is low. About 18% of the respondents say they are very satisfied or satisfied with democracy in Brazil. When data are cleaved by key areas, it is possible to notice variations, with lower satisfaction in the Grajaú and Iguatemi areas, and greater in Jardim Angela e Vila Matilde.

In recent years Brazil has been affected by a serious crisis and political instability, motivated by reports of corruption that fell on several prominent political figures at both national and local levels. One of the questions we want to explore throughout the research is how such crises may have affected respondents’ satisfaction with democracy. The political crisis worsened mainly between the first and second waves of the survey. The year 2016 was marked by the impeachment process against President Dilma Roussef, as well as the arrest and denunciations of corruption involving ministers and politicians from several parties. For this reason, we compared data from the first wave (2015) with data from the second wave (2017) to illustrate how the crisis may have affected the perception of the residents of each region.
Surprisingly, when we compared the responses of only those interviewed who remained on the panel between the first and second wave, satisfaction with democracy in Brazil increased by 5 points overall (from 13.6% to 18.5%). When cleaved by key areas, the increase was significant in low-class neighborhoods such as Vila Matilde and Pirituba, precisely those that showed lower satisfaction rates in the first application of the questionnaire. The data indicate that for some of the respondents the political crisis of 2016 may have been seen as a conflict that had positive results, at least until the beginning of 2017. The neighborhoods that show an inverse trend were Jardim Paulista and Iguatemi, in which satisfaction with democracy declined in the period.

1.3. COMPARISON BETWEEN PANEL WAVES

This section aims to present preliminary descriptive statistics comparing the first (2015) and second wave (2017) of the panel concerning questions about contact with institutions. In all cases we make a distinction between self-initiated contact, which occurs when the respondent actively seeks out an institution or service, and the contact initiated by the public authority, which occurs in cases where the interviewee is called, summoned or stop by authorities.

Considering the field periods and the hiatus between the first and the second wave, the time window between the questionnaires applications may vary around 14 and 21 months, with an average of 18 months of interval between the waves among those interviewed. In the first application, the recollection period established for recent contact experiences was 'in the last two years', while in the second wave they was asked 'since the last interview'. This means that for the recent contacts the recollection time was smaller in the second wave, so that lower percentages are expected.
Concerning contact with the police, in the first wave, 32.4% of the respondents self-initiated contact with the police in the previous 2 years, while in the second this percentage was 26%. As mentioned, this decrease was expected because of the change in the recollection time. Considering only those who remain in the panel, 47.2% of those who self-initiated contact with the police in the first wave reported initiated contact with the police again in the subsequent wave. On the other hand, 83.6% of respondents who did not initiated recent contact with the police in 2015 also did not do so on the 2nd wave. These results point to the existence of a group of people who tend to initiate contact with the police more frequently and, on the other hand, a group that rarely initiates contact with the police. Subsequent investigations can help understand what leads to recurrent self-initiated contact with the police, whether this behavior is related to victimization and exposure to violence, or whether it is related to police legitimacy.

Regarding police-initiated contacts, in the first wave 38% of the interviewees were stopped by the police, whereas in the second wave this percentage was 24%. As mentioned, a decrease was expected, however considering the size of the fall, it is necessary to investigate if there may be some bias in the profile of those who remained in the panel, since for example the police stop women less often and they had greater retention in the second wave of the panel.

Considering only interviewees that remained in the panel, among those who reported been recent stopped by the police in the first wave of the panel, 47.6% reported recently been stopped again in the second wave. On the other hand, 90% of those who had not been recently stopped in the first wave remained without recent police initiated contact in the subsequent wave. Dada indicates that it seems to exist a group of people that are more likely to be stopped by the police. Further investigations will seek to identify what are the characteristics of this group and discuss issues related to filter and selectivity in police activity.

The pre-tests that provided the basis for the construction of the questionnaires pointed out that the contact of the interviewees with the institutions of justice was rare. For this reason, for the first one we chose to explore lifetime contact experiences (and not just the recent contact of the last two years). Data from that first wave indicated that 28.5% of respondents self-initiated contact with justice institutions at some point in their lives. In the second wave 12.7% self-initiated contact with justice since the last interview. Of the people who remained on the panel, 26.2% of the respondents who initiated contact with justice once in lifetime, did it again in the interval between survey waves. However, 93% of those who had never started contact with justice in their lifetime, remained without contact with the institution.
The contact initiated by justice institutions was in the first wave also explored considering life-time experience. In the first wave, 20.6% of the respondents stated that they were summoned by justice in their lifetime, while in the second wave, 7.5% of respondents said they had been summoned since the last interview. Of the people who remained on the panel, 15% of those who had been call by justice once in a lifetime were called upon in some point between the interviews. In turn, 94.5% of those who had never been summoned by justice in life remained the same in the second wave.

Concerning contact with city hall, 16.4% of interviewers self-initiated contact with city hall in the survey first wave. Similar results were found in the second wave, in which 14.87% of the respondents reported the same. Considering only those interviewees who remained on the panel, 39% had sought the city hall on both occasions, while 90.4% reported not having sought the city hall in both surveys. The contacts initiated by the city hall seem to be quite rare. In 2015 only 3.2% had been sought by the city hall in the last 2 years and in 2017 were 1.83%.

**CONTACT AND PERCEPTIONS OF POLICE AND COURT PROCEDURAL JUSTICE**

As previously mentioned, the theory points to the importance of the contact with the authority and perceptions of procedural justice to the development of legitimacy. Considering this aspect, a second exploratory comparative exercise carried out with the data from the two panel waves consisted in verifying the impact of contact with institutions in the judgements about authority use of fair and appropriate procedures (procedural justice).

For each contact variable, the respondents who remained in the panel were grouped into four groups: (1) contact in the two waves; 2) contact only in the first wave; (3) contact only in the second wave; (4) no contact. For each group an index was constructed regarding the perception of procedural justice. Those groups were confronted with indicators related to the perception of procedural justice.

The police procedural justice indicator was elaborated from a score created with six questions about the perception of the way the police deal with the citizens in the neighborhood.

1 How often the police: ‘treats well people like you’; ‘pay attention to the information that people provide them with’; ‘make impartial and just decisions’; ‘treat all people equally’; ‘explain clearly why it pulls over or arrests someone’ and ‘recognize and correct their own mistakes’. Scale: 5 - Always; 4 - Almost always; 3 - Sometimes; 4 - Rarely; Never. The score was constructed by the sum of the answers divided by 6.
The score range between 1 and 5 points, and higher values indicate greater perception of police procedural justice.

Concerning self-initiated contact with the police, in the first wave the perception of procedural justice was higher to those who had no recent contact with the police. In the second wave we have similar data, the perception of procedural justice is higher for those without recent contact. On the other hand, the worst perception of procedural justice was between those who had the experience of contacting the police only in the second wave.

Among the respondents who made recent contact with the police in the first wave, the perception of procedural justice in the second wave was better between those who did not have recent contact.

In general, the best evaluations of procedural justice are among the interviewees who did not have recent contact with the police in the 1st and 2nd applications of the survey. The data indicate that recent contact experiences may contribute to a worse perception about the police’s behavior in the neighborhood.

**Graph 23. Procedural Justice and Self-Initiated Contact with the Police**
When we consider the recent contacts initiated by the police (people that were recently stop by the police), the perceptions about procedural justice present a greater amplitude when compared to the one of self-initiated contact with the police.

In the first wave, the evaluation of procedural justice was much higher among those who had not been approached recently by the police. In the second wave this pattern accentuated and those who have not been recently stopped by the police have an even more positive evaluation, while those who have been approached in the two waves have an even more negative evaluation of police procedural justice.

Among those who were stopped by the police in only one wave, the group of respondents who was stopped only on the first wave and were not stopped by the police afterwards, have a higher procedural perception of justice than the group of respondents who was stopped only in the second wave.

In general, the data indicate that in contacts initiated by the police, more recent and recurrent contact experiences are related to the worse evaluations of procedural justice.

Graph 24. Procedural Justice and Police-Initiated Contact
The same exploratory exercise was carried out to compare the impact of contact with courts in the perception of courts procedural justice. As previously mentioned, in the first wave, it was explored contact with courts throughout life, whereas in the second wave respondents are asked about contact with courts since the last interview.

The courts procedural justice indicator was elaborated from a score created with four questions about the perception of the way the institution treat citizens. The score range between 1 and 5 points, and higher values indicate greater perception of courts procedural justice.

In general, the perception of courts procedural justice is higher than police. The first wave data indicate that the perception of courts procedural justice is very similar between the groups of respondents who had contact and had no contact with the courts in life. These results could be related to the fact that the mentioned contact may be very old.

In the second wave the evaluation of procedural justice improves somewhat for those who had recent contact with the courts, while there is a small deterioration in the perception of the interviewees who mentioned that they had sought the courts only in the first wave. Among those who had no contact with justice in neither life nor recent, the perception of procedural justice remained almost the same. The data indicate that, contrary to what was observed for the police, in the case of the courts the contact initiated by the interviewee may not alter or even improve the perception of procedural justice.

---

2 How often does justice: ‘Makes fair decisions’; ‘Hear all sides to make decisions’, ‘Treat everyone with dignity and respect’; ‘Favor the interests of the rich and powerful’. Scale: 5 - Always; 4 - Almost always; 3 - Sometimes; 4 - Rarely; Never. The score was constructed by the sum of the answers divided by 4.
Considering the contacts initiated by the courts (when respondents are summoned for some reason), the data from the first wave indicate that once again the perception of courts procedural justice vary little among the groups that were and were never contacted by courts in life. In the second wave, the perception of procedural justice was greater among those contacted by courts both in life and recently. On the other hand, the evaluation of procedural justice of the courts was worse for those who were contacted only recently.
1.4. ACTIVITIES DEVELOPED BY THE RESEARCH TEAM

This section summarizes selected activities developed by the research team during this academic year. Conferences attended and to be attended, daily routines, seminars, undergraduate research projects, manuscripts submitted or in preparation, and next activities are detailed in this section of the academic report.

1.4.1 STRENGTHENING ACADEMIC TIES

ATTENDED CONFERENCES 2016-2017

- 3rd ISA Forum of Sociology (Vienna, Austria - jul. 2016)
  “Predictors and impacts of police legitimacy in the city of São Paulo”
  André Zanetic, Bruno P. Manso, Frederico C. Branco, Ariadne Natal, Thiago Oliveira

- 16th Annual Conference of the European Society of Criminology (Münster, Germany - sep. 2016)
  “Police legitimacy in São Paulo: consensual obedience and legitimate
disobedience”
Ariadne Natal, Thiago Oliveira, André Zanetic

- 40th Annual ANPOCS Meeting (Caxambu, Brazil - oct. 2016)
  “Legitimidade da polícia: teoria da dissuasão e justeza procedimental”
  André Zanetic, Bruno P. Manso, Ariadne Natal, Thiago Oliveira

- 40th Annual ANPOCS Meeting (Caxambu, Brazil - oct. 2016)
  “Como mensurar o que não é observável? Abordagem reflexiva de mensuração e modelagem de variáveis latentes em desenhos de survey”
  Thiago Oliveira, André Oliveira, Ariadne Natal

CONFERENCES TO BE ATTENDED IN 2017-2018


A presentation entitled “Social Conservatism and Legitimacy: Predicting Public Support for Police Violence in Brazil” will be held at a thematic session of the 17th Annual Conference of the European Society of Criminology.

Abstract: Who supports the excessive use of force by officers in São Paulo? Brazilian Military Police are recognized for their history of violence, abusive use of force and lethality. In the last decade, more than 3,500 people were killed by the military police in the metropolitan region of São Paulo. This study aimed at investigating the predictors of public support for police violence, particularly testing the effects of a social conservatism ideology and the role of legitimacy. It is plausible to test the hypothesis that those who recognize the police actions as legitimate are the ones who actually support the abusive use of force. Using the second wave data of a longitudinal panel started in 2015, representative of adults in São Paulo in 2017, we asked the respondents how they would evaluate the police actions after describing three unlawful scenarios: a homicide, a torture, and violence against protesters on a demonstration. We then used generalized structural equation modelling to estimate the effects of the ideology and legitimacy. Both variables were significant and positive. The results we found contribute to discussions about the relation between the public support and the permanence of police violence in Brazil.

Key words: Support for Police Violence; Social Conservatism; Legitimacy

A presentation entitled “Predictors and impacts of police legitimacy: testing the procedural justice theory in São Paulo” will be held at the “Violence, Police, and Justice in Brazil: research agenda and theoretical-methodological challenges” session of the 16th Brazilian Conference of Sociology.

Abstract: This paper aims at empirically investigating both the predictors and the impacts of the public perception of police legitimacy in São Paulo. The objective was to test Tyler’s model about perception of procedural justice in the Brazilian context. We thus used a representative survey of adults living in São Paulo in 2015. Assuming a reflective approach on measurement, the adopted analytical strategy involved generalized structural equation modeling to test the mediation role the police legitimacy plays between procedural justice and compliance with the law. Results indicate greater complexity in measuring duty to obey in a context such as the Brazilian one. After a content analysis of open-ended questions concerning the motivation to obey the police, we suggest four police legitimacy categories: moral duty to obey; disobedient protest; coercive obligation; and rejection of authority. These categories were incorporated in the model. The first two groups, who recognize the police legitimacy, are associated with perception of procedural justice and are significant predictors of legal compliance, whilst the others are anot. At last, we discuss some implications for criminal policies in Brazil.

Key words: Police legitimacy; Duty to obey; Procedural justice; Survey analysis; Structural equation model.


A presentation entitled “Legitimacy and obedience: a concept in social theory” will be held at the “Violence, punishment, and deviance: theoretical discussions and empirical investigations” session of the 41st Annual Meeting of the National Association of Research in Social Sciences.

Abstract: This paper aims at discussing the notions of legitimacy and obedience as they were suggested by social theory. In addition, it aims at indicating some contemporary perspectives which seek to empirically operationalize these concepts in sociological and criminological frames within analyses concerning legal institutions. The article thus start discussing the legitimate order ruling as it was suggested by Max Weber. It then points the work of two contemporary authors: David Beetham and Jean-Marc Coicaud. At last, it discusses the role legal institutions play in guaranteeing law-abiding behavior, as well as the conceptualization of legitimacy in empirical criminological researches. Focus is given to the work developed by Tom Tyler and by the critics made Anthony Bottoms and Justice Tankebe.

Key words: Legitimacy; Obedience; Authority; Max Weber; Procedural Justice.
PUBLISHED WORK


MANUSCRIPTS IN REVISION

- ZANETIC, André; NATAL, Ariadne; OLIVEIRA, Thiago. “Preditores e impactos da legitimidade policial: testando a teoria da justiça procedimental em São Paulo”. In revision, to be submitted to *Dados - Revista de Ciências Sociais*.
- OLIVEIRA, Thiago; OLIVEIRA, André; ADORNO, Sérgio. “Como mensurar o que não é observável? Exemplos de uma pesquisa sobre legitimidade policial em São Paulo”. In revision, to be submitted to *Revista Brasileira de Ciências Sociais*.
- JACKSON, Jonathan; BRADFORD, Ben; ZANETIC, André; NATAL, Ariadne; OLIVEIRA, Thiago. “Duty, deference and dissent: Unpacking police legitimacy and legal compliance in São Paulo”. In revision, to be submitted to the *Law & Society Review Journal*.

MANUSCRIPTS IN PREPARATION

- ADORNO, Sérgio; NATAL, Ariadne; OLIVEIRA, Thiago. “Legitimacy and obedience: a concept in social theory”. In preparation, to be submitted to the *Sociologies in Dialogue* journal.
- COELHO, Rafael; OLIVEIRA, Thiago; NATAL, Ariadne. “Raça, polícia e legitimidade”. In preparation, to be submitted to *Dilemas - Revista de Estudos de Conflito e Controle Social*.
- NATAL, Ariadne; OLIVEIRA, Thiago; TANKEBE, Justice. “Social conservatism and legitimacy: predicting public support for police violence in Brazil”. In preparation, to be submitted an international Criminology journal.

1. 4.2 RESEARCH TEAM ACTIVITIES
WEEKLY SEMINARS ON POLICE LEGITIMACY

From July 2016 to June 2017, weekly seminars were conducted at the Centre in order to discuss the contemporary literature concerning police legitimacy. All members of the research team participated, including scientific initiation researchers and undergraduate research assistants. Readings would vary between conceptual work in social theory - Weber, Beetham, Coicaud, and others -, empirical analyses concerning public perceptions towards the police - Tyler, Jackson, Gau, Murphy, and others -, and Brazilian texts in order to bring the discussion into a context of socially implemented authoritarianism - Pinheiro, Mesquita Neto, Santos, and others. Such meetings were pivotal in respect to the research development along the year.

BIWEEKLY SEMINARS ON URBANIZATION PROCESSES

During the time that the scientific initiations of Luísa Santos and Hegle Mariano were underway, fortnightly meetings were held with the purpose of presenting and discussing articles that dialogued with the urban and socio-spatial realities of the key areas of Cidade Ademar and Iguatemi. Derived mainly from Urban Geography and Urbanism, this bibliography focused on the production of urban space and the historical urbanization of the metropolis of São Paulo, having as main axis the discussion about the transformations of the concept of periphery and the historical and geographic processes that produced the Peripheral expansion from the 1940s.

SCIENTIFIC INITIATION PROGRAMS

- Race, Police, and Legitimacy: Racial Effects in Police-Citizen Encounters
  Rafael Castro Coelho Silva, 3rd year, Social Sciences, FFLCH-USP
  May. 2016 - Apr. 2017 (FAPESP)
  Abstract: Considering the general research program concerning predictors and impacts of the recognition of police legitimacy by citizens living in the city of São Paulo, this Scientific Initiation Program aimed at assessing racial differences influenced by police-citizen encounters. If the research team has already brought evidence to support the procedural justice hypothesis in this context, an important question remained unanswered: is there evidence to support this hypothesis in both white and black communities in São Paulo? Using the 2015 survey representative of adults in São Paulo, we tested the effects of trust in procedural justice and trust in effectiveness on duty to obey (binomial logistic model) and on normative alignment (OLS model), as well as the effects of the legitimacy components on legal compliance and cooperation with the police. Despite some slight differences between white and black citizens, their perceptions towards the police follow the same pattern, which emphasizes the importance of a procedurally fair police institution.
Police legitimacy in São Paulo: assessing social differences
Clara Taneguti Pimentel Costa, 4th year, Social Sciences, FFLCH-USP
may. 2016 - apr. 2017 (FAPESP)

Abstract: Considering the general research program concerning predictors and impacts of the recognition of police legitimacy by citizens living in the city of São Paulo, this Scientific Initiation Program aimed at assessing social differences influenced by police-citizen encounters. If the research team has already brought evidence to support the procedural justice hypothesis in this context, an important question remained unanswered: is there evidence to support this hypothesis in both rich and poor communities in São Paulo? Using the 2015 survey representative of adults in São Paulo, we tested the effects of trust in procedural justice and trust in effectiveness on police legitimacy (OLS models) for rich and poor citizens separately. Despite some slight differences between them, their perceptions towards the police follow the same pattern, which emphasizes the importance of a procedurally fair police institution.

Occupation and urbanization processes in the key area of Cidade Ademar
Luísa Rocha Cardoso Santos, 5th year, Geography, FFLCH-USP
apr. 2016 - mar. 2017 (FAPESP)

Abstract: Associate to research "Building Democracy Daily: Human Rights, Violence and Institutional Trust" accomplished by the Center for the Study of Violence (Núcleo de Estudos da Violência - NEV), this undergraduate research seeks to understand the context of historical process and the urbanization process of Cidade Ademar, one of the eight key areas that make up the research about legitimacy in the public service and with the residents.

Occupation and urbanization processes in the key area of Iguatemi
Hegle Mariano Silva Pereira, 4th year, Social Sciences, FFLCH-USP
apr. 2016 - mar. 2017 (FAPESP)

Abstract: Associate to research "Building Democracy Daily: Human Rights, Violence and Institutional Trust" accomplished by the Center for the Study of Violence (Núcleo de Estudos da Violência - NEV), this undergraduate research seeks to understand the context of historical process and the urbanization process of Iguatemi, one of the eight key areas that make up the research about legitimacy in the public service and with the residents.

UNDERGRADUATE RESEARCH ASSISTANT

Woman, Security, and Legitimacy: procedural justice and outcome
Maria Tranjan Prado, 4th year, Social Sciences, FFLCH-USP
apr. 2016 - june. 2017 (NEV-USP)
Abstract: Considering the general research program concerning predictors and impacts of the recognition of police legitimacy by citizens living in the city of São Paulo, this Scientific Initiation Program aimed at assessing gender differences influenced by police-citizen encounters. If the research team has already brought evidence to support the procedural justice hypothesis in this context, an important question remained unanswered: is there evidence to support this hypothesis in both victimized and not-victimized women groups in São Paulo? Using the 2015 survey representative of adults in São Paulo, we tested the procedural justice and the outcome hypotheses on police legitimacy (OLS models) for both groups separately. Despite some slight differences between them, their perceptions towards the police follow the same pattern, which emphasizes the importance of a procedurally fair police institution.

METHODOLOGICAL TRAINING

In order to qualify our research team, especially on topics such as Quantitative Methods in the Social Sciences, NEV has enhanced its human resources by supporting methodological training. Every member of the research team has participated of at least one quantitative course during the last year. The most important achievement was a partnership between NEV and the IPSA-USP Summer School on Methods and Concepts in Political Science, a global point of reference and synonymous with excellence and rigorous training in methods. In 2017, 8 researchers from NEV 11 attended the IPSA-USP Summer School, developing skills on topics such as data analysis, public policy analysis, and multi-method research. The partnership is aimed to continue in 2018.

Apart from the partnership with the IPSA-USP Summer School, we are encouraging our team to participate in methodological workshops and courses. Not only are some researchers are taking graduate-level classes at the University of São Paulo in topics such as Econometrics and Epidemiology, but the Center has also sent members of the team to specialized Summer and Winter Schools in Brazil – such as the Intensive Training in Quantitative Methods Program (CPQES-UFMG) and the Metodológicas (CEM-USP). A member of the research team has participated of the LSE Summer School on Methods – developing skills on latent variable modeling, structural equation modeling, and MPlus, which are central to the on-going research.

1.4.3 NEXT STEPS

LONGITUDINAL DATA ANALYSIS
Having collected data for the second wave of our longitudinal panel in eight key areas in São Paulo, efforts will be now focused on longitudinal data analysis across citizens who answered the questionnaire on both occasions. Due to its quasi-experimental nature, this research design shall allow us to engage in more robust explanations, since the estimated effects will be controlled by unobservable factors at the individual levels (i.e., fixed effects). Therefore, it will be possible to estimate the impact of police-citizen encounters, for instance, thus investigating the actual role legal institutions play in guaranteeing the recognition of the authority. Two manuscripts are expected using the 2017 panel data.

EXPECTED MANUSCRIPTS

- ADORNO, Sérgio; NATAL, Ariadne; OLIVEIRA, Thiago. “Legitimacy and obedience: a concept in social theory”. In preparation, to be submitted to the Sociologies in Dialogue journal.
- COELHO, Rafael; OLIVEIRA, Thiago; NATAL, Ariadne. “Raça, polícia e legitimidade”. In preparation, to be submitted to Dilemas - Revista de Estudos de Conflito e Controle Social.
- NATAL, Ariadne; OLIVEIRA, Thiago; TANKEBE, Justice. “Social conservatism and legitimacy: predicting public support for police violence in Brazil”. In preparation, to be submitted an international Criminology journal.

INTERNATIONAL PARTNERSHIPS

The research team keeps counting with the support of our international partners - not only as consultant expert reviewers, but as actual partners who are working alongside us. The first paper aimed to discuss with international community - “Duty, Deference, Dissent: Unpacking Police Legitimacy and Legal Compliance in São Paulo”, in revision and to be submitted to Law & Society Review - was written with the key support and expertise provided by Dr. Jonathan Jackson (London School of Economics and Political Science) and by Dr. Ben Bradford (Oxford University). Moreover, we are currently working with Dr. Justice Tankebe (University of Cambridge) on a manuscript discussing social authoritarianism in Brazil, as he was responsible for suggesting our new measures of public support for police violence.

Besides their visits to São Paulo in multiple occasions, in August 2016 a member of our research team had the opportunity of visiting all three of them due to the attendance in the LSE Summer Methods Programme. Such occasion was an opportunity to discuss some of the preliminary results of the ongoing investigation and to hear suggestions concerning changes in the questionnaire (for the second wave). In fact, following Dr. Jackson’s review, we now have
more questions about duty to obey and normative alignment with the police, making it possible to adopt a reflective approach on measurement. And following Dr. Tankebe’s review, we have questions concerning public support for police violence by actual scenarios, which are being analyzed for a manuscript with his coauthorship.

3RD WAVE DATA COLLECTION

In order to complete the panel as it was primarily conceived, data are planned to be collected in the first semester of 2018 for the third wave of the longitudinal study. Great changes in the questionnaire are not expected for this occasion. Considering the original 1200 respondents, a rate of at least 75% is expected to be part of the study again.
2. Civil Servants, Legitimacy and Trust

The last report presented an overview of the most recent literature on self-legitimacy and analyzed the first results from the residents’ survey, specifically the data about contacts between the population and public services. It also presented the results of pre-test interviews with police officers and judges, and the development and pre-test of the questionnaires for police officers. Additionally, there was the planning of the field work.

2.1. RESEARCH

2.1.1. POLICE

The purpose of this study is to explore public officials’ view of their self-legitimacy. Internal legitimacy, or self-legitimacy, is defined as the level of confidence that a public official has about his or her own legitimacy—feeling worthy or not worthy of his or her authority (Tankebe, 2011). This approach may help to identify actions that justify their political power, as well as their internal beliefs in their moral right to exercise such authority. We seek to understand the most relevant aspects that influence self-legitimacy and its impact on policing. In this regard, following what has been pointed out by international literature, we explore the existence of procedural justice in internal relations, between superiors and subordinates, between peers, and between subordinates and the institution as a whole; and aspects related to their relationship with the public, compliance with the law, perception of the organization’s identity, and identification with the organization and its objects.

A. THE PROCESS OF AUTHORIZATION

As described in the last report, we required authorization from the Secretary of Public Security of the state of São Paulo to collect the data from police officers. The negotiation started on January 27th and ended only on June 28th when we received signed authorization from the Secretary to conduct the research. With this document, we started the contacts to organize our field work.

For the Civil Police, we contacted the chief of each police station in which we wished to apply the questionnaires. In these contacts, we explained what the research was about and then we sent a copy of the authorization. In some cases, we visited the police stations to introduce
ourselves to the chief and clear up some questions concerning the data collection. After this procedure, we scheduled the beginning of the activities at the station.

For the Military Police, after a meeting between researchers and members of the Direction of Community Policing and Human Rights (Diretoria de Políciia Comunitária e Direitos Humanos - DPCDH), a captain was designated to intermediate our contacts with the commanders of the Companies selected for the data collection. This arrangement facilitated the work because when we contacted the Companies to schedule the visit, the officers had already been told by their superiors about the study and about the authorization from high command to conduct the research.

B. FIELD WORK

The questionnaires were applied between July 7th and November 8th, 2016. During this period, we visited all the Civil Police Stations and Military Police Companies in the eight key areas (see Appendix 1).

In pairs, the researchers drove to the locations and provided four laptops with the questionnaires hosted on Survey Monkey online survey software. The questionnaires were accessed exclusively on the laptops we provided, which were connected to the internet through a mobile connection service we hired. Most of the time, the equipment was placed in circulation areas, such as dining rooms, pantries, or instruction rooms. In these places, the equipment was oriented in a way to guarantee the greatest possible privacy to the participants when filling out the questionnaire.

The presentation of the study to the officers and the invitation to participate in it happened in different ways. Mostly, the invitations happened at the place where the equipment was located. As the officers arrived, the researchers introduced themselves, described the study and invited them to participate. Banners with basic information about the research (the main goal; the content of the questionnaire; who could participate and the importance of their participation) were available in strategic locations as a means of informing and attracting the police officers.

3 The Military Police questionnaire has 99 closed questions and four open questions. Available in: https://pt.surveymonkey.net/r/?sm=8jWMNTPAnN_2F550gtE09unkiVK3Rjz6GU1uoPHAEF8mc_3D
The Civil Police questionnaire has 97 closed questions and four open questions. Available in: https://pt.surveymonkey.net/r/?sm=Sp5W8fH_2FSUjw2d0RnVZnb0Lnf7U42d60Q1tbHvLks_3D
All closed questions have a 5-point scale.
The officers usually came up and asked the researchers who was carrying out the research and what its goals were. Next to the laptops, we offered coffee and cake. What was just a courtesy worked as a strategy of approximation. While the officers drank the coffee, they could clear up some questions about the study and, often, decided to participate.

After the first visit, we defined the next visits taking into consideration the officers’ shifts. If most officers of a specific shift had already answered the questionnaire, during the next visits we tried to reach officers from different shifts. If one day the data collection had not been productive, we came back on a different day during the same shift so that other officers could participate. Considering that the eight research locations were distant from each other and that in each area often there were a Civil Police Station and a Military Police Company next to each other, we always tried to visit both of them on the same day.

In the Military Police Companies, we arrived before the shift change, when orientation happens. In almost all companies, the shift change takes place at 6 a.m. and at 6 p.m. In some companies, there were groups – such as the motorcycle police and school police – that had different schedules from the rest of the troop. Orientation are sessions in which the sergeants give instructions to the officers before they go out on the streets. At the beginning or at the end of the orientation, we could briefly explain the study and invite officers to participate. The officers usually answered the questionnaires before their shift started because, on working days, they normally get to the company long before their shift starts. We also noticed that the end of the shift was the worst moment to get them to participate because they were usually in a hurry.

Knowing the Companies’ dynamics and trying to ensure that most officers participated in the research, we determined that the researchers should stay at the Company as long as possible. If data collection started at dawn, it would last until lunch hour to catch the officers that went back to the company for lunch. The ones that started in the middle of the afternoon lasted until the evening. The researchers’ permanence varied according to the availability of officers in the unit who, on special operation days, spend less time at the company.

The data collection in the Civil Police Stations had a different arrangement. There was no specific time to start the activities. As the officers arrived, not always at the same time, they went to their offices. The availability of these officers varied according to their function: the officers in charge of bureaucratic activities could take breaks from their work to participate in the study. The officers serving the public and registering occurrences were seldom available, and when they decided to answer the questionnaire, in some cases they were constantly interrupted to answer requests.
When the research team arrived at the stations, contact with the officers usually started with one of the researchers going to their offices to explain the research and invite them to participate. The place where the researchers stayed at each station varied: in some of them, they were located in the kitchen, in others in the administrative area or next to the front desk on the ground floor. In the latter case, the researchers could accompany police services closely. In order to reach groups in different shifts, the data collection was conducted during the day and during the evening.

The police officers, civil and military, who agreed to participate answered the questionnaire alone on the laptops. The researchers remained close by to answer any questions they might have about filling in the questionnaire or using the system. The time spent to fill in the questionnaire varied. Some officers answered it in 20 minutes, while others took 30 to 40 minutes.

We did not have access to information about the number of officers working in each unit. Alleging to be a “security” issue, this information is considered strategic by the commanders and is seldom made public. Therefore, we could not select a representative sample for the study and we decided to use a convenience sample. During the time we stayed in the units, almost all officers, without distinction, were invited to participate in the research. Even officers working in administrative areas at the company were invited, since all of them had worked as a patrol officer at some point in their career. The same procedure was adopted with the Civil Police Stations. The questionnaires obtained, therefore, were answered by officers that agreed to participate.

C. METHODOLOGY

The answers to closed-ended questions were counted and organized into tables. The answers of open-ended questions were classified. All the answers were reviewed to identify the main subject, since in some cases the police officers included different subjects in their responses. After that, some categories were created to group answers having similar content. Considering that not all police officers answered the open-ended questions, and those who did answer included some different subject in their responses, there is variation in the number of responses presented. This classification will enable us to change open-ended question to closed-ended questions in a second version of the questionnaire.

D. RESULTS
The survey was conducted in the eight key areas. A total of 62 visits were made, of which 39 were in Military Police Companies and 23 in Civil Police Stations. We gathered 298 completed questionnaires answered by military police officers and 140 questionnaires answered by civil police officers. It is important to mention that despite the fact that we did not have information about the staff, we have approximate numbers that we got by informally talking to people at each unit. Based on these numbers we sought to survey at least 30% of the personnel. The tables 3 and 4 shows the number of visits, number of questionnaires gathered, and the number of estimated personnel in each police unit.

Table 3. Visits, questionnaires and estimated personnel for Military Police

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MP VISITS</th>
<th>MP QUESTIONNAIRES</th>
<th>ESTIMATED PERSONNEL</th>
<th>% PARTICIPATING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V. MATILDE</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>37.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IGUATEMI</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>36.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRAJAÚ</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>23.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIRITUBA</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>32.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JD. PAULISTA</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. ANDRADE</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>31.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JD. ÂNGELA</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIDADE ADEMAR</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>38.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>872</td>
<td>34.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4. Visits, questionnaires and estimated personnel for Civil Police

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CP VISITS</th>
<th>CP QUESTIONNAIRES</th>
<th>ESTIMATED PERSONNEL</th>
<th>% PARTICIPATING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V. MATILDE</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>37.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IGUATEMI</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>35.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRAJAÚ</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>32.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIRITUBA</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JD. PAULISTA</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. ANDRADE</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>36.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JD. ÂNGELA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>30.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIDADE ADEMAR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>43.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>37.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The police officers’ willingness to participate in the survey varied from place to place. Even though it is not possible to indicate the reasons for that, some factors can be explored as possible reasons for this variation. The first factor was the support (or lack of support) from the chiefs for the study. In spite of all chiefs having agreed to the study, in some cases they showed clear support and encouraged the officers to participate.

In a Military Police Company, for example, the chief told the officers that the study was a great opportunity to express their dissatisfaction. In addition to the chief’s support, others officers’ encouragement would also encourage participation. At two Police Stations, and at three Military Police Companies, five police officers became “promoters” of the study. After they completed the questionnaire, they also invited and encouraged their colleagues to do the same, even those who were more reluctant. There was one situation where an officer relieved a colleague from attending the public so that he could answer the questionnaire.

The second factor was the timing of researchers’ visits when others events were occurring at the Police Stations and Military Police Companies, which changed the work routine. For example, the research team arrived at a Military Police Company almost at the same time that the new officer-in-chief arrived. He had been assigned to that Company the night before, some hours after the researchers scheduled their visit with the former chief. He was a bit dissatisfied with his transferal and had no knowledge of the study. At another Military Police Company, the researchers’ visit occurred on the same day that the Correctional Office arrested nine police officers, charged with larceny, drug trafficking, and robbery. The episode created a stressful atmosphere among police officers.

At the Military Police Company of Grajaú, where we had less participation from police officers, the Correctional Office carried out a major operation three months after our data collection. During this operation, at the end of January 2016, 12 police officers were arrested and charged with drug trafficking. Two of them were caught carrying a lot of drugs in their squad car while on duty. This fact could explain the lower participation in this unit. It is possible that not only those officers who were involved in criminal activity, but also others who probably knew about it, did not feel comfortable participating in the study.

Some justifications given by the police officers to not participate in the study were lack of time, dismay, despondency, not believing that the research results would benefit their work, or because they considered the questionnaire too long. Certainly, other reasons have also interfered in the participation of police officers; however, we did not conduct any type of study to identify those reasons because we think it wiser to not insist on looking for information of any nature from those who did not demonstrate much willingness.
DISSCRIPTIVE STATISTICS: MILITARY POLICE

PROFILE

A total of 298 military police officers took part in the survey, the vast majority (84%) of the male sex, with ages varying from 20 to 29 years (38%); 30 to 39 years (36%); and 40 to 49 years (24%). More than half of them (54.4%) have college degrees (29.2%) or some college education (25.2%). The majority self-identify as white (58.7%); 31.5% identify as 'pardo' (mixed-race), and 8.4% as black. The sample is made up primarily of enlisted members (98.3%), and among these the majority are soldiers (62.8%), the lowest rank; followed by corporals (24.8%); sergeants (10.1%), and sub lieutenants (0.7%). Only five of them are commissioned officers, being lieutenants and captains. The vast majority of respondents (78%) are active in street patrols. As for their time in the Military Police, half of the police officers (50%) have been in the institution for five years or less; the remaining police officers have between 6 and 10 years on the force (10%); 11 to 15 years (13%); or between 16 and 20 years (13%).

In short, our sample is primarily composed of white men under the age of 40, with high educational levels, focused on patrolling duties, and who have been in the force for less than 10 years.

CAREER

These questions focused on the reasons for choosing the police career, the values that guided this choice, and how he/she evaluates his/her choices. The vast majority of respondents (42 didn’t provide answers) replied to the question of why they chose to become military police officers, and among the most common reasons given were: “like the profession” (67 instances), police officers who said they chose the profession because they had an interest in or admiration for the career; “help people” (49 instances), police officers that chose this career so that they had an interest in or admiration for the career; “help people” (49 instances), police officers that chose this career so that they

---

4 In an informal conversation with police officers at the Community Police Directory, we were told that the number of women on the force is close to 14%, which leads us to believe that the representation of women in our sample is not far from the reality of the force.
5 Careers in the Military Police are divided into enlisted and officer ranks. Enlisted police (soldiers, corporals, and sergeants) are in charge of operational activities; upper ranks are formed by commissioned officers (sub lieutenants, lieutenants, captains, majors, lieutenant colonels and colonels) who exercise management and command functions.
6 “Out of admiration for and always liking the primary activity”; “Admiring the institution and identifying with the profession.”
7 “I decided to become a police officer due to the strong desire to help my fellow man”; “Passion for helping people.”
could help others; “family influence” (42 instances)\(^8\), cases of police officers who chose the career because they had a close family member who was a military police officer; and “fulfilment of a dream” (32 instances)\(^9\), police officers who describe the choice of this career as the fulfilment of a dream, oftentimes defined as a childhood dream.

The majority of police officers (62.4%) stated that if they could restart their lives, they wouldn’t change their decision and would still be police officers. Some respondents (14.8%) said that they would still be police, but not as members of the Military Police, and another 17.1% said they would choose a different profession.

Slightly more than half of police officers (53.4%) had only worked in the battalion where they were currently stationed at the time of the questionnaire. The remainder (46.6%) had already worked in other locations, the majority (30%) in 2 or 3 different places. More than half of police officers (64%) had worked up to five years in their current battalion; the other had been between 5 and 10 years (15%) or more than 10 years (21%) at their current battalion.\(^10\)

The majority of police officers (67.8%) had a positive view of the region where they work, stating that “it’s a good place to work.” Only 9.7% said that their current work location “is a bad place to work,” while 10.1% demonstrated some indifference, saying they are stationed in a place that is “neither good nor bad to work.”

The sample is composed of people who wished to become (military) police and who seem to not regret this decision. Taking into account the data regarding time working as a police officer, there seems to be an intense shifting of police officers to different work locations during their careers, but this didn’t impede them from positively evaluating the places where they are working.

**WORK CONDITIONS**

Questions here sought to identify their perceptions about resources and work conditions. The answers were very similar with regard to three aspects related to working conditions. The majority of respondents stated that the following resources “frequently don’t meet” or “never

---

\(^{8}\) “Family profession”; “I always accompanied by father at the MP and got it in my head that I would follow in his steps and be MP as well.”

\(^{9}\) “Ever since I was a child I dreamt of entering the police force”; “Because it is my dream and professional achievement”

\(^{10}\) Police officers at the start of their careers pass through more work locations as part of the need to fill out the staffing at units. There is also the fact that in the last decade new Battalions and Companies were created, which could also have had an impact on this movement.
meet” the needs of police officers: professional training and updates (42.3%); human resources (40.6%) and; material resources such as uniforms, vehicles, weapons, etc. (37.6%).

Regarding changes that they said had happened at the Military Police since they entered the institution, close to half of police officers (170) said that these had in fact taken place. In an open-ended question format, more negative changes than positive changes were provided, and sometimes police officers noted more than one change that had taken place. It was possible to identify 31 types of changes, some being positive (11) and others negative (20). Among the 84 answers that indicated negative changes, the most frequent were: “negative changes, but impossible to identify” (14), responses where it was clear that the changes didn’t lead to improvements, although it was impossible to identify what the changes were; “less respect” (10), answers which indicated that currently the police no longer is respected by the population; “salary or devaluation” (10), answers related to deteriorating wages in the profession; and “monitoring” (9), answers that indicated greater monitoring of police work. Among the 61 answers that indicated positive changes, the most frequent were: “material resources” (21), answers where the police officers noted that currently they have more modern equipment than previously, such as uniforms, weapons, vehicles, etc.; second was “professionalization” (11), where police officers reported that currently the police utilizes very different proceedings, which make them much more professional; and third, “superiors respect their subordinates more” (10), which includes answers where police officers noted that there were changes in behavior of those officers tasked with leadership, who currently are in greater contact and more respectful of their subordinates.

Although police officers noted positive changes in relation to material resources at the institution, these seemed to not be sufficient to meet their daily needs; even less sufficient are resources involving personnel, such as the police contingent and trainings and refresher courses. They also noted that the police force has become more professional over the course of time, which could be reflected in their perception of improvements in internal relations between superiors and subordinates, as well as in greater monitoring of their work. However, they also noted that they have been devalued in terms of the financial aspect and in the treatment they receive from the broader population.

INSTITUTIONAL IDENTITY
The aim here was to identify if there is a moral alignment between officers’ own values and the values of the police organization. The results show that the officers demonstrate a strong connection to the institution, as they feel pride in being part of it and identifying with its values.

The open-ended question “What does it mean for you to be a Military Police officer?” was answered by the vast majority of police officers (87%). The three most frequent responses, which together accounted for more than half of the answers demonstrating satisfaction, were: “positive sentiment” (69), police officers who demonstrated an affective connection to the profession; “helping people” (60), answers that linked policing activities to the possibility of helping people and; “fulfillment” (30), answers that indicated that becoming a police officer was the achievement of something highly desired.

The fourth most common answer, “not being valued” (24), presents a negative connotation, and was cited by police officers who affirmed that they didn’t feel they received recognition for the career they chose.

For the great majority of respondents, the values of the Military Police are compatible with their own values, with 37% of them agreeing completely with this compatibility, and 43% saying that they agree somewhat. Only 14% disagreed in some way that there was compatibility between these values.

When asked if they felt proud of being part of the Military Police, almost all officers responded in the affirmative. More than half (66%) agreed completely with this question, stating that they felt proud of their institution, and another 26% said they agreed somewhat with this statement.

RELATIONSHIP WITH SUPERIORS

The focus of this set of questions is to explore the features of a good and bad police manager (focus on internal procedural justice and supervisory procedural justice); career

---

11 “A beautiful profession...I love my profession”; “It means my life.”
12 “Protect and serve society regardless of social class”; “Being a police officer is being able to help others, to sacrifice oneself for someone you don’t even know.”
13 “Personal and professional realization”; “A dream come true, a victory. Before being a Military Police, I earned 4 times as much. Which means I didn’t choose the MP to make money, but rather as a priesthood.”
14 “Giving my all and not having the due recognition (inside and outside of the institution) and continuing this journey without expecting anything in return”; “It means serving, giving of yourself on behalf of others although often you are not recognized for your work.”
development (procedural fairness in promotions, special training...) and experiences with internal controls (procedural fairness in internal/administrative procedures).

When asked whether their commanders at the Company value and take into account the opinions of the troops, the answers were split. For 40% of police officers, commanders always (15%) or almost always (25%) care about the opinion of the troops. For 33% of respondents, this never (14%) or rarely (19%) happens. There are also 25% who said that this “sometimes” occurs.

With regard to decisions made by superiors being based on objective criteria, rather than personal judgments, less than half of police officers (42%) said that this “always” happens (14%) or “almost always” happens (28%). For 28% this happens “sometimes” and for 25% this “rarely” happens (17%) or “never” happens (9%).

With regard to the perception that commanders make decisions in a fair manner at the Company, for almost half of police officers (47%) this “always” happens (17%) or “almost always” (30%); for 28% this happens “sometimes,” and for 22% this “rarely” happens (15%) or “never” happens (7%).

The majority of police officers (71%) said they are treated with respect by their superiors, saying that this “always” happens (41%) or “almost always” (30%). For 15% this happens “sometimes” and for 11% this “rarely” or “never” happens.

In response to the question about whether superiors always give explanations about decisions that interfere in day-to-day operations, the answers were once again split. For 39%, superiors “rarely” (22%) or “never” (17%) provide explanations about their decisions; while for 37% this “always” (13%) or “almost always” happens (24%); another 23% said this “sometimes” happens.

Slightly more than half of police officers (58%) stated that they are “always” (21%) or “almost always” (37%) treated fairly by their superiors. Another 23% said that “sometimes” they are treated fairly, while 18% said they are “rarely” (14%) or “never” (4%) treated in a fair manner by their superiors.

In response to the question of whether their superiors are concerned with the well-being of police officers, 36% said that this “never” (17%) or “rarely” happens (19%), while some of the respondents (35%) said that this “always” (10%) or “almost always” (24%) happens; 26% said that only “sometimes” are superiors concerned about their well-being.

The question about recognition for good performance in the Military Police presented a clear division among police officers. Almost half (47%) “agreed completely” (5%) or “agreed
somewhat” (42%) that good performance is recognized and rewarded in the institution. The other half (45%) “disagreed somewhat” (21%) or “disagreed completely” (24%) that this recognition occurs. In other words, one-fourth of police officers don’t feel the least bit recognized for their good performance.

The majority of police officers (59%) disagree, whether they “disagree completely” (43%) or “disagree somewhat” (16%), with the statement “the Military Police is fair in regard to promotions and career advancement.” Another 35% agreed with the above statement, with just 11% among these saying that they “agree completely.”

The majority of police officers (63%) also agreed, whether “agreeing completely” (28%) or “agreeing somewhat” (35%), with the statement that “the objectives of the Military Police are clear to me”; 28% disagreed with that statement.

In response to the question of whether superiors understand what happens to police officers on the street, the majority (58%) agreed, totally (15%) or partially (43%), with this statement. Another 32% of police officers disagreed (16% disagreed somewhat and another 16% disagreed completely) that superiors possess this understanding.

The majority of police officers (64%) agreed with the statement that their superior helps them to learn about the job, while 24% disagreed with this statement.

Almost half of police officers (43%) said that their superiors “always” (21%) or “almost always” (22%) provide evaluations about the job that help them improve their performance. However, another 29% said that these evaluations happen “sometimes” and another 26% said that this “rarely” (15%) or “never” (11%) happens.

Slightly more than half of police officers (51%) “agree completely” (14%) or “agree somewhat” (38%) with the statement “My superior encourages and supports my development.” Another 35% of police officers disagreed with this statement, “disagreeing somewhat” (14%) or “disagreeing completely” (21%).

The majority of police officers (57%) who filled in the questionnaire had been subjected to disciplinary or administrative procedures. These officers were asked three questions about this experience. At the same time that the majority of them said that during this proceeding they were assured the right of defense (90%) and that they were treated with respect (69%), slightly more than half (55%) said that they didn’t think that they outcomes of these proceedings were fair.

In summary, upon being asked in a broad manner about the quality of their relationship with superiors, the police officers said that they are treated with respect and fairly. However,
upon specifying the aspects of this relationship, the answers proved to be more divergent. In
general, the officers don’t feel that their superiors take their opinions into account, nor that their
decisions are always objective or always fair. They don’t feel they are recognized for their good
performance, don’t feel that job promotions are fair, or that their superiors are concerned with
their well-being. The administrative procedures to which they have been subjected, despite
having their right to defense guaranteed and being treated respectfully, didn’t have outcomes
that they considered fair. This indicates that there are important aspects in the superior-
subordinate relationship that need to be better understood.

COMPLIANCE

These questions focus on the willingness to do or not do what other people want him/her
to do and to respect rules.

In response to whether police officers agree with the statement “I do what my superior
asks me to do,” almost all (93%) said they “agreed completely” (57%) or “agreed somewhat”
(36%). There was slightly less agreement with the statement “I follow my superior’s instructions
even when I disagree with these instructions,” where 87% of officers agreed completely (43%) or
agreed somewhat (44%).

As for the statement “I often feel inclined to openly question my superiors’ directives,”
half of police officers (51%) said they agreed completely (9%) or agreed somewhat (42%), while
another 36% disagreed somewhat (11%) or disagreed completely (25%) with this statement.

To the statement that “I do not question my superior because otherwise I can be
punished,” the majority of police officers (72%) agreed completely (39%) or agreed somewhat
(33%) with this statement. Only 18% disagreed with this statement.

The majority of officers (70%) agreed completely (36%) or agreed somewhat (34%) with
the statement “Always following the legal rules does not help to get the police’s real job done.”
18% disagreed with this statement.

The majority of respondents (73%) also agreed completely (47%) or agreed somewhat
(26%) with the statement “It is sometimes acceptable to use more force than is legally allowable
to make an arrest.” 18% disagreed with this statement.

The majority of police officers (60%) agreed with the statement that “Officers who make
excessive use of physical force during the course of their policing activity must be investigated
and punished,” while one-fourth of police officers disagreed, completely or somewhat, with this statement.

Obedience of superiors seems, at least in part, to be motivated by coercion. At the same time that the majority say they obey the orders of superiors, only half of them say that they feel at ease in questioning such orders, and the majority consider that they could be punished for such behavior. As for the norms that regulate their activities, there seems to be some flexibility in obeying them. The majority believe that there are moments when norms impede them from working effectively, and that even excessive force could be justified in specific situations. In situations such as these, however, the majority feel that the officer should be investigated and punished, even if there is strong resistance from one-fourth of the group to these types of investigations.

RELATIONSHIP WITH PEERS

This set of questions explored the quality of relationship with colleagues at both police institutions. The vast majority of police officers (91%) agreed with the statement “I feel respected by colleagues in this Company” and also agreed with the statement “I feel respect for my colleagues in this Company” (93%).

Similarly, a majority (74%), albeit to a lesser extent, agreed with the statement “I trust my colleagues in this Company,” agreeing completely (24%) or somewhat (50%); another 15% disagreed completely or somewhat. In response to the statement “My colleagues in this Company trust me,” 71% of police officers said they agreed completely (32%) or agreed somewhat (39%). It is interesting to note that for this statement, 12% of police officers chose the option “don’t know” as a response. The vast majority of police officers (81%) also agreed in saying that they feel they have the support of their colleagues in the Company.

When asked to reflect upon how much they trust civil police officers, 37% of military police officers said that they trust them completely (2%) or trust them somewhat (35%), while another 43% said that they mistrust somewhat (17%) or mistrust completely (26%) civil police officers.

In response to the statement “I feel respect for civil police officers that work in this region,” the great majority (76%) agreed completely (46%) or agreed somewhat (30%). To a lesser extent, when asked if they agreed with the statement “I feel respected by civil police officers that work in this region,” the majority of military police officers (61%) also agreed completely (19%) or agreed somewhat (42%), while 24% disagreed with this statement.
Half of military police officers agreed completely (10%) or somewhat (41%) with the statement “I trust the civil police officers that work in this region,” while another 31% disagreed with this statement.

Slightly less than half of military police officers (47%) agreed that they “feel supported by the civil police officers that work in this region,” while another 34% disagree with that statement (with 20% saying they disagree completely that such support exists).

Military police officers have a very good relationship with their colleagues in the company. They are relationships of trust, respect, and mutual aid. As for their colleagues in the civil police, even though the relationship is respectful, there doesn’t seem to be as much trust, nor even certainty that they can count on their help.

**RELATIONSHIP WITH THE PUBLIC**

Questions here focus on the way police officers feel and behave towards the public, especially if they are concerned about procedural justice in his/her service - the process of decision-making, explaining reasons, politeness, etc.

The majority of police officers (71%) agree completely (35%) or agree somewhat (36%) that people should be treated with respect regardless of their respect for the police. However, one-fourth of officers (25%) disagree with that statement, among whom 15% disagree completely. At the same time, slightly more than half of police officers (55%) agree with the statement that “People who break the law do not deserve to be treated with respect by the police,” among whom 16% said they agreed completely with that statement. Another 33% disagreed with that statement.

The great majority (86%) agree that when a police officer makes a decision, it is important to take time to explain the decisions to everyone involved; and they also agree (82%) that it is necessary to give everyone a good reason why they are being stopped, even if it is not required.

More than half of police officers (60%) disagreed with the statement that “There is little sense in officers trying to be impartial, because that is impossible in this job,” among whom 45% disagreed completely; another 30% said they agreed with this statement.

When asked if people willingly provide information about suspects, answers were split. Among police officers, 46% agreed that people contribute with this kind of information, while 41% disagreed.
Half of police officers (52%) agreed with the statement “The public thinks we go about the job in the right way,” while 35% disagreed.

With regard to the treatment they believe they should provide to the population, the vast majority of police officers agree that they should listen to people’s opinions, as well as explain to them the decisions that they make. Meanwhile, in relation to respectful treatment, there seems to be a “license” to act otherwise in certain situations. There seems to be group of police officers who believe that people who commit crimes or who are disrespectful of police officers don’t deserve respectful treatment. A group also believes that it is not possible to carry out police work with total impartiality. Furthermore, less than half of police officers say they have a good relationship to residents in the region where they work, which may help to explain the fact that they state that the population doesn’t usually help police do their work.

Satisfaction

Questions to identify if police officers are (or are not) satisfied with their careers.

The great majority of police officers (81%) disagree that they are paid fairly for the work they do, of whom 69% disagree completely. The majority (85%) also agree that they need to carry out extra work during their off-duty hours to supplement their income, with 70% agreeing completely with this statement.

More than half (58%) disagree with the statement “The amount of work I am expected to do is fair” (35% agree completely or somewhat).

In relation to working schedule, the majority of police officers (61%) consider it to be fair, with 32% disagreeing (completely or somewhat) with that.

The majority of police officers (60%) disagree completely (45%) or disagree somewhat (15%) with the statement “Transfers in military police are carried out in a fair way for all police officers.” Another 27% agree with that statement.

It is possible to say that there is some satisfaction, although not generalized, regarding the organization of work shifts. However, there is great dissatisfaction among police with the workload, with the way transfers are made, with salaries, and with the need to have extra employment during their off-duty hours.

Self-Legitimacy
This set of questions seeks to explore how officers understand the foundations of their legitimacy - what legitimacy and authority means and how they feel about it.

Less than half of police officers (43%) said that they “always” feel confident in using the authority that is invested in them as military police officers. The rest say that they “almost always” (22%) or “sometimes” (21%) feel confident. The results are a bit less positive for the subsequent question. Only 34% say that they “always” have sufficient authority to do their jobs well; 33% say that they “almost always” do, and 20% say they “sometimes” feel they have that authority. At the same time, the vast majority (82%) agree completely (55%) or somewhat (27%) that as military police officers they occupy a position of special importance in society.

The vast majority of police officers (91%) also agree that people should always obey their orders, as long as they are legal. The majority (70%) also answered that they always or almost always feel confident in making important decisions on their own; another 17% said this happens “sometimes.”

As for the phrase “In my experience, police work is better when people are afraid of the police,” 62% of police officers disagree, either completely (46%) or somewhat (16%). However, about one fourth of police officers (26%) agree with this statement.

Asked whether they feel that they have the respect of the population, the answers vary: 37% of police officers said that this happens “sometimes”; 35% said that this rarely (26%) or never (9%) happens; and 31% answered that this “almost always” (21%) or “always” (5%) happens.

The open-ended question about what the Military Police can do in order to have (greater) respect from the population was answered by most (63%) officers. Among the answers, the vast majority (70%) provided measures that depend on the police themselves, while the other presented alternative that depend on other agents or institutions. Among those actions that depend on police, the most cited were: “disseminate the work done by police” (27)\textsuperscript{15}, suggestions that indicate that police officers believe that the population needs to better understand the police in order to respect them more; “get in closer contact with the population” (16)\textsuperscript{16}; “value police

\textsuperscript{15} “Giving more exposure to police work, how it is spread out across the patrol area, how the work begins and how it ends, exposing our precarious working conditions, so that the suffering and hard-working population sees that we are the same, and that we are all fighting every day to survive”; “Promote the work that it does and make it clear to the population what its rights and duties are.”

\textsuperscript{16} “Try out campaigns that bring the population closer and make them trust the work we do”; “Work with society, seeking to give them guidance about the Military Police’s work, seeking to bring the population closer to the MP.”
officers” (16)\textsuperscript{17} and “be professional” (15)\textsuperscript{18}, suggestions that indicate that the police need to improve their working methods.

At the same time that police officers believe that people should obey their orders, they seem to not have great confidence in their own authority. There also is no consensus that they have the respect of the population, and as is the case with other questions, there is a group of more conservative police officers who believe that it is good for people to fear the police. When asked about what the military police could do to be more respected, once again there a group of police officers who believe that they are not the ones responsible for making themselves be respected, but rather other actors.

**POLICE LEGITIMACY IN THE EYES OF THE PUBLIC**

Questions here explore how police officers think citizens evaluate police work - what they expect, satisfaction with the police, etc.

Less than half of police officers (45%) disagreed, either completely (26%) or somewhat (19%), with the statement “In my view, the average citizen in this region defends the Military Police in conversations with friends.” Another 32% agree, and 16% neither agree nor disagree with this statement.

The statement “In my view, the average citizen in this region agrees with the values that guide the work of the Military Police” divided opinions. Among police officers, 41% disagreed, while 38% agreed with the statement, of whom only 4% agreed completely.

Less than half of police officers (45%) agreed with the statement “In my view, the average citizen in this region believes that military police officers make decisions based on facts, not personal interest,” while 30% disagreed.

Half of police officers (49%) agree with the statement “In my view, the average citizen in this region believes that military police officers treat everyone with courtesy and respect.” However, 34% disagree with this statement.

\textsuperscript{17} “Valuing police officers with better pay, support from the courts”; “Value them in the sense of better pay, as well as labor rights that we don’t have, such as FGTS (Time of Service Guarantee Fund), overtime, etc.”

\textsuperscript{18} “Work within the law, with respect and professionalism”; “Revisiting concepts such as police training at the academy, requiring a more complete curriculum and an approach to our work that is more dignified.”
Almost half of police officers (47%) agree with the statement “In my view, the average citizen in this region believes that the Military Police has shown much success in handling crime,” and 36% disagree.

Slightly more than half of police officers (57%) agree with the statement “The citizens in this region believe that the military police officers respond quickly to calls,” and 30% disagree.

More than half of police officers (62%) also agree with the statement “The citizens believe that the Military Police acts in accordance with the law when dealing with anyone,” and 24% disagree.

The vast majority of police officers (92%) agree that the image people have of the Military Police is formed primarily by what they see in the media, and among these 67% agree completely with this description. The majority (72%) also agree that the image that people have of the Military Police is formed by stories that acquaintances tell them about the police. Likewise, a majority, although to a lesser extent (65%), agree that the image that people have of the Military Police is formed by experiences they themselves have with military police officers (18% agreed completely); 26% disagree with this relationship.

Slightly more than half of police officers (58%) agree that residents think that the Military Police is violent, while 19% disagree. Another 16% neither agree nor disagree with this perception.

With regard to the question of whether residents support the Military Police when it kills criminals, answers were split. Among police officers, 42% of them disagreed that there is support, while 37% agreed.

The majority of police officers (68%) disagree, either completely (55%) or somewhat (13%), that there is an outcry among residents when a military police officer is assassinated. Only 16% of police officers agree that there is any kind of uproar.

Half of police officers (51%) agree that residents believe that military police officers in their region are honest, while 23% disagree with this possibility. Half of police officers (53%) also agree that the image of the Military Police improves in the eyes of the population when accusations against police officers are investigated and responded to, although 27% disagree with this.

The answers indicate that a minority of police officers believes that the population hold them in high esteem. A large number of them believe that the population has a very negative view of their work. At the same time, these police officers don’t see themselves as the ones
primarily responsible for the view that this population has of them, and tend to shift responsibility to other agents, especially the media, for this negative view.

**VIGILANTE VIOLENCE**

There continues to be groups within the police that support actions to "carry out justice with their own hands," be it by the population, be it by police officers themselves. One fourth of police officers agree, and 11% say they neither agree nor disagree, that “It is sometimes okay for the public to take the law into their hands,” and to the statement that “It is sometimes okay for the police officers to take the law into their hands,” 14% agreed with this possibility and 13% said they neither agree nor disagree.

**EFFECTIVENESS**

The majority of police officers evaluate in a positive way the performance of the Military Police. The majority (73%) rates as “good” (52%) or “excellent” (21%) the performance of the Military Police in preventing crime; the majority (79%) also rates as “good” (54%) or “excellent” (25%) the Military Police’s response to calls from the population. Slightly more than half (56%) rates as “good” (42%) or “excellent” (14%) the feeling of security in their patrol area; and more than half (62%) rate as “good” (49%) or “excellent” (13%) the performance of the Military Police in preventing armed robbery. The exception was the performance of the Military Police in preventing drug trafficking, rated positively by less than half of officers (46%) and negatively by one fourth of them. Another 27% rated the performance in this area as “neither good nor bad.”

With the exception of drug trafficking, police officers tend to positively rate their performance in the areas they patrol.

**SUPPORT FOR COMMUNITY POLICING**

The majority of police officers (62%) disagree with the statement “Community policing is not ‘real’ policing.” However, 30% of them agree with the statement, of whom 11% said they agree completely.

The majority (68%) also agrees that in some communities it is not possible to have community policing, of whom 42% said they agreed completely with this statement; another 23%
disagree with this statement. At the same time, the vast majority of police officers (81%) also agree that working with the community to solve problems is an efficient way of providing security.

At the same time that police officers believe that the participation of the population in issues of public safety are important, there are officers who don’t think that community policing is real policing, as well as thinking it inviable to implement it in specific locales.

SUPPORT FOR HUMAN RIGHTS AND DEMOCRACY

Regarding human rights, the majority of police officers (77%) disagree that these are “Rights of police officers”; slightly more than half (57%) disagree that they are “Rights of all” (35%, meanwhile, agree); and the majority (79%) agree that they are “Rights of criminals” and of these 62% agreed completely with this statement.

More than half (63%) agree that human rights are “Rights that preclude / undermine police work,” and only one fourth disagree with this statement.

The statement “Rights that guide the work of police” divided opinions. Forty-two percent (42%) disagreed with this view, while 40% agreed with it.

More than half of police officers (69%) said they prefer democracy to any other form of government, and 16% disagreed. The vast majority (88%), however, agree with the statement, “In a democracy, the fundamental work of police is to protect the rights of all people.”

The majority of police officers (82%) agree that it is important for the press to accompany and disseminate the work of the police. The majority (72%) also agree that the opinion people have of the police is very important for their work, and only 14% disagree with that.

There is still a prevailing view among police officers that human rights are the rights of criminals, because they don’t see them deserving such rights. They also believe that these are rights that get in the way or impede police work. Paradoxically, these same police officers believe that their work in a democracy is fundamental, guaranteeing the protection of the rights of all people. It is interesting to note that despite seeing the press as a major disseminator of negative images of the police, the majority of police officers agree that the press should accompany and publicize their work; they also agree that public opinion in regard to the police is something important and that cannot be ignored.

TWO POLICE FORCES
Asked about what changes among those that have been proposed for civil and military police forces in Brazil would be the most adequate for the population, the opinions of police officers are very divided: 22% defend “Keeping the two polices as they are”; 19% prefer to “Unify the two polices, maintaining the military structure”; 18% prefer to “Replace the Military Police and the Civil police with a new police”; 10% prefer to “Keep the two polices, but demilitarize the Military Police”; 10% support “Unifying the two polices, maintaining the civil structure.”

The majority of military police officers – almost half – prefer a new, unified police, but there is no consensus about whether it should have a military, civil, or “new” structure. There is another part (22%), however who prefer keeping the two police forces the way they are.

ANY OTHER COMMENTS

One hundred military police officers made use of the final space that was available for comments. The four most common topics were: “criticism of work conditions” (18 instances); “internal equality” (15 instances); “hope for results/praise for the study” (13 instances); and “more support for the police” (11 instances).

The comments about “work conditions” included criticism of various aspects, such as salaries (which leads many of them to find a second job as a source of extra income during their off-duty hours), precarious state of vehicles and motorcycles, insufficient staffing, the quality and quantity of equipment, as well as the violent environment that leads many police officers to have to hide their profession.

The comments classified as “internal equality” criticized the hierarchy and, above all, the harassment and abuses carried out by superiors. One of the comments noted that “despite being military personnel, I think that things would greatly improve if we did away with the hierarchy and superiors’ abuse of subordinates, I am certain that if they treated their platoon more humanely the police would be light years better…”

The criticisms also made reference to the conditions of facilities, in many cases considered inhumane and in contrast with the facilities reserved for higher ranks. Inequality was also noted in the absence of a career plan for enlisted men and women. The enlisted personnel, by dedicating themselves to the central activity of policing, considered themselves “real police,” but are also those who receive lower salaries and are more subjected to punishment - including being exonerated, punishment which is not levied on officials. There is an appeal for rights to be equal among all police.
Punishments meted out by superiors are oftentimes seen as having no logical basis, being abusive for coming down on those who, for example, in a moment of distraction don’t salute their superiors, or jailing a police officer who misses work. There are also transfers with no explanations, which are seen as veiled punishments.

One of the statements exposes a bit of each of these aspects: “I hope to have contributed to the improvement of this activity which is so discriminated against, I hope that people outside of the institution see how we live and are treated inside the police, I hope that I may one day see the police being respected not just out there in society but especially in here, excessive working hours, abuse of power, bullying all the time, veiled threats and a lot of politics involved, a fair career plan for everyone not just officials, who have regular promotions while enlisted officers don’t ... it’s not just salaries in the Military Police that need to improve, but it’s respect, dignity, family, time, health, and the life of the military police officer...”

Comments classified as “hope for results/praise for the study” express the hope of some police officers that the results of the study contribute to improvements in their work. Some of the participants also stressed that they would like to receive a copy of the study results. There are also compliments regarding the questionnaire, and the interest and initiative of USP in listening to the police officers. One of the comments states that “This kind of study is very good and it would be very good to do this more often so that we could present our opinions.”

The category “more support for police” includes comments that focus on appeals for greater support for police officers, be it from the government that doesn’t provide good working conditions, from superiors who oftentimes don’t know what goes on in their world, from the press that only propagates a negative image, from defenders of Human Rights who aren’t concerned about their lives, or from the wider population who don’t recognize the work the police does. According to one comment, “Nobody cares about what you think or what your needs are.”

DISCRIPTIVE STATISTICS: CIVIL POLICE

PROFILE

The participants in the study are mostly white (77%) men (83%) between the ages of 30 and 49 (72%) with college degrees (76%) and who have been on the police force for more than
10 years (63%). The largest portion of the respondents work as a clerk (32%), followed by detective (18%), agent (similar to a detective) (17%), and scribe (17%).

The average time of service in the civil police is 14 years. Slightly more than half of participating police officers have been on the force for less than 15 years (56%). The largest number of participants have been on the force for 5 years or less (25%). Also notable is that among interviewees at least 15% already are eligible for retirement as they had already been police officers for more than 25 years.

CAREER

The majority of participants (69%) said that they would still be police officers if they had to begin their professional careers over again. We also note that 55% would choose to work in the Civil Police force. On the other hand, it is not insignificant that 1 in 4 police officers said that if they had to start over they would pursue a career other than the police.

The question “Could you tell us a little about why you chose to become a Civil Police officer?” was answered by 78% of surveyed civil police officers. The answers allowed us to identify 18 different reasons why they chose this career. Among the officers who answered this question, the most common reasons mentioned were: liking the profession (24%); family influence (19%); vocation (18%); fulfilment of a dream (15%); and being a government employee (11%). Out of all the answers, 68% of the reasons fell into one of these categories.

The majority of police officers (83%) had already worked in other precincts or police departments other than the one they were at during the time of the study. The number of those who had worked at 2 to 5 precincts/departments included about half of respondents (49%), and those who had worked at 6 to 10 precincts/departments, 24%; 9% had worked at more than 11 precincts/departments.

Among civil police officers answering the survey, 81% had been at their current precinct for less than 5 years. Among these, 57% had been there between 1 and 5 years, and 24% less than one year. Respondents with 6 or more years at their current precinct were 17% of respondents.

Their feelings about the region where they work were positive for 52% of respondents and negative for 28%. Among those with a positive view, 45% consider the region to be a good place to work, and 7% the best place they have ever worked. Among those with a negative
outlook, 17% consider the region where they work to be a bad place to work and 11% the worst place they have ever worked.

WORK CONDITIONS

Since entering the Civil Police, 60% of police officers said that they noted changes in the institution.

The open-ended question “Since beginning your career in the police force, have you noticed changes in the Civil Police?” was answered by 58% of civil police officers surveyed. The organization and systematization of the answers allowed us to identify 17 different categories of changes. Among those officers answering the question, the main changes mentioned were those related to the following topics: human resources (36%), material resources (23%), and salaries or the devaluing of civil police officers (19%).

When grouped into positive changes and negative changes, we note that 73% of police officers answering this question mentioned changes that are considered negative. Among these, 67% highlighted exclusively negative changes. Mention of positive changes was made by 36% of respondents. Among these, 30% mentioned only positive changes. Mention of positive as well as negative changes were made by 6% of respondents.

Among the main changes recognized as positive by police officers are: supply of material resources (office material, fuel for vehicles, IT equipment, and weapons), 55%; and greater and improved professionalism of civil police (higher levels of education, better education and training, more adequate procedures, etc.), 17%.

Among the main negative changes mentioned by police officers are the lack of human resources (46%) and salary and/or devaluing of the career of civil police (25%).

For 55% of participants, the material resources available don’t meet the needs of civil police officers. Among these, 36% say that material resources frequently don’t meet their needs, and 19% say that they never meet their needs. Only 10% say the material resources in some way meet the needs of police officers, with just 1% saying these resources totally meet their needs.

In the eyes of those responding to the questionnaire, 75% think that human resources available to the Civil Police don’t meet its current needs. Of this group, 38% think that human resources never meet their needs, and 37% say they often don’t meet their needs. Only 3% think that human resources available in some way meet the needs of the Civil Police, and among these only 1% say that human resources fully meet the needs of the Civil Police.
Trainings and updates don’t meet the needs of police officers, according to the opinion of 72% of participants. In this group, 45% say that trainings/updates never meet the needs of officers, and 27% say that they frequently don’t meet those needs. The needs are met in some way in the eyes of 5% of respondents, with only 1% thinking that trainings/updates totally meet their needs.

**INSTITUTIONAL IDENTITY**

The open-ended question “What does being in the Civil Police mean to you?” was, among the open-ended questions, the most answered by civil police officers (78%). Reading the answers allowed us to identify 14 different groups of meanings about being a police officer. Among the answers it was possible to note that for the majority (74%), being a civil police officer had some positive connotation. Among the positive meanings, the themes that had the largest number of responses were: helping others (28%); positive feelings related to the profession (28%) (for example: doing what they liked; feeling of pride in relation to the profession; working in one of the most dignified, noble, and important professions; vocation, etc.); personal and/or professional fulfillment (15%); or working for public causes (11%). These four groups encompass 82% of all positive meanings provided.

Among those officers mentioning negative sentiments (39%): the majority (55%) mentioned not feeling recognized or valued; 24% noted difficulties that made the activity of policing a difficult job; 14% were disappointed with their professional choice; and 12% mentioned some negative feeling related to the profession (being a necessary evil in society; “more drawbacks than benefits”; “at this point in the game, a drag”; “false sense of heroism”; “being a survivor”, etc.)

With this question, many participants mentioned both positive aspects and negative aspects in their answers. However, in analyzing the answers, we note that: among respondents mentioning positive aspects, 61% mentioned exclusively positive content. Among those who provided negative aspects, 25% mentioned exclusively negative content. Those providing answers with positive as well as negative connotations were 14% of respondents.

Among participants, 61% agreed and 33% disagreed with the view that “the values of the Civil Police are compatible with your values.” Among those in agreement, 42% agreed somewhat and 17% agreed completely with the statement. Among those who disagreed, 19% disagreed somewhat and 14% disagreed completely.
The majority of police officers interviewed (83%) manifested pride in being part of the Civil Police. When asked how much they agree with the phrase “I am proud to be a part of the Civil Police,” 42% agreed completely and 41% agreed somewhat. Disagreeing with the statement were 13% of officers, with 8% disagreeing somewhat and 5% completely.

**RELATIONSHIP WITH SUPERIORS**

When asked if “precinct leadership value and take into account the opinions of the team,” slightly more than half (52%) answered that their opinions are taken into account always (26%) or almost always (26%). On the other hand, 25% said that their opinions rarely (17%) or never (8%) are considered and valued. Seventeen percent (17%) of respondents said their opinions are sometimes considered and valued.

For 46% of participants, decisions made by superiors are always (19%) or almost always (27%) based on objective criteria. Those who think that superiors don’t base decisions on objective criteria account for 22% of participants, with 12% thinking that criteria are never objective, and 10% rarely so. Decisions sometimes follow objective criteria in the eyes of 24% of respondents.

Slightly more than half (53%) of participants think that, at the precinct where they work, their superiors always (19%) or almost always (34%) make decisions in a fair way. Another 16% think that decisions are rarely (12%) or never (4%) fair. Decisions are sometimes fair for 22%.

The vast majority of participants (86%) consider themselves respected by their superiors. Of these, 63% think they are always respected, and 23% almost always. Only 2% think they rarely (1%) or never (1%) are respected by their superiors. Those who think they are sometimes respected account for 10% of participants.

When asked whether their superiors provide explanations about decisions that interfere in their daily work, 45% said that they always (14%) or almost always (31%) get these explanations. Those who said they rarely (16%) or never (12%) receive explanations total 28% of respondents. Decisions are sometimes explained to 25% of participants.

With regard to the treatment received by superiors, the majority (64%) think that they always (32%) or almost always (32%) are treated fairly. Those who don’t think they are treated fairly account for 11%, with 7% thinking they are rarely treated fairly and 4% never treated fairly. Those saying they are sometimes treated fairly account for 21% of participants.
In the respondents’ view, 44% said their superiors always (17%) or almost always (27%) are concerned with their well-being. On the other hand, 28% said this type of concern rarely (11%) or never (17%) happens. The cases where superiors sometimes are concerned with their well-being were noted by 24% of participants.

The majority of participants say that their superiors know what happens to police officers in their interactions with the public, as 64% agreed with this statement. Of these, 24% agreed completely and 40% agreed somewhat. Disagreeing with this statement were 22% of respondents, with 10% disagreeing somewhat and 12% disagreeing completely. Six percent (6%) neither agreed nor disagreed.

The majority of respondents (62%) agree that their superiors help them to learn about the job they are doing. Among those who agree, 37% agreed somewhat and 25% completely agree. Disagreeing with this statement were 29% of participants, with 19% disagreeing completely and 10% disagreeing somewhat. Neither agreeing nor disagreeing accounted for 8%.

A large part of participants (47%) think that the evaluation of their work by superiors never (30%) or rarely (17%) helps them improve their performance. On the other hand, 27% said that these evaluations help them improve their performance. Of these, 15% said it almost always helps, and 12% that it always helps. Responses saying that it sometimes helps accounted for 18%.

Opinions about whether superiors encourage and support the development of officers were split: 46% agreed with the statement and 40% disagreed. Among those who agreed, 22% agreed completely and 24% somewhat. Among those who disagreed, 29% disagreed completely and 11% somewhat. Eight percent (8%) neither agreed nor disagreed.

Forty-eight percent (48%) of participants agreed with the statement that at the precinct where they work good performance is recognized and valued in some form. Of these, 11% agreed completely and 37% agreed somewhat. On the other hand, 36% disagreed with this statement, with 27% disagreeing completely and 9% disagreeing somewhat. Neither agreeing nor disagreeing accounted for 8% of participants.

The majority of participants (82%) don’t consider the Civil Police to be fair in regard to promotions and career advancement. Of this total, 71% disagreed completely and 11% somewhat. Meanwhile, only 11% consider promotions and advancement to be fair, with 2% agreeing completely and 9% agreeing somewhat. Neither agreeing nor disagreeing were 6%.

When asked if the objectives of the Civil Police are clear for officers, 50% agreed and 40% disagreed with the statement. Out of those who agreed, 35% agreed somewhat and 15% agreed
completely. Of those who disagreed, 22% disagreed somewhat and 18% disagreed completely. Neither agreeing nor disagreeing accounted for 6%.

The proportion of those who said they had passed and those who said they had not gone through administrative proceedings was 57% and 41%, respectively. Among officers who did go through administrative and/or disciplinary proceedings, the great majority (82%) said they been guaranteed the possibility to defend themselves.

Still in the realm of police officers who said they had gone through administrative/disciplinary proceedings, 68% said they considered treatment they received during the process to be fair. The outcome was considered fair by 65% of officers who had gone through administrative and/or disciplinary procedures.

**COMPLIANCE**

The majority of police officers who participated in the study tend to do what their superiors ask of them, as is suggested by the answers to the phrase “I do what my superiors ask me to do.” Among respondents, 85% agreed with the statement, with 44% agreeing completely and 41% agreeing somewhat. Disagreement was voiced by 7% of respondents, with 6% disagreeing somewhat and 1% disagreeing completely. Neither agreeing nor disagreeing accounted for 6%.

As for following instructions from superiors even when they disagree with them, 66% of respondents agreed with this statement. Of these, 45% agreed somewhat and 21% agreed completely. Disagreeing with this statement were 22%, with 12% disagreeing somewhat and 10% completely. Neither agreeing nor disagreeing accounted for 5%.

Among the officers surveyed, the majority (68%) agreed that they feel comfortable questioning the instructions of their superiors. Of this group, the degree to which they feel comfortable was 43% for feeling somewhat comfortable, and 25% completely comfortable. On the other hand, responses where they said they disagree showed that 22% don’t feel comfortable questioning their superiors’ instructions. Of these, 12% feel somewhat uneasy, and 10% don’t feel at all comfortable doing so. Those saying they neither feel comfortable nor uncomfortable in questioning their superiors accounted for 6% of participants.

The opinions about being punished for questioning their superiors were very much split. The phrase “I don’t question my superior because I could be punished” had the agreement of 47% of respondents and disagreement of 44%. Among those who agreed, 35% agreed somewhat
and 12% completely. Of those who disagreed, 27% disagreed completely and 17% somewhat. Neither agreeing nor disagreeing accounted for 6%.

In the opinion of most police officers (63%), always following protocol doesn’t help police officers carry out their work the way it should be done. Among those who agree with this idea, 45% agreed somewhat and 18% agree completely. Disagreeing with this were 25%, with 15% disagreeing completely and 10% disagreeing somewhat. Those who said they neither agree nor disagree totaled 10%.

The majority of participants (58%) agree that sometimes it is acceptable for Civil Police to use force beyond that which is allowed to carry out an arrest. Among these, 34% agreed completely and 24% agreed somewhat. On the other hand, 35% of respondents disagree with this statement, with 24% disagreeing completely and 11% somewhat. Neither agreeing nor disagreeing accounted for 3%.

A significant majority of the professionals interviewed (71%) agree that police officers who make abusive use of physical force should be investigated and punished. Disagreeing with this statement were 23% of respondents. Among those who agreed, 35% said they are completely in favor of investigating and punishing those who make abusive use of force, and 36% agreed somewhat. Of those who disagreed, 14% would be somewhat opposed to such proceedings, and 9% completely opposed. Four percent (4%) neither agreed nor disagreed.

**RELATIONSHIP WITH PEERS**

Of those police officers who answered the questionnaire, the vast majority (88%) felt respected by their work colleagues. Those who agreed completely with the statement “I feel respected by my work colleagues in this Precinct” accounted for 59% of respondents, and 29% agreed somewhat. Six percent disagreed, of whom 4% disagreed somewhat and 2% completely. Neither agreeing nor disagreeing were 6%.

The vast majority of police officers (93%) said they felt respect for their work colleagues. Upon reading the phrase “I feel respect for my colleagues in this Precinct,” 73% agreed completely and 20% agreed somewhat. Only 5% disagreed, with 3% disagreeing somewhat and 2% completely. Neither agreeing nor disagreeing accounted for 2% of participants.

With regard to trust, the majority of participants (71%) tend to trust their colleagues at the precinct. In relation to the phrase “I trust my colleagues at this precinct,” 47% said they trust
them somewhat, and 24% completely. Nineteen percent (19%) were in disagreement, with 13% disagreeing somewhat and 6% completely. Ten percent (10%) neither agreed nor disagreed.

Agreement with the statement “my colleagues at this Precinct trust me” reached 75%, and disagreement accounted for 5%. Of those who agreed, 46% agree somewhat and 20% completely. Among those who disagree, all of them disagree somewhat. Neither agreeing nor disagreeing totaled 10%.

The phrase “I feel I have the support of my colleagues at this Precinct” found agreement from 85% of officers. Of these, 54% agreed somewhat and 21% completely. Disagreement reached 13%, with 9% disagreeing somewhat and 4% completely. Those who neither agreed nor disagreed reached 10%.

The majority of civil police officers interviewed (53%) said they trust military police officers, and 30% said they mistrust them. Among those who said they trust them, 46% said they do so somewhat, and 7% completely. Among those who mistrust them, 18% mistrust them somewhat, and 12% completely. Those who said they neither trust nor mistrust them total 14%.

A significant majority of civil police officers who answered the survey said they felt respect for military police officers who work in the same region as their precinct. Agreement with the phrase “I feel respect for military police officers working in this region” reached 83% of respondents, while 9% disagreed. Among those who agreed, 43% did so in part, and 40% completely. Among those who disagreed, 6% did so in part, and 3% completely. Neither agreeing nor disagreeing accounted for 6% of respondents.

Among the participating civil police officers, the majority feel respected by military police officers working in their regions. The statement “I feel respected by military police officers working in this region” was agreed to by 84% of respondents, of whom 52% agreed somewhat and 32% completely. Disagreeing accounted for 9%, with 5% disagreeing somewhat and 4% completely. Four percent (4%) of respondents neither agreed nor disagreed.

When the question focuses specifically on trusting the military police officers active in the region served by the precinct, 71% agreed, suggesting they trust those military police officers, and 15% disagreed, suggesting they don’t trust them. Among those who potentially trust them, 57% trust completely and 14% somewhat. Among those who don’t trust them, 9% don’t trust them somewhat, and 6% don’t trust them at all. Those who neither trust nor mistrust them total 12%.

As for support from military police officers working in the region, 73% of civil police officers interviewed said they agreed they feel supported by them. Of those who agreed, 54% do
so in part and 19% completely. Eleven percent (11%) disagreed (6% in part and 5% completely). Neither agreeing nor disagreeing accounted for 12%.

RELATIONSHIP WITH THE PUBLIC

The significant majority of participants (82%) agree that people should be treated with respect, regardless of how they treat the police. Agreeing completely with this statement are 49% of participating civil police officers, and agreeing somewhat are 33%. Disagreeing with this statement are 14% of officers, with 10% disagreeing completely and 4% somewhat. Neither agreeing nor disagreeing accounted for 2% of respondents.

The majority of participants (61%) disagree that people who disrespect the law don’t deserve to be treated with respect by the police. Of these, 47% disagree completely and 14% somewhat. On the other hand, 30% agree that those who disrespect the law don’t deserve to be treated with respect by the police, with 24% agreeing somewhat and 6% completely. Neither agreeing nor disagreeing were 5% of respondents.

An expressive majority (87%) agree that, when a police officer makes a decision, it is important to hear the opinions of the people involved. Of these, 60% agree completely and 27% agree somewhat. Disagreement was manifested by 9%, with 5% disagreeing somewhat and 4% completely.

Disagreement with the phrase “for police officers it makes little sense to try to be impartial because this is impossible in police work” reached 63% among respondents. Of this group, 51% disagree completely and 12% disagreed somewhat. Agreement with the statement reached 29%, with 23% of participants agreeing somewhat and 6% completely. Neither agreeing nor disagreeing reached 5%.

Of the officers interviewed, 56% disagreed that the population is willing to inform the police about suspicious persons. Of this total, 40% disagreed completely and 16% disagree somewhat. On the other hand, 26% of respondents agreed with this willingness, with 22% doing so in part and 4% completely. Neither agreeing nor disagreeing totaled 12% of participating officers.

The police’s view of the population was gauged, among other questions, by the following statement: “people think we do our job properly.” The majority of respondents (51%) disagreed with this statement, and 40% agreed. Among those who disagreed, 29% did so in part, and 22%
completely. Of those who agreed, 37% agreed in part and 3% completely. Five percent neither agree nor disagree.

The relationship of civil police with the residents of the region where they work is considered excellent (4%) or good (46%) by 50% of participants, and bad (12%) or awful (6%) by 18%. The view that it is neither good nor bad is held by 27% of respondents.

A large number of respondents (42%) disagree that residents in the region where they work in general defend the Civil Police in conversations with friends. In this group opinions are distributed equally between those who disagree completely (22%) and those who disagree somewhat (20%). At the other extreme are those who think residents in the region defend the Civil Police. This group accounts for 32% of respondents, with 30% agreeing in part and 2% agreeing completely. Neither agreeing nor disagreeing were 10% of respondents. For this question there is also a significant number of respondents who said they don’t know: 13%.

Half of those interviewed (50%) disagree that, in the region where they work, residents agree with the values that guide the work of the Civil Police. Of this group, 31% disagree somewhat and 19% disagree completely. On the other hand, 26% of police officers think that residents in the region where they work agree with the values of the Civil Police. Of these, 24% agree somewhat and 2% completely. Neither agreeing nor disagreeing reaches 9%. As with the previous question, 13% didn’t know how to answer this question.

The disagreement of 44% of those interviewed suggests that, for this group, residents in the region where they work tend to believe that civil police officers make decisions based on personal interests rather than objective criteria. At the other end, there are those 34% who, in agreeing with the statement, think that the population believes that their decisions are based on objective criteria. Of those who disagree, 25% do so in part and 19% completely. Of those who agree, 24% agree somewhat and 10% completely. Neither agreeing nor disagreeing accounts for 11%. Nine percent of respondents said they didn’t know.

Among civil police, 48% agreed and 37% disagree that residents of the regions where they work generally believe that the Civil Police treats everyone with courtesy and respect. Of those who agree, 40% do so in part and 8% completely. Among those who disagree, 24% disagree somewhat and 13% completely. Neither agreeing nor disagreeing were 6%.

When the issue is control of crime, 55% of participating civil police disagree and 28% agree that residents in the region where they work generally believe that the Civil Police has been successful in this task. Among those who disagree, 29% disagree somewhat and 26% completely.
Among those who agree, 24% do so in part and 4% completely. Neither agreeing nor disagreeing accounts for 8% of respondents.

Disagreement with the statement “residents in the region usually believe the Civil Police quickly deals with cases that arrive at the precinct” reached 59% of participants. Of these, 37% disagree completely, and 22% disagree somewhat. Agreement with this affirmation totaled 25% of respondents, with 19% agreeing somewhat and 6% completely. Neither agreeing nor disagreeing were 7% of respondents.

In the view of 43% of civil police officers, residents in the region where they work generally tend to believe that the Civil Police acts in accordance with the law, regardless of who the person is. Among those who took this stance, 29% agreed somewhat with this statement, and 14% did so completely. Disagreeing with this statement were 37% of participants, with 22% disagreeing somewhat and 15% completely. Neither agreeing nor disagreeing were 6%. Six percent (6%) said they didn’t know what the population thinks about this.

The majority of police officers participating in the study (65%) disagree that residents in the region where they work are moved by the killing of a civil police officer. Among these, 51% disagree completely and 14% disagree somewhat. Agreement for the notion that there is an outcry among residents reached 16% of respondents, with 12% agreeing somewhat and 4% agreeing completely. Eleven percent (11%) said they don’t know, and 6% said they neither agree nor disagree with this statement.

Satisfaction

A significant majority of interviewed police officers (89%) disagreed that they are paid fairly for the work they do, with 74% disagreeing completely and 15% disagreeing somewhat. In agreement with the idea that they are paid fairly for the work were just 8% of respondents, with 7% agreeing somewhat and 1% agreeing completely. One per cent of respondents neither agreed nor disagreed.

Sixty-one percent (61%) of police officers interviewed disagreed that their workload is fair. Among these, 42% disagree completely, suggesting that their workload is completely unfair, and 19% disagree somewhat. In agreement, and deeming their workload to be fair, were 32% of participants. Among these, 23% agreed somewhat and 9% agree completely. Neither agreeing nor disagreeing reached 6%.
The majority of officers (80%) agree that they need to hold extra jobs during their off-duty hours to supplement their income. We highlight the 57% who agreed completely with such a need, and 23% who agree in part. Disagreeing with this need are 9% of interviewees, with 6% disagreeing completely and 3% disagreeing somewhat. Neither agreeing nor disagreeing were 5% of participants.

Police officers were asked if the organization of their work shifts was fair. Agreeing with the fairness of their work shifts were 53% of participating civil police. Among those who agreed, 38% did so in part and 15% completely. On the other hand, 42% disagree, with 23% disagreeing completely and 19% disagreeing somewhat. Neither agreeing nor disagreeing totaled 4% of respondents.

A significant majority (80%) of police officers disagree that transfers at the Civil Police are carried out in a manner that is fair to all officers. We note that among those who disagree, 68% disagree completely that the process of transfers is fair, and 12% disagree somewhat. Respondents who think the process of transfers is fair account for 13%. Among these, 12% think the process somewhat fair, and just 1% think it completely fair. Neither agreeing nor disagreeing were 4%.

**SELF-LEGITIMACY**

Among study participants, 43% feel they always (26%) or almost always (17%) are confident when using the authority invested in them as police officers. At the other end are the 27% of officers who never (14%) or rarely (13%) feel confident in using police authority. Those who sometimes feel confident account for 27%.

The majority of those surveyed (76%) agree that the role of civil police officer gives them a position of special importance in society. Complete agreement with this notion was shared by 40% of respondents, and 36% agreed somewhat. On the other hand, 16% disagreed, 10% doing so completely and 6% somewhat. Neither agreeing nor disagreeing accounted for 6%.

The belief that people should obey police orders as long as they are within the scope of the law is widely accepted by the police officers interviewed. This statement was agreed to by 81% of police, with total agreement coming from 58% of respondents and partial agreement from 23%. Disagreement reached 11%, with 6% disagreeing completely and 5% disagreeing somewhat. Neither agreeing nor disagreeing reached 5%. 
A large number of police officers (51%) feel that they always (24%) or almost always (27%) have sufficient authority to do their jobs well. Those who think they rarely (12%) or never (8%) have sufficient authority total 20% of respondents. Those who think they sometimes have sufficient authority reach 27%.

Those who feel they always (24%) or almost always (36%) have the confidence to make important decisions on their own account for 60% of interviewed civil police officers. Those who rarely (6%) or never (9%) feel confident total 15%. Those who sometimes feel confident account for 22%.

Among the civil police officers taking part in the study, the majority (62%) disagree that police work is better when people are scared of the police. Of note among those who disagree is the significant number of police who say they disagree completely with this view: 47%. Fifteen percent (15%) disagree somewhat. On the other hand, 28% of respondents agree with this idea, with 22% agreeing somewhat and 6% completely. Neither agreeing nor disagreeing were 6%.

When the topic is the respect of the wider population, the majority of police officers are split into two groups: those who feel they rarely (24%) or never (11%) are respected by the population and those who feel they sometimes are respected. Each of these two groups constitute 35% of the total answers. Those who feel they always (4%) or almost always (22%) are respected constitute 26% of participants.

POLICE LEGITIMACY IN THE EYES OF THE PUBLIC

A significant majority of respondents (84%) agree that the image that people have of the police is formed, for the most part, by what they see in the media. Of this total, 42% agree completely with this statement and 42% agree somewhat. Disagreement comes from 9% of participants, with 6% disagreeing somewhat and 3% completely. Neither agreeing nor disagreeing are 4%.

Another significant number is those who agree (74%) that the image people have of the Civil Police is formed through experiences they themselves have with the Civil Police. Of this total, 56% agree somewhat and 18% do so completely. Disagreeing with this statement are 18% of participants, with 14% doing so in part and 4% disagreeing completely. Neither agreeing nor disagreeing are 3% of participants.

In agreement with the idea that stories told by acquaintances about the police influence the image that people have of the institution were 64% of respondents. Of these, 50% agree
somewhat and 14% agree completely. Disagreement was noted by 19%, with 14% doing so in part and 5% completely. Those who neither agree nor disagree totaled 11%.

A large part of civil police answering the survey (42%) disagree that the Civil Police is considered violent by the broader population. On the other hand, 35% of participants agree that the Civil Police is seen as violent by the population. Among those who disagree, 25% do so in part, and 17% completely. Of those who agree, 29% do so in part and 6% completely. Those who neither agree nor disagree total 11%. Those who said they didn’t know how to answer account for 10% of respondents.

Half of the police officers (50%) disagree that residents believe that all police reports that are filed are in fact investigated. Of these, the largest part are those who disagree completely: 33%. Those who agree in part total 17%. At the other extreme, 32% of respondents agree that the population believes that all police reports are investigated. Of these, 27% agree somewhat and 5% agree completely. Neither agreeing nor disagreeing are 6%. Those who said they don’t know how to answer total 11% of respondents.

The perception police have about how residents tend to evaluate the honesty of civil police was split. Disagreeing with the notion that residents believe civil police in their region are honest were 38% of respondents, while those who agree totaled 33%. Those who disagree somewhat and those who disagree completely had an equal portion of responses: 19%. Among those who agree, 27% do so in part and 6% do so completely. Neither agreeing nor disagreeing were 13%. Answering that they didn’t know how the population feels were 14% of respondents.

Agreement that the image of the Civil Police improves when accusations against officers are investigated and punished reached 58%. Of these, 31% agreed somewhat and 27% completely. Disagreement was 25%, with 16% disagreeing completely and 9% somewhat. Neither agreeing nor disagreeing were 10%. Respondents who said they didn’t know what the population thought were 6%.

The question “What can the Civil Police do so that they are (more) respected by the population?” was answered by 69% of participating civil police officers. Reviewing the answers identified 19 different categories of suggestions about what the police could do to be more respected.

Among the suggestions provided, 32% of respondents mentioned the need to improve working conditions, namely the increase in the staffing of police and the reduction in workload. For 30% of responding officers, the Civil Police would get more respect if it was more valued by those in government. The majority of answers in this category mentioned the need for better
salaries for the work they do. For 22%, acting professionally is one of the important elements in earning more respect for the Civil Police. In this category, the most common answers stress issues such as: investigating and clarifying crimes in a way that is technical, transparent, impartial, balanced, and within the scope of the law; not working to serve political interests, but fulfilling the specific obligations of the Civil Police: to investigate, guide, and serve diligently; maintaining one’s integrity and acting with courtesy, respect, and ethics.

Finally, we also note that for 10% of police officers answering the survey, the Civil Police needs to do “nothing” to be more respected by the population.

VIGILANTE VIOLENCE

Among police officers filling out the study, the significant majority (77%) disagree that sometimes it is acceptable for people to carry out justice with their own hands. Among this group, the majority disagrees completely with such a possibility (68%) and 9% disagree somewhat. Of those who agree (17%) 11% do so in part and 6% completely. Neither agreeing nor disagreeing were 4%.

The tendency of considering it unacceptable, regardless of the pretext, to mete out justice with one’s own hands is maintained even when the focus is on the police. As with the prior question, the significant majority (77%) disagree that these acts are acceptable, with 67% disagreeing completely and 10% disagreeing somewhat. Those who agree total 16%, with 12% agreeing somewhat and 4% agreeing completely. Neither agreeing nor disagreeing were 4%.

EFFECTIVENESS

The opinion of police officers is split with regard to the performance of the Civil Police in investigating and solving crimes. Those who consider its performance bad (27%) or awful (14%) total 41%, and those who consider it excellent (5%) or good (32%) total 37%. Those who consider the performance neither good nor bad total 19%.

The majority of civil police officers interviewed (54%) rate as bad (32%) or awful (22%) the feeling of safety in the regions where they work. Those considering it excellent (3%) or good (19%) total 22% of participants. Neither good nor bad were 21%.

When investigating and solving armed robbery, the performance of the police is rated as bad (30%) or awful (15%) by 45% of surveyed police officers. Those who see it as excellent (5%) or good (23%) total 28%. Neither good nor bad was 21%.
With regard to drug trafficking, the performance of the police in investigating and solving such crimes was considered bad (29%) or awful (15%) by 44% of respondents, and excellent (5%) or good (29%) for another 34%. The answer neither good nor bad was chosen by 17% of participants.

The Civil Police’s investigation and solving of homicides was rated excellent (14%) or good (37%) for 51% of those surveyed. At the other end, 28% of them rated its performance as bad (17%) or awful (11%). Respondents who thought it neither good nor bad totaled 17%.

**SUPPORT FOR COMMUNITY POLICING**

Disagreement with the idea that community policing is not “real” policing reached 51% among interviewed civil police officers. In this group, 29% said they disagreed completely with this statement, and 22% disagreed somewhat. There is a tendency to agree that community policing is not real policing among 26% of participants, with 17% saying they agree somewhat and 9% completely. Neither agreeing nor disagreeing were 12%, and 7% said they didn’t know.

Although the majority of civil police officers interviewed had a positive view of community policing, 51% agreed that in some communities it is impossible to adopt it as a mode of police work. Of those who agree, 27% did so completely, and 24% somewhat. Disagreeing with this view were 37% of participants, with 24% doing so completely and 13% somewhat. Five percent neither agree nor disagree.

A significant majority of civil police officers (80%) agree that trying to solve problems alongside the community is an efficient way of providing security in the region. Among those who agree, 43% said they agree completely and 37% agree somewhat. On the other hand, 11% disagreed, with 6% doing so completely and 5% disagreeing somewhat. Four percent neither agree nor disagree.

**DEMOCRACY AND HUMAN RIGHTS**

Among civil police officers answering the survey, 64% disagreed and 27% agreed that Human Rights are police rights. Among those who disagree, 58% disagree completely and 6% disagree somewhat. Of those who agree, 21% agree completely and 6% agree somewhat. Four percent neither agree nor disagree.

Slightly more than half of civil police officers (52%) agree that human rights are rights for everyone. Of these, 40% say they agree completely with this view and 12% agree somewhat.
Disagreement was stated by 43% of participants, with 32% disagreeing completely and 11% disagreeing somewhat. Two percent (2%) answered that they neither agree nor disagree.

In the eyes of almost half of civil police officers, Human Rights are rights that impede or harm police work. Agreeing with this statement were 48% of study participants, and 39% disagreed. Among all those who agreed, 27% did so completely and 21% did so in part. Among those disagreed, total disagreement was found among 28% and 11% disagreed somewhat. Seven percent answered that they neither agree nor disagree.

The opinions regarding Human Rights are split when it comes to their relationship to police work. When asked if Human Rights guide or direct police work, 48% of participants agreed and 40% disagreed. The most common tendency among both those who agreed and disagreed was that of agreeing or disagreeing completely, with each of these answers accounting for 28% of responses. Those who agreed somewhat or disagreed somewhat accounted for 20% and 12% of answers, respectively. Those who neither agreed nor disagreed total 6%.

The perception that Human Rights are “the rights of criminals” is very common among Civil Police participating in the study. In agreement with this idea were 61% of respondents, with 47% agreeing completely and 14% agreeing somewhat. Disagreement was found among 29%, with 22% disagreeing completely and 7% disagreeing somewhat. Answers where respondents neither agree nor disagree total 5%.

An extensive majority of police officers answering the study said they prefer democracy to any other form of government. In agreement with this statement were 82% of participants, and 14% disagreed. Of those who agreed, 53% did so completely, and 29% agreed somewhat. Of those who disagreed, 9% did so in part and 5% disagreed completely. Neither agreeing nor disagreeing were 1%.

A significant majority of civil police officers (92%) agree that the essential job of the police in a democracy is to protect the rights of all people. We note that among those who agreed, total agreement reached 74%, and partial agreement reached 18% of responses. Those who disagreed totaled 3%, with 2% disagreeing completely and 1% disagreeing somewhat. Two percent neither agree nor disagree.

In agreement that it is important for the press to accompany and publicize the work of the police were 81%, and 17% disagreed. Among those who agree, 41% said they agree completely, and 40% do so in part. Among those disagreeing, 9% do so completely and 8% disagree somewhat. Two percent of respondents neither agree nor disagree.
The ratio between those who agree and disagree that the opinion people have of the police is very important for the work they do was 68% and 19%. The degree of agreement was 38% among those who agree completely and 30% who agree somewhat. Among those who disagree, 13% disagree completely and 6% disagree somewhat. Neither agreeing nor disagreeing were 9%.

**TWO POLICES FORCES**

Among civil police officers surveyed, 79% support changes to the existing police model. Of these, the largest number (36%) propose substituting both the Civil and Military Police with a new police force.

A second group, with 21% of support, backs the unification of both police forces, with 19% preferring the unified force to have the same structure as the Civil Police, and 2% the structure of the Military Police.

Those defending keeping the two police forces, but with some changes, total 14% of interviewees. Of these, 12% believe the Military Police should be demilitarized, and 2% think the Civil Police should be militarized.

The suggestion of keeping just one police force and eliminating the other has support from 6% of respondents. Of these, 5% would only keep the Civil Police and extinguish the Military Police, while 1% would keep only the Military Police and eliminated the Civil Police.

Finally, the idea that there shouldn’t be any changes in the police forces, keeping them both as they are, is supported by 17% of participants.

**ANY OTHER COMMENTS**

Among the 56 civil police officers who contributed with comments, 43% used this space to criticize aspects related to salary, training, and/or selection of civil police officers. In this group, “better salaries” or “dignified pay” was the main aspect highlighted, present in 22 out of 24 responses.

Also with regard to participants who provided comments, 32% used this space to criticize work conditions. Although critiques of material resources were mentioned, the majority of comments grouped under this heading were related to problems involving human resources, such as the lack of or small number of public servants and, consequently, the heavy workload and
demands that they feel subjected to. One in two officers specifically mentioned this aspect in their comments.

Comments that contained criticism of the government were made by 21% of civil police officers who answered the question. Among the main criticisms were the lack of support and/or lackadaisical attitude of the government with regard to the police, and interference from politicians or the executive branch in the police. At least half of police officers who criticized the government in their comments made reference to one of these aspects.

Comments that criticized superiors were the fourth most common topic mentioned by officers. Among respondents, 20% mentioned superiors. Among the 11 officers who mentioned their superiors, 5 criticized “policing from the office,” that is, far from the population and from the daily demands of the police job, which is focused above all on meeting political demands or public opinion.

DISCREPANT STATISTICS: COMPARING MILITARY POLICE AND CIVIL POLICE

As for the sample, civil police officers are older than military police officers, have more education, self-identify as white, and have spent more time on the police force. The sample populations for both police forces are primarily male (more than 80%). (see Appendix 7)

Table 5. Police Self Legitimacy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I feel confident in using the authority that has been vested in me as an officer</th>
<th>Always/Often OR Totally agree</th>
<th>Sometimes OR Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Rarely/Never OR Partly disagree/Totally disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MP</td>
<td>CP</td>
<td>MP</td>
<td>CP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As police officer, I believe I occupy a position of special importance in society</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I believe people should always do what I tell them as long as my orders are lawful</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel that I have enough authority to do my job well</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel confident to take important decisions on my own</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In my experience, policing is better when people fear the police</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel that I have the citizen’s respect</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The first analyses about how police view their self-legitimacy shows that, in general, they feel confident in using their authority as police officers, and also feel that they occupy a position of special importance to society. They also tend to perceive that they have the authority to do their jobs well and feel confident when making decisions on their own.

In their contact with the public, the understand that the population should obey their orders, as long as they are within the law. They also understand that the population being scared of the police does not make their jobs easier. Despite this, they tend to think that they are not very respected by the population.

Comparing answers from the two police forces, they follow the same trends, but in different proportions, indicating that military police officers are more confident than civil police officers in almost all items related to self-legitimacy. Military and civil police officers give similar responses about fear of police and respect of the population. However, although military police officers feel more confident, they feel that they don’t have the respect of the population in equal measure to civil police officers.

### Table 6. Relationship with Superiors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Always/Often OR Totally agree/Partly agree</th>
<th>Sometimes OR Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Rarely/Never OR Partly disagree/Totally disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Senior managers value and consider the views of their staff</td>
<td>MP 40% CP 53%</td>
<td>MP 25% CP 17%</td>
<td>MP 33% CP 25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My superior’s decisions are based on the facts, not personal prejudice</td>
<td>MP 42% CP 46%</td>
<td>MP 28% CP 24%</td>
<td>MP 25% CP 22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My superiors make decisions in a fair way</td>
<td>MP 47% CP 53%</td>
<td>MP 28% CP 22%</td>
<td>MP 22% CP 16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My superiors give me explanations about the decisions that affect my daily live</td>
<td>MP 37% CP 45%</td>
<td>MP 23% CP 25%</td>
<td>MP 39% CP 28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My superiors treats me with respect</td>
<td>MP 71% CP 86%</td>
<td>MP 15% CP 10%</td>
<td>MP 11% CP 2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My superiors make decisions in a fair way</td>
<td>MP 58% CP 62%</td>
<td>MP 23% CP 21%</td>
<td>MP 18% CP 11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In my institution, good performance is recognized and rewarded</td>
<td>MP 47% CP 37%</td>
<td>MP 7% CP 8%</td>
<td>MP 45% CP 35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My superior makes assessments about my work to help improve my performance</td>
<td>MP 43% CP 27%</td>
<td>MP 29% CP 18%</td>
<td>MP 26% CP 47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My institution acts fairly regarding career progression and promotion</td>
<td>MP 35% CP 11%</td>
<td>MP 4% CP 6%</td>
<td>MP 59% CP 82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior managers are in touch with what is happening on the frontline</td>
<td>MP 58% CP 64%</td>
<td>MP 7% CP 6%</td>
<td>MP 32% CP 22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My supervisor helps me to learn about my job</td>
<td>MP 64% CP 62%</td>
<td>MP 10% CP 8%</td>
<td>MP 24% CP 29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My superior encourages and supports my development</td>
<td>MP 51% CP 46%</td>
<td>MP 12% CP 8%</td>
<td>MP 35% CP 40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My superior takes interest in my welfare</td>
<td>MP 35% CP 44%</td>
<td>MP 26% CP 24%</td>
<td>MP 36% CP 28%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In both police forces, the relationship with superiors seems to be more positive than negative. However, depending on the theme evaluated, the view of police officers about their superiors varies. Superiors tend to be better evaluated in terms of the way they treat their subordinates, the knowledge they have about what happens in the course of police work, and their willingness to help subordinates learn to do their jobs. Evaluations are less positive in terms of the way superiors make decisions, give recognition and evaluate the performance of subordinates, as well as the encouragement and support for the development of officers and their concern for the well-being of police officers.

Compared with civil police officers, the view of military police officers about their superiors are less positive in the areas related to the way decisions are made (especially the questions about their opinions being taken into consideration and valued, and having the reason behind decisions explained to them), the way they are treated by superiors, the knowledge their superiors have about what happens during the course of serving the public, and in superiors’ concern with the well-being of subordinates. Civil police officers have a less positive view of their superiors in areas related to promotions and career advancement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 7. Compliance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>I do what my supervisor asks me to do, because their decisions are the most appropriate</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **I follow my supervisor’s instructions even when I disagree with these instructions** | 87% | 66% | 3% | 5% | 8% | 22% |

| **I tend to feel comfortable to question my supervisor’s instructions** | 51% | 68% | 10% | 6% | 36% | 23% |

| **I do not question my supervisor because otherwise I can be punished** | 72% | 47% | 8% | 6% | 18% | **44%** |

| **Always following the legal rules does not help to get the police’s real job done** | 70% | 63% | 9% | 10% | 18% | 25% |

| **It is sometimes acceptable to use more force than is legally allowable to make an arrest** | 73% | 58% | 6% | 3% | 18% | 35% |

| **Officers who abuse of their physical force on the policing activity must be investigated and punished** | 60% | 71% | 11% | 4% | 25% | 23% |

Police officers in general tend to follow the instruction of their superiors, even when they disagree with them. In part this stance is justified by the fear of being punished should they question those instructions.
Police officers also tend to agree that following norms doesn’t always help them do police work, and that sometimes it is acceptable to use excessive force to carry out an arrest. However, despite this, they tend to think that police officers who make abusive use of physical force should be investigated and punished.

Comparing answers, there seems to be greater submission to coercion on the part of military police, because they tend to do what superiors ask more often, even when they disagree, as well as being more afraid of punishment should they question their superiors. Although almost half of civil police officers say that they don’t question their superiors for fear of being punished, they tend to feel more at ease than their colleagues in the military police to question their superiors. Military police officers apparently also show greater support for the use of force, as they are less inclined to believe that following the rules always helps them do their job, and they tend to show greater tolerance for using excessive force to make an arrest. Civil police officers, in turn, tend to show more support than military police officers for the investigation and punishment of police who make abusive use of physical force.

Table 8. Relationship with Peers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Always/Often OR Totally agree</th>
<th>Sometimes OR Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Rarely/Never OR Partly disagree/Totally disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I feel respected by my colleagues in this police station</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel respect for my colleagues in this police station</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I trust my colleagues in this police station</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My colleagues from this police station trust me</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel supported in my work by my colleague officers</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thinking about the Civil/Military Police, how much would you say that you trust in military/civil police officers</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel respect for civil/military police officers that work in this region</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel respected by civil/military police officers that work in this region</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I trust the civil/military police officers that work in this region</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel supported by the civil/military police officers that work in this region</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In both police forces, opinions about colleagues within their own institutions are extremely similar and positive. However, when comparing answers that explore their perception
of colleagues at other institutions, the results differ. Civil police officers were more positive in evaluating their colleagues in the military police than the latter were in evaluating the former. Military police officers show greater mistrust for their civil police colleagues, and feel less respected and supported by them than vice versa.

Table 9. Relationship with Public

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Great/Good OR Totally agree/Partly agree</th>
<th>Neither good nor bad OR Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Bad/Terrible OR Partly disagree/Totaly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MP</td>
<td>CP</td>
<td>MP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People should be treated with respect regardless of the way they treat the police</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People who break the law do not deserve to be treated with respect by the police</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When a police officer make a decision, it is important to take time to explain the decisions to everyone involved</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is necessary to give everyone a good reason why they are being stopped, even if it is not required</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>Does not apply</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is little sense in officers trying to be impartial, because that is impossible in this job</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The people I deal with willingly provide me with information about suspects</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The public think we go about the job in the right way</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How do you evaluate the relationship of the police and the people in this neighborhood</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Both police forces also tend to consider the relationship that they have with the community to be excellent or good. They also think it important that people be treated with respect, regardless of how they treat the police, and that it is important to listen to the opinions of people before making a decision. Both forces also tend to think that when doing police work it is almost impossible to try to be impartial.

The difference between military and civil police officers appears in topics such as the respectful treatment of people who break the law, their view of how the public evaluates police work, and people’s cooperation with the police. Military police officers seem to defend, more than civil police officers, greater rigor in dealing with people who were disrespectful or who committed crimes. However, at the same time, when rating their relationship with residents in the neighborhood, military police officers tend to be more positive than civil police officers.

Table 10. Democracy
At both institutions, police officers seem to be very aligned with democratic values. The majority says they prefer democracy to other forms of government, and say that they support the press accompanying police work. They also say that in a democracy the job of the police is to protect the rights of everyone, and that the opinion the public has of the police is important to their work.

When we compare results from both police forces, the only answer that stands out is that related to the preference for democracy, which is greater among civil police officers than military police officers. All other answers are very similar.

2.1.2. JUDICIARY

In the last CEPID report (2015-2016), we proposed, to further the study about the judiciary, to improve the interview script and to start the interviews with judges, seeking to understand how they perceive their self-legitimacy and the functioning of the Brazilian Justice System. In addition to these activities, we also reviewed the international literature on judicial legitimacy, focusing on how that literature approaches the issue of internal procedural justice and self-legitimacy, key dimensions in the NEV’s CEPID Program on the legitimacy of democratic institutions.

In the current report, we present: (i) the interviews with the judges, describing the strategies adopted to access them and the procedures applied; (ii) the process of transcription, systematization, and preliminary analysis of the interviews; and (iii) a paper with a review of the literature about judicial legitimacy.

A. INTERVIEWS WITH THE JUDGES
ACCESS

One of the main challenges faced by the research team was contacting the judges for the interviews. We had to use numerous strategies to gain access to them. One strategy was to apply snowball sampling. This sampling technique is not probabilistic and involves research participants indicating other people from their network of friends and acquaintances to participate. Following this technique, we contacted judges we knew and asked them to help us get in touch with other judges, by indicating them or by intermediating contact. Using this technique, we got six interviews. There are, however, some important limitations: since the judges normally indicate people from their circle of acquaintances, the indicated judges were usually from the same generation and age group of the first group, and shared the same ideas and values. Therefore, the analysis of the interviews presents methodological reservations as to their potential to represent all members of the judiciary. Thus, with the available data we can discuss the perspective of a specific profile that exists in the judiciary, but we cannot generalize about the perception of all judges.

The profile of the judges we accessed using the snowball sampling technique is: between 30 and 40 years of age; 8 to 10 years in the profession; mostly men; and education levels from unfinished post-graduate studies to Master’s or Doctorate degrees. This latter characteristic favored our access to this population, because these judges recognized the importance of the study and so usually agreed to participate and to be interviewed.

Another strategy used to access the judges was to contact them via the Sao Paulo Court of Justice (TJSP), using a route similar to that adopted when contacting the police officers. We sent a letter to the president of the TJSP asking for his support in conducting the study and gaining access to the magistrates. The letter was sent in the beginning of March 2017; but as of this date (June), we have not received any answer from the court, despite the numerous phone calls we made.

Finally, we tried calling directly the Special Civil Courts (JEC – Juizados Especiais Civeis) from the key areas selected for the Program’s studies. From all the Courts that replied to our initial contact, only one judge got in touch with us, and she agreed to give the interview. In our other attempts, we could not access the judges because of obstacles imposed by officials/clerks or because they did not agree to participate in the study.

INTERVIEW PROCEDURES

We conducted the interviews with the judges using a semi-structured schedule inspired by the questionnaire used with the police officers. We interviewed six judges altogether, four of
them from the Special Civil Courts (JECs), one from the Internal Affairs of the Court of Justice of Sao Paulo (TJSP), and one appellate judge of the TJSP. These first interviews were important in improving the open-ended questions in the script and to get familiar with specific issues related to the workings of the justice system.

It is important to note that, despite the concentration on Special Civil Courts, we had the opportunity to interview two judges that were not from these courts. During the interviews, we realized that there are topics directly related to the judges’ self-legitimacy in the justice system and to their internal institutional relations. Interviewing a judge from Internal Affairs at the Court of Justice allowed us, for example, to understand how this agency inspects and monitors judges’ work, and how this affects the judiciary’s internal legitimacy.

The interview with the appellate judge from the TJSP allowed us to get in touch with someone who has worked in the field for over twenty years and who could describe her perceptions on the changes that have taken place in the judiciary in recent years.

TRANSCRIPTION, SYSTEMATIZATION AND PRELIMINARY ANALYSES

The audio of the six recorded interviews were transcribed and then revised. After finishing this step, we started reading and systematizing the material. We first identified the ideas that were recurrent in the interviews, and then we developed the preliminary analyses of the selected material.

B. PRELIMINARY RESULTS

We used the interview with a judge from a Special Civil Court partnering with a university, carried out at the beginning of the study, to pre-test the interview script. Through our contact with this judge, the questions were improved and then tested with the rest of the participants.

In the systematization of the interviews, we identified that the following issues were recurrent: (i) the structure and resources (both material and human) of the Special Civil Courts; (ii) contacts with the population; (iii) perceptions about changes in the judiciary; (iv) the issue of productivity; (v) the relationship with the National Justice Council (CNJ); and (vi) the public image of the judiciary.

STRUCTURE AND RESOURCES (MATERIAL AND HUMAN) OF THE SPECIAL CIVIL COURTS

The Court of Justice of the State of São Paulo is considered the largest court in the world in volume of cases. According to some of the judges interviewed, the existing structure is not sufficient to handle all these cases.
In São Paulo, there are thirty Special Civil Courts (JECs) in the capital alone. Thirteen JECs operate out of Regional Forums, thirteen at universities, two in Citizenship Integration Centers (CICs), one in the subway, and another in an annex of the Itaquera “Poupatempo” agency.

The Courts located in the Regional Forums have different characteristics from those functioning in universities. The Courts at the forums have their entire structure linked to the Court of Justice of Sao Paulo; this means that the notary’s office and the officials can use the full structure of the forum. The courts located at the universities use covenants established between the Court of Justice and these institutions, and draw their structure and most of their staff from the universities. Attendants, conciliators, and the administrative assistants are employees or interns linked to the university. The Court of Justice nominates the judge, the clerk, and justice official who will perform the necessary functions to enable the Court’s activities: from the first contact of the population with the forum up to the hearings.

In the study, we interviewed two judges that work in JECs partnered with universities. According to them, the structure of these courts differ from the ones in the forums because there is intense employee turnover, because they are not civil servants but are hired by the university. Furthermore, they have a different structure from that existing in the forums. According to Judge “W”, who works in a court operating at a university, all of the structure and most of the JEC’s staff are assigned by the university and, therefore, it is necessary to be flexible to work in this institution. She emphasizes that these problems with the structure and the human resources might affect the quality of contact with the population and delay the processes, which, in turn, might impact the public’s image of the judiciary (Interview – Judge “W”).

Judge “A”, who works at a different court also located in a university, described something similar, adding that not all employees and interns assigned by the university are directly subordinated to the judge, but are subordinated to the College instead. According to him, this situation raises questions about the future of the judiciary and the limits to the actions it can perform.

CONTACT WITH THE POPULATION

Another issue that was raised in the interviews with judges who work at the JECs was that the contact between the magistrate and the population is not immediate; in fact it is at all times mediated by interns and officials. Thus, the aspects discussed by the literature about the contact between the population and the police do not apply in the same way to the judiciary.

This situation happens because in the courts there is a system of conciliation that precedes contact with the judge. There is a constant effort to resolve litigation before it is
effectively judicialized, in order to hasten the decisions and the work in general. Thus, the population have more contact with the attendants, notaries, and conciliators than with the judges. Contact with the magistrate only happens when there is no conciliation and the case proceeds to judicial procedures. However, according to the interviewees, when the case arrives before the judge to be decided, the judge quickly proffers a decision without hearing the parties. According to Judge “P”, she only holds a hearing when it is necessary to hear witnesses and when it might change her sentence.

Even when there is a hearing, the contact between the judge and the parties is ritualized. Despite being a special civil court, this does not mean that formalities are absent from the hearings. The parties can manifest and report their version of the facts, but this happens in a specific time and place during the hearing.

Contact with the population is more frequent for officials of the registry, who guide the public through the functioning of the court and explain each step of the process, informing them of the proceedings of the case and the documents necessary for the preparation of the petition. According to Judge “T”, the officials need to explain the progress of the case in a way that people can understand, especially when the person has no lawyer and has no understanding of law. If the person takes on a lawyer, it is the lawyer who contacts the officials.

In the evaluation of the interviewees, judges who work in the JECs must be someone who has the patience to listen and to explain, because the citizens want to speak and to be heard. According to them, it is common to hear people saying that the judge made their decision without listening to what they had to say. In this regard, Judge “P” says: “I think he [the judge who works in the JECs] cannot be a judge who does not like people” (Judge “P”).

PERCEPTIONS ABOUT CHANGES IN THE JUDICIARY

The interviewees highlighted some important changes in the Brazilian judiciary in recent years. One of them is related to the image of the magistrates. They believe there is no longer a “deification of the judge,” as people seem to have more access to them today.

Another aspect that the interviewees believe has changed a lot is the role required of the judges. While formerly the common image was that of the “chamber judge,” nowadays the judges are more active, they know what is happening in the notary’s office and how to solve problems. This is also related to the role that the TJSP’s Internal Affairs Office and the CNJ have required of the judges, who are now practically expected to be administrators of the courts and forums. Some respondents consider this role extremely important, as it brings judges closer to the officials and allows the magistrate to have more control over the notary offices. Therefore, these accounts
show that the command agencies of the court, as well as the CNJ, have acquired a central role in the management of the judicial system.

In parallel, another change perceived by the judges concerns the modernization of the system, the computerization and the establishment of productivity goals, with the implementation of the system of movements of the judiciary. In their accounts, this issue was associated with the emergence of the CNJ, which, according to them, has propelled the process of dynamization of the judiciary. According to Judge “T”, the computerization of guidelines, sentences, and judicial documents has given a more intense pace of work to the magistrates, since the decisions need to be hastened so that the notary can meet daily demands. This is also in line with the targets monitored by the Internal Affairs Office and the CNJ.

The interviewed judges also pointed out a change in the roles taken on by the judiciary. This acceptance of roles that were not previously assigned to the judiciary may be related to an empty space left by certain institutions. The justice system has ceased to be just reactive, and has become an active player. According to some interviewees, this situation can be damaging if exaggerated. Excessive proactivity may get to the point of replacing other branches of the state, such as the executive and the legislative. The judiciary was meant to judge and not to administer. Judge “L” goes so far as to say that we can end up living in what he calls “the century of the judiciary.” In the view of this judge, the judiciary needs to know where it stands, especially because it fuels expectations that are not part of its prerogatives.

The judges mentioned the recent operations undertaken by the Federal Police, the Federal Public Prosecutor’s Office, and the Judiciary, which have been publicized in the media and have contributed to making these agencies better known by the population. Judge L gives the example of the Federal Supreme Court (STF), which has been deciding issues of great political impact. He states: “When I was a law student in Largo São Francisco [Law School of the University of Sao Paulo], I did not know the names of all the STF ministers, I knew two or three. Today, any student knows the names of the ministers. (...) So It changed, the STF changed” (Judge “L”). Also according to this judge, the importance of the STF has increased in the eyes of the population because we are experiencing a “lack of respected institutions. (...) At this moment, when we do not trust the legislative anymore, we do not know who is there at the executive. And decisions have to be made. This ends up putting responsibility on the STF; that should not be the case, but it is, and the ministers become more famous.”

THE PRODUCTIVITY ISSUE
According to the judge from Internal Affairs whom we interviewed, the judges are obliged to send a monthly report to the system of movements of the judiciary (MOVIJUD), in which it is possible to check how many hearings were held, how many sentences were handed out, cases interrupted for more than one hundred days, processes in progress, decisions, dispatches, etc. This information is automatically fed into the system every month. Thus, the system condenses the productivity of the judiciary.

The issue of productivity was a topic that came up in almost all interviews. Some judges rate this procedure as a positive for the judiciary, while others pointed out negative aspects and the impact these productivity goals may have in judicial output, especially with regard to the quality of decisions.

Considering that the productivity issue appeared in all interviews, the decision to interview a judge from Internal Affairs was crucial. It allowed for a better understanding of how this “monitoring” system works, what its origins are, and its importance for the functioning of the judiciary and for the issue of the legitimacy of the system and the functions they perform.

For Judge “W”, the CNJ’s and Internal Affairs’ demand for numbers is important because, in her view, “the citizen does not want a nice sentence, with citations of doctrine, jurisprudence, etc. He wants to know what comes at the very end: if it was valid or not.” She adds that the judiciary needs to adapt to this reality in an attempt to meet the expectations of the population. In her opinion, this may decrease the quality of her work, but it is necessary to adapt.

For the Judge “A”, with this system of productivity the magistrate becomes a “sentencing machine.” In a similar vein, judge L argues that judicial cases are no longer prepared as they were in the past, with the use of doctrine and jurisprudence. According to him, the sentences were better argued and justified, but they took much longer to be decided. Today, the judge decides more succinctly, without references, and that makes them more fragile and susceptible to appeals and revisions in the appeals Courts. Related to this, the judge states: “Finally, we have a situation where the judiciary needs to respond faster to avoid delays, but this has its consequences.”

The Internal Affairs judge explains that when they identify a judge with very low productivity, or who is holding back processes for too long, the agency tries to discover what is happening. Sometimes the judge may have personal problems that affect his work (such as depression, a sick child, divorce etc.), a situation that does not justify the opening of administrative proceedings. In these cases, Internal Affairs tries to resolve the issue of the demands through joint voluntary actions, by sending another judge, or through some other solution. In other cases, they detect that the judge is not actually working as expected. According
to the interviewee, the magistrate may be devoting himself to his academic career or writing a book instead of working at his court. When this is the case, the judge will certainly undergo an administrative procedure, with all possible sanctions, ranging from censorship to compulsory retirement.

**THE RELATIONSHIP WITH THE NATIONAL JUSTICE COUNCIL (CNJ)**

The interviewees stressed that the judiciary has changed a lot in recent years, especially after the creation of the CNJ. The judge who is now in the Internal Affairs Office also worked at the Council, and was able to describe the changes in this agency over the years. At the outset, at its inception, there were a series of conflicts, due mainly to efforts of self-affirmation, something related to the issue of legitimacy. In other words, it was important for the CNJ to be recognized as an agency that was active in the judiciary sphere. Over the years, the Council has taken on a more strategic role, as was recognized by the judges interviewed. Judge L points out that it is still necessary to improve, as CNJ policies face different local realities. He argues that another issue that still needs improvement is the relationship with the magistrates who do not understand the role that the Council has been playing and who are uncomfortable with the agency’s work of monitoring and supervision.

**THE IMAGE OF THE JUDICIARY**

One recurrent topic in the interviews was the issue of the image of the judiciary being associated with sluggishness. The judges stressed that people still think the Brazilian justice system is slow and that the decisions take too long to be handed down. Thus, according to Judge “W”, “the big problem of the judiciary today is time, is the delay”; even though the judges take seriously the task of attending people, delayed justice is still a problem.

Another problem the judges pointed to was the large number of lawsuits in the Brazilian justice system. In Sao Paulo alone there are twenty million lawsuits. In addition to the volume of lawsuits, there is also a large number of appeals, which makes the judiciary even slower, resulting in a disbelief in the justice system. Judge L gives the example of a situation in which someone threatened to sue another person and notes that, while in other countries this would make the person afraid, in Brazil it is the opposite. In Brazil, people say “sue me if you want,” because they wager it will have no consequences. With this example, the judge wanted to show how the slowness and excessive appeals contribute to distrust of the judiciary’s capacity to resolve conflicts.
Judge “P” believes that the population has a negative view of public servants, but that the judiciary is not evaluated as badly as the rest – especially the JEC, due to the service provided, which she thinks is good. In her opinion, if the judiciary improved the provision of services, its image would improve greatly.

This opinion is not shared by Judge “W”. For this judge, responding to people’s demands well and in a reasonable time is not enough to improve the judiciary’s image. In her view, what influences people’s judgement of their experiences with the judiciary the most are the results. If people lose a case, they think it was the judiciary’s fault. People do not remember that they were well treated, that the initial petition was faithful to what was reported, that during the hearings the judge listened to them and to the witnesses carefully, etc. If the sentence was contrary to their interests, people will say everything was bad.

For judge “L”, judges’ behavior also affects the judiciary’s image. If there is excessive exposure in the media or on social networks, it can lead to distortions and precipitous judgements by the population. In the past, judges stayed in their chambers and only communicated through documents. Now, they are more exposed and vulnerable to judgments.

C. REVIEW OF THE INTERNATIONAL LITERATURE ON JUDICIAL LEGITIMACY

The paper aims to review the international literature on legitimacy and procedural justice, focusing on the justice system. The review was conducted in two steps. During the first phase, we considered the articles already collected for other NEV studies on legitimacy, selecting those dealing with the judiciary. From the more than sixty articles, books, and chapters gathered in the reference base, twenty mentioned, albeit briefly, the legitimacy of the justice system, often together with police institutions. The second step in the literature review consisted of updating this reference base, using the following combinations of keywords in the research: procedural justice and judiciary; legitimacy and judge; procedural justice and criminal justice; self-legitimacy and judge; legitimacy and judiciary; legitimacy and courts. As the result of this research, we found another ten articles and papers, most of which were about criminal justice.

In the reviewed literature, legitimacy was the key concept used to analyze law enforcement institutions, such as the judiciary and the police, but we also found other notions like public trust, confidence, fairness, etc. The theoretical and conceptual framework adopted in most of this literature comes from the works of Weber (2004) and Beetham (1991). They also often use Tom Tyler’s studies, especially the theory of procedural justice. This theory has been used to understand citizens’ perceptions of court sentences and the relations between justice...
institutions and the judges. In methodological terms, these studies usually use data from opinion surveys, such as the 5th European Social Survey.

We identified some research possibilities concerning the justice system from the procedural justice approach that had not been explored yet. Most of the existing literature that discusses police and judicial legitimacy refer to them as having the same type of relationship with the population. This is the approach adopted in the works of Tyler (2003), Tyler and Hou (2002), and Fagan (2007), among others. Although this criminology literature refers to the State authority in general, studies about procedural justice and contacts between the population and police officers or judges have focused on the performance of the police force.

It is possible that one of the challenges for conducting research on procedural justice in the judiciary is related to the type of contact existing between citizens and judges. This relationship presents mediations of different orders: bureaucratic, procedural, ritualistic, and symbolic. Immediate, circumstantial, and situational contact with the population is frequent for the police, but not for judges, whose meetings are scheduled, prepared, and ritualized in its order of speech and postures. The very disposition of seats in the courtroom strengthens the idea that the judge is the authority, the one who has the “right to speak the law” (BOURDIEU, 1989). Thus, the judges’ legitimacy lies in rituals, symbols of power, and dispositions that indicate their authority. The relationship with the population is part of this process, but it happens through formal procedures and is full of mediations. Dialogue between the judge and the parties is never spontaneous, since the parties only answer the questions asked by the judge.

The literature review showed that most of the work on the legitimacy of the judiciary focuses on the field of criminal justice (Fagan, 2007; Tyler, 2003; Moore, 1997; Peršak, 2016; Lind and Tyler, 1988). In part, this emphasis can be attributed to the fact that much of this literature is produced in the field of criminology, a field mostly concerned with crime control. From this point of view, the study of the judiciary often deals with the issue of delays in the judicial response to justice, taken to be one of the factors that discredit the judiciary in the eyes of the population. For this literature, the slowness and the need for more productivity from the judiciary are important dimensions of the judiciary’s legitimacy.

It is important to remember that most of the reviewed literature was produced in countries with a model of justice that differs from the Brazilian model. There are differences that need to be highlighted when considering these studies and comparing them with the Brazilian Justice System. One difference that must be considered is the career placement of judges in the United States and in Brazil. In some American states, judges are elected, and in others they are appointed by the governor or by the legislature. In Brazil, the judges need to pass a public servant
exam that evaluates their knowledge of law. Hence, there is a major difference in the form of insertion. Another important difference between the American and the Brazilian systems is that in the United States the magistrate is exercised by mandates, with the duration varying from state to state (Reis, 2012).

Another important point is that few studies seek to observe how judges perceive their own legitimacy. The existing studies on self-legitimacy usually focus on police officers (Tankebe, 2010; Tankebe 2014, Bradford and Quinton, 2014; Jonathan-Zamir and Harpaz, 2014). Internal legitimacy or self-legitimacy is defined as the level of trust a public servant has in their own legitimacy, considering whether they feel worthy of the authority invested in them (Tankebe, 2011). This perception is constructed and reproduced through a continuous dialogue between the police and the population, as well as within the police organization itself (Bradford and Quinton, 2014).

The issue of self-legitimacy emerged as a development of the debate on the legitimacy of the police and court institutions. Bottoms and Tankebe (2012) argued that the issue of legitimacy cannot be restricted to the public’s perception and needs to be broadened to consider the reciprocal relationship between the power holders and their audiences. Thus, one must consider “internal legitimacy” or “self-legitimacy.”

For Bottoms and Tankebe (2012), power holders cannot exercise their functions solely based on public opinion, internal legitimacy being necessary to define the institutions’ priorities. According to the authors, internal legitimacy is also a precondition to external legitimacy because power holders need to cultivate this self-belief in their own authority before claiming legitimacy on the part of the population.

### 2.1.3. MUNICIPAL ADMINISTRATION

The two rounds of surveys carried out with the community show that the public’s contact with the municipal administration is very restricted. During the first round of surveys (2016), 26% of the population had gone at some point to the municipal administration. For 11% of them, contact had taken place more than 2 years prior, and for 15% during the previous 2 years. During the second round (2017), which gauged contact in just the previous year, that number fell to 9%.

It is important to add to this result that in recent years the majority of services provided by the municipal administration could be carried out via telephone or on the internet. On these channels, direct contact is made not with the municipal administration but with a central call center of the mayor’s office, which forwards requests to the specific services. Citizens can accompany the progress of their request using the protocol number for their service.
When the service is done in person, the citizen informs monitors – usually outsourced – who are stationed at the entrance what they need, and should their request be for a service that is provided by the municipal administration, they receive a numbered ticket and await service. An electronic panel informs them of the window where they will be served. When providing this service, the employee accesses the site for the same central call center, fills in the form depending on the request, and hands the printed protocol number to the citizen, so that they can accompany the progress of their request through the call center or on the internet. If the requested service involves updating document data, the employee checks the documents using the protocol that generated the request and files them so they can be sent to the service area that requested them. The same protocol number is used to accompany the status of the request.

This information allowed us to realize that the decision-making power of government employees serving the public at these windows is very restricted. The majority of decisions related to citizen requests don’t depend on them. They don’t even decide who will be served, because this is controlled by the numbered ticket and the forwarding of the requests follow standardized models through a computerized system with very basic information about requests (name, address, and type of service required). Should it prove necessary, the very system provides a list of documents that the citizen should provide and where these should be delivered.

These factors led to the conclusion that municipal administration services lack important elements to test the main hypothesis of our study: that legitimacy is produced through contact between citizens and public servants. Firstly because, thinking about legitimacy from the point of view of the public, the frequency of contact between residents and the municipal administration is so slight as to preclude any analysis of relationships. Secondly because, thinking about legitimacy from the point of view of the government employee, we are dealing with a contact that happens very quickly and impersonally, considering how a large portion of the service is organized by machines, and where the government agent exercises more of a mechanical role, that of a clerk, than a decision maker. In light of all these restrictions, we opted to concentrate the study on government employees at agencies that apply the law (police and courts), which are those with whom the population has real contact and whose servants exercise authority and have great decision-making power in the services provided.

2.2. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

LIMITS OF DATA
As stated earlier, we got as many questionnaires as possible for a convenience sample, which is not representative of the units or police institutions studied. However, considering all the challenges in studying the police institution, we got enough information to delineate the profile of this population of police officers and to make comparisons between the key areas.

It is important to note that, unlike the other two surveys in this project, we did not conduct a longitudinal study with the police officers. The first reason for such a choice is methodological. The contacts that police officers have with the public happen frequently and with great variation in its diversity. For example, in a single day the officer can have multiple contacts with different people, dealing with cases that are not very serious. The next day can involve a single contact, one case with high complexity and severity. This diversity makes it impossible to establish causal relationships between these contacts and self-legitimacy. The second and third reasons are operational. There is high staff turnover at police departments, for both patrolmen and chiefs. Under these conditions it is very difficult to monitor the work of the same group over a period of time. Finally, the vast majority of police officers participated in the survey because of assurances of confidentiality and anonymity. The military police discipline code itself prevents them from talking about the institution to outsiders. This means that, most likely, we would not have enough police officers willing to participate in a study in which they would be identified.

ADVANCES

• In 30 years studying police, this was the first time we had free access to the low ranks of military police and civil police officers. This contact was very productive for us because we could get information beyond the questionnaires. During the time that the NEV team spent with the units, we had the opportunity to closely observe the services carried out at police precincts, the working dynamics, and to have long conversation with officers with different profiles. This field observation certainly enriched our knowledge and understanding of this institution and its members. For example, in these conversations we learned about the “goals” of police work, such as minimum quotas for stop and frisk for military police officers, or minimum quotas for criminal acts registered by civil police officer. There is no official information about this kind of operating strategy, but it is present in every Company. We also learned that in case of auto accidents, officers have to bear the costs of repairing police vehicles, no matter the reason for the accident. All this information improves our analyses and modifications to the questionnaires.
• This contact also broke down police resistance to NEV and to our research. Most of the time they are suspicious of the intentions of our studies for fear of criticism.

• It was a good test to validate the questionnaire, which proved successful.

• We have valuable and unprecedented data that allows us to compare the perceptions of police officers from two police institutions.

• It allowed us to establish a partnership with the police, and created the possibility of expanding the collection of data and to think about new possible studies about the institution (although as the people in command positions shift, that can eliminate this possibility).

2.3. Highlights

• The mobilization of concepts such as procedural justice and self-legitimacy allows us not only to understand the perceptions that police forces and judges have of their own authority, but also how it is formed through relations with superiors and the public. They also allow us to explore their implications on civil servants’ notions of democracy, human rights, and violence. The study not only made it possible to know, from the perspective of the operators that work at street level, how their institutions function, but also — following negotiation with superiors — allowed for the possibility of better understanding training processes at police academies. These open venues in the corporations will lead NEV to a deeper understanding of the self-legitimacy process in these institutions, as well and to develop strategies and materials that can contribute more effectively to police training.

• In a first analysis, comparing the answers presented by military police and civil police officers, we could perceive that as police forces the two institutions are quite similar. What differs them are the attitudes, norms, and values derived from being a member of a militarized or civil organization.

• Still considering this first comparison, it is possible to identify that the military police tend to present more conservative positions than the civil police.

• This openness to the study and the access investigators had to police staff without any intermediation suggests that the police may be changing not only their relationship with outsiders but also with their own members. Whereas dialogue used to be restricted to the upper echelons, we can now approach front-line officers, those who actually perform police work.
2.4. NEXT STEPS

PAPERS

We are planning the following papers:

- Methodological paper
- Paper analyzing self-legitimacy among military police officers.
- Paper analyzing self-legitimacy among civil police officers.
- Paper analyzing the answers of military and police officer for specific subjects.
- Literature review on legitimacy and self-legitimacy and judiciary.
- Paper analyzing the interviews with judges.

RESEARCH

- Deepen the analysis of the quantitative data by cross-referencing variables.
- Deepen some questions in the survey by the collection of qualitative data through focus groups with police officers.
- Review the questionnaires using the results of the analyses.
- Continue discussions with the high command of the police forces (Military and Civil) on the possibility of expanding the study and surveying a statistical sample that is representative of police officers in the state of São Paulo.
- Continue the interviews with judges.
- Finish the transcription, systematization, and analysis of the collected data.
### 2.5. Activities Scheduled for Next Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JUL</td>
<td>AUG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analyzing data survey police</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methodological paper - Surveying police officers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analyzing data survey police – paper Military Police and self-legitimacy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analyzing data survey police – paper Civil Police and self-legitimacy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analyzing data survey police – paper Military and Civil Police forces in Sao Paulo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review the Questionnaires of the Police</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focal Groups with policemen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Systematization and analysis of the information produced in the focal groups with policemen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paper with a literature review on legitimacy and self-legitimacy and Judiciary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview with Judges</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Systematization and analysis of interviews with judges</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paper with the first analyses of the interviews with judges</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bibliographic review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Report</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. THE EARLY ADOLESCENTS LEGAL SOCIALIZATION PROCESS AND TRUST IN INSTITUTIONS

3.1. INTRODUCTION

This report presents the results of the first wave of data collection of the São Paulo Legal Socialization Study (SPLSS), a longitudinal survey whose main goal is to explore how early adolescents form their perceptions of rules and law, and how they legitimate authority figures. The report is organized into three sections. In the first section, it presents the final sampling process, the descriptive statistics from the first wave, and some analysis undertaken from the current research stage – organized in articles submitted to national and international journals. The second section reports the participation in academic conferences, and the technical meetings with partners abroad. Finally, the schedule for the next research period defines strategies for the second wave data collection, and projects future research endeavors.

Firstly, the initial results demonstrate the research potential for the issue of CEPID general research program, “Building Democracy Daily: Human Rights, Violence and Institutional Trust.” The early adolescents’ legal socialization process and trust in institutions study refers to the aspect of socialization regarding internalization of social norms and orientations toward different social authorities. In this process, the quality of the contact with authorities is very important, since each interaction between citizens and authorities is a potential “teachable moment” (Tyler et al., 2014). The legal socialization content generates (or not) legitimacy and trust.

Following recent studies (Trinkner & Cohn, 2014; Trinkner & Tyler, 2016), the São Paulo Legal Socialization Study (SPLSS) emphasizes the possibilities of exploring the impact of individual experiences with legal and nonlegal authorities. Family and school authorities may be as relevant as legal authority in this process of attributing legitimacy and trust in laws and institutions. Aligned with previous studies (Fagan & Tyler, 2005; Jeleniewski, 2014), SPLSS findings have shown that legitimacy is partly the result of an extensive learning process, which is an important development stage in early adolescence.

As pointed out in the 3rd CEPID Report (2015-16), the development of the survey took the following steps. First, an exploratory study was conducted in order to approximate experiences, languages, and values of early adolescents about the main research issues. This primary approach allowed the team to refine the questionnaire as well as to have a clearer perspective of the
challenges of collecting data with this age group: means of access to early adolescents and the
data collection instrument final format, question wording, length of the interview, and tailoring
language to the stage of cognitive development. It also had detected the relevance of considering
the impact of exposure to violence and victimization, and differences in educational systems such
as private and public schools.

After this exploratory experience, the research team was able to develop the survey with
questions widely used in international literature on legal socialization. The questionnaire used to
collect data highlighted the substantial role that socioeconomic backgrounds may play in legal
socialization, compliance with laws, experiences with the police, and exposure to violence.

So far, the analysis of the data has reached some interesting findings. On one hand, most
of the interviewees agree that they have the duty to obey parents, teachers, and police. On the
other hand, when analyzing the justifications for this perception of duty, it was possible to notice
that motivations through consent are more frequent for parents and teachers, while coercive
motivations are more frequent for police. However, when analyzing the quality of the contact
and perceptions of the police reported by the early adolescents, some socioeconomic variables,
especially family income and type of school (private or public), were significantly associated with
the variable legitimacy of the police. The group that presented the lower socioeconomic
conditions and the higher exposure to violence in the neighborhood perceived the police as less
legitimate.

Substantially, this report presents the descriptive results of São Paulo Legal Socialization
Study (SPLSS) data collection first wave. As main results it also includes publications, international
meetings with partners, and scientific conferences presentations. At the end, the appendix
contains the reviewed version of the questionnaire for the second wave.

3.2. SÃO PAULO LEGAL SOCIALIZATION STUDY (SPLSS)

The data collection was conducted by the Brazilian Institute of Public Opinion and
Statistics (IBOPE). Therefore, after the pre-tests and final review, the questionnaire was
converted by IBOPE to the software, Survey-To-Go, to allow the use of tablets by the interviewers.
This method minimizes errors of commission and omission and filtering, and facilitates the
systematization of the data into a data bank.

As explained in the previous report, the sampling process followed two stages: the
selection of schools and the selection of students. The first step was taken through the Probability
Proportional to Size (PPS) method and resulted in 112 participating schools. After the selection of schools, fieldwork supervisors presented the research to the school principals and distributed the consent forms for the students in order to gain parental consent. On a second visit, the researchers were able to interview the eligible participants, with contact information form filled and consent form signed by the parents.

The São Paulo Legal Socialization Study (SPLSS) achieved some important theoretical and methodological advances over the past years: in particular, the development of the conceptual framework, the research instruments, and the complete first wave of data.

A) DATA COLLECTION: FIRST WAVE

As previously planned, the participants were born in 2005, sixth grade students, and living in the city of São Paulo. The longitudinal cohort time-lapse is 5 years (2016 – 2020) with at least 3 waves of data collection. The main data collecting tool is a survey questionnaire created by NEV research team. The final full sample is N=800, equally divided between boys and girls.

The questionnaire consists on seven thematic sets and includes social and demographic profiles such as race, gender, family income, and religion. Each set was designed to address issues of legal socialization, such as understandings of rules and laws, the relationship with legal and nonlegal authorities, perceptions of procedural justice and legitimacy, and adolescents’ rule-violating behavior (RVB). Additionally, two important issues related to the Brazilian context, not so well explored in the international literature, are victimization and exposure to violence (direct and indirect).

As showed in Table 11, to complete the sampling it was necessary to contact more private schools than public schools in order to achieve the sufficient number of schools in each area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCHOOL TYPE</th>
<th>SCHOOLS CONTACTED</th>
<th>PARTICIPATING SCHOOLS</th>
<th>REFUSALS</th>
<th>NO TERMS RETURN</th>
<th>OUT OF SCOPE</th>
<th>NON-EFFECTIVE CONTACTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Map 3.1 below shows (on the left) the final distribution of schools in the city of São Paulo. Each school had a maximum of twelve students and a minimum of one. Map 1 shows (on the right) the distribution of the students throughout the city according to informed home address. It is possible to notice that both school and student sampling are well distributed in the territory, and all city regions were covered. This distribution follows the school census conducted by the Ministry of Education of Brazil (MEC).

Also following the 2014 MEC School Census, the sample has a majority of students from public schools. Graph 26 shows the distribution of interviewees according to school type. Graphs 27, 28, and 29 show the sample profile in terms of race, religion, and family income per household according to Brazilian minimum wage.
The descriptive results selected for this report are presented according to the questionnaire sets sequence.

Firstly, it includes present information about the family composition of the interviewees. The data show that 94.9% of the interviewees live with their mother, 53.3% live with both parents, another 18.1% live with their grandparents (with or without their parents). Most of the respondents (83%) have at least one brother (or sister) and 24.2% said they had more than two siblings. The data organized in Graph 30 below demonstrate that there is a significant association
between the number of siblings and a family income range of the respondents. As family income rises, the number of children at home decreases.

The questionnaire family set has questions to assess the involvement of parents in their children’s activities. Those questions were elaborated based on parental practice scales (Teixeira et al., 2006; Darling & Cumsille, 2008). When questioned about how they perceive parental involvement, most interviewees show that parents are supportive: for 73.7% parents support their activities; for 98% parents praise when they do a good job; for 93% the parents require good school performance; for 94.6% the parents look after school studies; 73.6% say that the parents do fun activities; and for 84.36% the parents try to know who are their friends.

According to the early adolescents, parents are the most truthful people. In addition, according to the literature, interpersonal trust is one of the elements that can influence the process of legal socialization (Rotenberg, 2010; Tyler, 2015). Further, early adolescents were asked about who they look for when they have to solve a difficult problem: the most mentioned figure was the mother (82.1%), followed by the father (58%), and friends (34.1%). Only 8 individuals said they had no one to trust. In addition, most (more than 90%) reported relying on parents, friends, and teachers.

According to Nucci et al. (1996) and Smetana (1996), children and adolescents judge parental legitimacy considering the specific domains on which these authorities demand control. As pointed out in the previous report, also following the parental style literature, ten rules were listed concerning different subjects in the life of early adolescents. They were questions about household rules, the parents’ right to make rules, and how often they obey each rule. The results are shown in Table 12.

---

The graph shows the number of siblings by family income range. The x-axis represents the number of siblings (No siblings, 1 sibling, 2 siblings, 3 siblings, 4 or more siblings), and the y-axis represents the percentage. The bars are color-coded to indicate different income ranges: < 1 salary, 1-2 salaries, 2-5 salaries, 5-10 salaries, > 10 salaries.
As observed in Table 12, the rules regarding play in the streets (43.5%) and permission to date (56.3%) are the least frequent among the interviewees. The most frequent rules are those involving health care, such as smoking or drinking (98.6%), and moral issues such as lying (97.3%) and saying cuss words (94%). In terms of obedience, on average, most interviewees expressed that they should obey the rules established by the parents in all the topics questioned.

It is interesting to note that for all cases the number of early adolescents who say they agree with the right of parents to control issues are higher than the existing rules. Thus, while 75.8% report that parents actually control the music and media they access, 90.1% agree that parents would have the right to set rules on that issue.

For those who reported that some rule exists at home, it was asked how often they obey it. Overall, more than 94% say they obey existing rules. Even in existing household rules, it is possible to observe that parents establish, on average, more rules for girls than boys, as shown in Graph 31 below, and confirmed in the mean difference tests (t-test, p=0.000).
Another important question for the study of legal socialization is the consequences that adolescents face when they do not obey any of the parents’ rules. Seven possible reactions have been listed relating to ways of disciplining children such as little chat, dialogue, punishments, and severe punishments. The most frequent ones are verbal reprimand (96.1%) and some form of punishment such as being without cell phone or TV (74.9%). Punishments like forbidding the adolescent to leave home or threatening to hit them is found in approximately half of the sample, 48.25% and 47.63% respectively. Violent punishment such as verbal insults and beating up occur with the minority of respondents, 15.38% and 18.5% respectively.

For each issue mentioned above, it was asked if they think the parents have the right to act that way. The data demonstrate that adolescents agree with less violent forms of punishment. Among those who report that parents can verbally reprimand, 97.4% think it is right, 90.65% for punishment, and 78.5% for prohibition of leaving home. As noted before, violent punishments are less frequent and are not well accepted by early adolescents: among those reporting that parents would verbally offend, 58.5% disagree, 45.95% do not think parents have the right to beat, and 38.32% do not agree that parents have the right to threaten to beat.

The SPLSS measures of legitimacy for the three figures of authority are essentially the perception of the right of the authorities to make the rules and the duty to obey them even when they do not agree. The two questions had the possibility of answering ‘yes’ and ‘no’. There were 98.6% of respondents who agreed on the right for parents to make rules and 98.25% the duty to obey even when they do not agree with parents.

Another aspect concerning the relationship between adolescents and authority is the perception of procedural justice. It was asked what the parents would do if they felt that the he/she did something wrong. For 93.8% parents would give them the opportunity to express their side of the story; for 92.7% parents would explain why they are verbally reprimanding; for 91.1%
parents would listen to all sides of the story before making a decision; and for 95.12% believe that parents would talk politely.

SPLSS also includes peer relations in the legal socialization process. One issue to be highlighted refers to the importance of friends for the formation of the opinions and behaviors related to many subjects. According to the data collected, the perception that they are aligned with friends is relatively low among respondents: 27.26% said their friends’ opinions are not important for their decisions; 81.2% said they would not change the way they are to be accepted by friends; and 54.7% do not believe that they need to share the same opinions as their friends.

The role of the peer group has relevance to behavior in relation to central themes of the process of legal socialization. Thus, in the age range between 10 and 11 years, the willingness to support the actions of friends considered wrong is low; only 31.5% would support wrongdoings. Compared to parents, the importance of friends is also relatively low: 71.5% of respondents said they would not stand with their parents to defend their friends.

One important element for legal socialization is the relationship with early adolescents who have misbehaviors and misconducts. Thus, it was measured by the “perception of their friends” behavior. More than 88% of respondents said none of the listed circumstances – taking anything without paying, breaking something or doing school graffiti, hitting someone, and experiencing drugs – occurred while they were with friends and/or siblings.

Another aspect of peer relationships is the practice of bullying. There were questions to measure which bullying practices respondents suffered and perpetrated. In the following two tables are the responses about being bullied and bullying.

### Table 13. Bullied

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Once</th>
<th>Few Times</th>
<th>Many Times</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Verbally offended someone (friend or schoolmate)?</td>
<td>7,8%</td>
<td>15,0%</td>
<td>21,3%</td>
<td>74,7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excluded someone from a group of friends on purpose?</td>
<td>6,4%</td>
<td>8,3%</td>
<td>1,5%</td>
<td>83,8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Made fun of someone (friend or schoolmate)?</td>
<td>6,4%</td>
<td>18,6%</td>
<td>3,6%</td>
<td>71,4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spread lies about someone (personally or on the internet)?</td>
<td>1,4%</td>
<td>1,6%</td>
<td>1,3%</td>
<td>96,9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posted embarrassing pictures or videos about someone on the internet?</td>
<td>0,5%</td>
<td>0,5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>99%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Most early adolescents say they do not perpetrate bullying. The most common practices are verbally offending and “making fun of someone”: 25.3% and 28.6% respectively. In the following table is the data about bullying.
According to the data above, it is more common for early adolescents to admit to having been bullied than having committed bullying. The most frequent is to have been a victim of verbal offense at least once (43.4%), and participating in “mak[ing] fun of him/her” (37.2%). Note that the practice of spreading embarrassing photos or videos is practically non-existent among the interviewees.

An indicator was created crossing bullying practices with demographic and socioeconomic variables: the frequencies of the answers of those who suffered bullying with those who said they had practiced bullying was added. The average responses were compared according to other variables such as sex, race, income, and type of school. The mean comparison tests presented significant results for sex and type of school. Thus, on average, boys report having undergone more bullying practices than girls, as do private school students over public school students.

Focusing more in-depth on bullying among early adolescents, the means of bullying were compared according to the responses to rule-violating behavior. The data for behavior issues was processed in a binary way, with 531 (66%) respondents saying they had not committed any type of RVB and another 269 (34%) committed one type or more. On average, those who commit some type of RVB suffered more forms of bullying (M1 = 0.24, M2 = 0.76, p-value = 0.000).

Regarding schools, in 2016 (the date of the first wave of the research) 44.8% were at the first year in the school where they were interviewed. This was already expected, since the 6th year is the beginning of the second cycle of elementary education in the Brazilian school system, and usually some students move in to a new school.

There were also some questions about the school environment and about the teachers. Questions were asked about the sense of belonging to the school as previously used in the New
Hampshire Youth Study V. The number of respondents who said they did not like going to school were low (8.9%), they would like to change schools (18%), and only a small minority said they did not like the teachers (2.4%). Participants show they feel part of the school, as 59.6% answered ‘yes’ to the five questions about school belonging.

One of the questions about belonging evaluates whether respondents like the teachers. There is a difference between public and private school students in relation to teachers’ evaluations: for all those who said they did not like teachers (N = 19), only one individual is from a private school.

Note that among 42.1% who reported not doing any activity beyond school, 70.3% were from public schools. Among the most accomplished extracurricular activities are sports (28.8%) and foreign language studies (17.6%).

There were questions about teachers’ procedural justice. The main question was: “what the teachers would do if they think that you did something wrong”. For 86.9% the teachers would be given the opportunity to express their side of the story; for 89.4% the teachers would explain why they are verbally reprimanding; for 88% the teachers would listen to all sides of the story before making a decision, and 96.6% believe that the teachers would talk politely.

Regarding teacher legitimacy, the question was: “do you agree that your teachers make the rules in the classroom?” 96.1% said ‘yes’. Obedience to teachers was also considered a duty for 96.1% of respondents.

In addition to questions about the right to make rules and the duty to obey, specific situations of authority perception were added. When asked if teachers can demand the student to turn off the cell phone during class, 93.9% answered ‘yes’. When asked if teachers can stop a fight, 95.9% answered affirmatively.

Finally, regarding school relationships, there were questions about victimization whose perpetrator are adults or students. The most frequent situation was to witness fights and discussions among students, reported by 60%. In addition, 23.5% reported having had something stolen inside the school, 17.7% said they had been physically attacked by students, and 1.25% said they had been physically attacked by adults.

Two fundamental aspects of the legal socialization process are the behaviors and actions that early adolescents develop toward general rules and laws. For this evaluation, questions about rule-violating behavior were asked. The main questions are: “Have you ever taken something from a store without paying for it?”, “Have you ever broken something on the street? (including graffiti)”, “Have you ever verbally offended or hit someone deliberately?”, “Have you
ever used drugs?”, “Have you ever purchased counterfeit goods?”, and “Have you ever cheated at school?”. The scale used was the likert four-point type, divided between “once,” “few times,” “often,” and “not at all”. Most of the interviewees (66%) reported not having committed any of these behaviors and 33% reported at least one of these behaviors. Cheating on school exams (22%) and buying pirated products (13%) were the most frequent acts reported.

Regarding the rule-violating behaviors, respondents were asked if they think such attitudes are correct. This type of question measures “legal cynicism.” For 99% it is not right for people to pick something up from a store without paying, breaking something on the streets, or using drugs; 98% think it is not right to hit someone intentionally; and 93% believe that it is not right to buy pirated products or cheating on a school exam.

The early adolescents’ general perceptions about the function of laws were surveyed according to eight items. For 93%, laws should be obeyed even when people do not agree with them. At the same time, 32% think that some laws can be disobeyed. For 80%, the laws are the same for everyone, but 63% believe that there are people who are above the law. 96% believe that laws serve to protect people, but most (56%) disagree that all laws are good for the whole country. Finally, 77% believe that laws can be changed, and 88% think that people who break laws should be punished.

Perceptions about violence have the neighborhood as the main reference. Regarding exposure to violence in the neighborhood, 23% said they saw people selling drugs on the streets, 33% said they saw people being assaulted in the neighborhood, 15% said they saw people carrying guns without being police officers, and 33% said they heard gunfire shots. Overall, 58% experienced at least one of these situations in the neighborhood. There was no significant difference in exposure to violence in the neighborhood according to gender. On average, public school students are more exposed to violence in their neighborhoods than students from private schools.

In general, the neighborhood is seen as a good place to live: 93% like to live in the neighborhood, 53% said there are some streets they avoid walking alone, and 65% said that parents forbid them to walk alone at night.

The SPLSS survey also has questions about the police. Most early adolescents said they trusted in the police (85%). There was no significant difference between gender, nor between the type of school in relation to trust in the police.

In regards to the police, the SPLSS survey introduced questions about the types of contact (direct and indirect) with these legal authorities. This type of assessment consists of an innovation
in relation to other legal socialization studies. It allows us to have better measurement on which
types of contact are the ones that most influence in the perceptions of procedural justice and
legitimacy for early adolescents.

Firstly, the early adolescents were asked about a variety of police activities that they could
witness. Regarding police indirect contact, 86% have seen the police stopping and searching
someone on the street, 53% have seen the police arresting someone, and 12% have seen the
police beating someone up.

Concerning these three questions, a simple variable of police enforcement was
elaborated with the sum of all the indirect experiences. Only 10% reported not having any of
these experiences with the police, 80% said having witnessed one or two situations, and 10%
reported having seen all three situations. There was a significant difference in contacts according
to the gender of the respondent, but the boys reported having seen more police actions than the
girls.

Regarding direct experiences, the early adolescents generally have few contacts with the
police. The fewer contacts were associated with the tasks of guaranteeing law and order. Five
situations were listed to measure this topic. As expected, the main contacts for the majority were
on occasions when they requested some information from the street policeman (56.48%) and
school campaigns (53.88% answered ‘yes’ to “have you participated in a campaign or have been
talking to policeman?”).

The SPLSS research team had predicted that in this age group just a few participants
would have experiences with police, such as being stopped, searched, or taken to the police
station. In that sense, it was asked if they or someone else close to them had the experience.
Subsequently, 17% answered that they had been stopped by police, 9.76% had been searched by
police, and 4.39% had been taken to a police station.

In order to measure contacts with the police, a variable, “police contact,” was created:
sum of the positive answer for the five types of direct contacts. Most early adolescents reported
having one or two contacts in the past year, less than 1% had all contacts, and 18% reported no
contact at all. For this variable there was no significant difference between boys and girls.

Considering that contacts with the police would be less frequent, questions about
expectations related to procedural justice were asked: 70% believe that the police officer would
give him/her the opportunity to express his/her side of the story, 82% believe that the police
officer would explain the procedures taken, 77% believe that the police officer would act with
them in the same way as they would with others, and 72% believe that the policeman would treat them politely.

In order to measure the police legitimacy, questions similar to the measurement for parents' and teachers' legitimacy were developed. However, police officers are not figures who create rules, they must enforce laws. Thus, the legitimacy associated with the “right to make rules” has been replaced by right to enforce rules. So, 90% think the police have the right to stop and frisk people on the street, and 92% believe that people must obey the police even when they don’t agree with them.

Graph 32 below compares the answers concerning the “right to make rules” among three spheres of authority. Additionally, Graph 33 compares the duty to obey for the same three spheres. In all cases, more than 90% agree with both the right to make rules and the duty to obey for the three authority figures. Note the family authorities are the ones with whom the early adolescents most agree, followed by the teachers and the police.

Finally, there are procedural justice perception questions for the police. During the elaboration of the SPLSS survey, the researchers were aware about the lower contact with the police. Questions were asked in a way to stimulate the respondents to answer about the expectation of the treatment given by the legal authorities. Subsequently, 70% believe that police would give the opportunity to express their side of the story, 82% believe that the police would explain the procedures take, 77% believe that the police would act with them the same way they would with others, and 72% believe that the police would treat them politely. In Graph 8 below,
the answers to the four elements of procedural justice (voice, transparency, impartiality, respect) were organized in order to compare the data for the three authority figures.

Graph 33. Procedural Justice

However, considering the procedural justice as a four-item index, most respondents believe that there would be lower procedural justice for police; less people said that the four items would be present in a possible contact with the police.

These are the main results of the first wave of SPLSS. At the moment, the research team is working on the planning of the second wave of data collection that will start in August 2017.

C) PUBLICATIONS

Data collected from SPLSS also serves as the basis for several, interdisciplinary, cross-national research collaborations for publications. Over the last year, the early adolescents legal socialization research team has published and submitted articles to national and international journals. So far, there is a book review already published in the most prestigious Social Science Brazilian journal. Further, six papers have been submitted. Currently, there is a paper in process for submission to an English language journal.

PUBLISHED

This book review brings the Brazilian audience one of the most controversial books published recently about youth study and criminal justice. In this book, Alice Goffman presents a remarkable ethnography of young African American men who are caught up in the web of surveillance. All find the web of presumed criminality, built as it is on the very associations and friendships that make up a life, nearly impossible to escape. The ethnography is based in the city of Philadelphia. Like most other city police forces, Philadelphia’s police have a political mandate to reduce drug-selling and violent crime by getting tough for illegal activity. On the other side of the struggle are a fairly small group of young people who live on the run.


This article presents some reflections about the field of legal socialization. In order to highlight the field, we analyzed three interviews with adolescents from the city of São Paulo. We sought to investigate how interactions with different authority figures shape the beliefs, attitudes, and behaviors toward the laws. The literature review combined with the Brazilian reality characteristics allowed us to understand how the experiences of victimization can affect the development of adolescents’ perceptions of the legal world.

THOMAS, Kendra; RODRIGUES, Herbert; GOMES, Aline M. M.; OLIVEIRA, Renan T.; VEIGA, Debora P. B.; BRITO, Rafael C. “Normative Development of Brazilian Pre-Adolescents: Parental Legitimacy, Procedural Justice and Adolescent Compliance.” Youth & Society. [Submitted in Jan., 2017]

The purpose of this study is to capture normative Brazilian development in the transition between childhood and early adolescence and gain a deeper understanding of the variables that influence compliance. This analysis draws from the São Paulo Legal Socialization Study (SPLSS), a cohort study (n=800; age=11 years) from public and private schools. Descriptive statistics give a snapshot of normative Brazilian parenting practices and pre-adolescents’ perceptions of legitimacy across multiple issues. Hierarchical linear modeling revealed that procedural justice, global legitimacy, issue-specific legitimacy, and disciplinary techniques all significantly predicted compliance between issues and adolescence. Parents should be mindful to use appropriate disciplinary practices paired with procedural justice practices to increase compliance and continue to be perceived as legitimate authorities. Our findings broaden the literature on
appropriate parenting practices in early adolescence, and allow for greater generalizability of current Western research to a diverse metropolitan setting in Brazil.

RODRIGUES, Herbert; GOMES, Aline M. M.; OLIVEIRA, Renan T.; VEIGA, Debora P. B.; BRITO, Rafael C. “Socialização legal de crianças e adolescentes: revisão da literatura e desafios de pesquisa.” Plural. [Submitted in Fev., 2017]

The article aims to present the legal socialization as an inquiry field that seeks to understand how children and adolescents develop their views on authorities, rules, and laws. This article presents a literature review divided into two main segments: a theoretical review about the traditional approaches and a brief review about the recent studies on legal socialization. In addition, the article highlights some research challenges that can contribute to the understanding of this process in the Brazilian context.

OLIVEIRA, Renan T.; VEIGA, Debora P. B. “Por que pré-adolescentes obedecem? Análise dos modelos de socialização legal.” Cadernos de Pesquisa. [Submitted in Jun., 2017]

Recent studies indicate that adolescents’ orientations toward authorities is a result of legal socialization, a process by which people develop their understandings about rules and laws. Legal socialization can be analyzed through two models: coercive or consensual. Considering these models, an individual may voluntarily obey an authority or do so because of fear of punishment. This article analyzes early adolescents’ motivations to obedience toward parents, teachers, and police officers according to these two models. Data came from the Study of Legal Socialization in São Paulo (SPLSS). The early adolescents’ motivations for obedience to three authorities were analyzed according to those models. The data indicate that participants consider obedience as a duty, mainly for consensual reasons.


This article presents a descriptive and exploratory analysis based on the first wave results of the São Paulo Legal Socialization Study (SPLSS). The purpose of this study is to understand how early adolescents internalize laws and social norms. Early adolescents’ social backgrounds shape the formation of legitimacy and trust in authorities and democratic institutions. Thus, utilizing multiple correspondences analysis (MCA), we seek to identify associations among sociodemographic characteristics and variables such as victimization and trust in the legitimacy of police. We find two asymmetrically differentiated profiles regarding legitimacy.
Legal socialization is a process by which adolescents develop their understanding of laws and rules and how they legitimate the authorities that enforce these laws and rules. Previous studies of legal socialization have found a strong correlation between parental legitimacy and adolescents’ rule compliance. This article contributes to this body of work by investigating the factors associated with parental legitimacy in the Brazilian context. This analysis is based on the baseline results from the São Paulo Legal Socialization Study (SPLSS), a cohort study with a random sample of eight hundred early adolescents (age = 11 years) from São Paulo public and private schools. Participants were interviewed at school about legitimacy, procedural justice, victimization, parental supervision, domestic violence, and peers. Using poisson regression, we investigated the association between parental legitimacy and sociodemographic characteristics, parental supervision, domestic violence, and peer group influence. Best model was chosen based on Akaike Information Criterion. Female gender (RP=1,44; p<0.001), parental engagement (RP=1,26; p=0.02 and RP=1,29; p=0.005), a nuclear family composition (RP=1,2; p>0.014), and higher parental supervision (RP=1,3; p=0.002) are positively associated with parental legitimacy. The influence of a deviant peer group reduces parental legitimacy (RP=0,81; p=0.055). Parental legitimacy is positively associated with family composition and parental style and negatively associated with negative peer group influences. Our findings reinforce exiting efforts to create policies that promote positive family dynamics as an effective way to achieve parental legitimacy, with a strong potential to contribute to the prevention of rule-violating behavior in this age group.

D) UNDERGRADUATE SCIENTIFIC INITIATION PROJECT

As part of research development, there is a scientific initiation scholarship attached to the project. This undergraduate student project focused on the contact between students and teachers and the relationship of authority that emerges from this relationship. This scientific initiation project focused on school relations. The main objective has been the study of teachers’ self-legitimization.
Continuing the investigation, this year we analyzed the 800 answers to the survey open-ended question: “Why should you obey your teachers even when you do not agree with them?” The intention was to understand the motivations of school obedience. It was noted that the duty of obedience is widely disseminated among the sample (96%), and the greatest motivation is the recognition of authority through the perceptions of their adult status, the knowledge accumulated in their years of study, and their social function. On a smaller scale, adolescents are willing to obey by the alignment with the value that guides the imposed rule or by the fear of possible punishments.

Moreover, the scientific initiation project responsible is preparing two scientific articles aimed at disseminating the results of his previous scientific initiation researches. The first is under preparation to be submitted to the Brazilian journal *Psicologia Escolar e Educacional*. It explores the feeling of self-legitimacy of the public school teachers addressing issues such as the quality of contact with students, superiors and peers and the social identity of the profession. Its conclusions are that the self-legitimacy of these professionals is influenced mainly by the quality of the work relations, the consolidation of the social identity of the profession and the sense of having legitimacy towards its students.

The second article, soon to be submitted to the journal *Perspectiva*, evaluates how the students see the authority of the teacher, especially the concepts of the right to make rules and the duty of obedience. Its results demonstrate that the recognition of teacher authority is internalized in the students *a priori*. However, deference to the authority’s commands is independent of this first legitimation and is related to the way in which the authority behaves in the exercise of its functions, that is, in consonance with the idea of concerning teachers’ procedural justice that directly influences the sense of duty of obedience of their students.

### 3.3. INTERNATIONAL PARTNERSHIPS AND CONFERENCES

#### A) INTERNATIONAL MEETINGS

The time period concerning this report was important to strengthen international partnerships, in order to generate ideas and cooperations for publications. There were two workshop meetings with international partners in the United States of America in 2016.

The meeting with Professor Rick Trinker took place at School of Criminology and Criminal Justice, Arizona State University (September 8th and 9th, 2016). On the first day, the CEPID research programme was presented to Dr. Trinkner, his students, and other professors. The
audience praised the CEPID’s initiative and demanded characterizations of Brazilian socio-economic reality. They also commented on the challenges of developing the research in such a different society.

After the presentation, Dr. Trinkner and his team debated the SPLSS questionnaire. At first, the workshop focused on adjustments of the data-collecting tool in order to improve the second wave survey for international comparisons. As a result, the workshop suggested slight modifications on questions and scales for the concept of “legal cynicism”.

Another assignment of the meeting was the planning of co-authored papers with Rick Trinkner. The first one programmed will test SPLSS data on the legal socialization model developed by Trinkner & Cohn (2014). It will be an innovative approach analyzing how three different authorities (parents, teachers, and police) influence one another’s legitimacy. This type of test is still unpublished in the legal socialization field. Moreover, other co-authored papers will depend on future waves of SPLSS. One example of analysis is if bad experiences with those authorities change early adolescents’ perceptions of legitimacy.

The second meeting was with Professor Kendra Thomas from College of Applied Behavioral Sciences, University of Indianapolis (September 14 and 16th, 2016). In the last year, Kendra Thomas reached the CEPID after suggestion of Professor Ellen Cohn from the Legal Socialization Laboratory from the University of New Hampshire.

In the first day of workshop, we planned the partnership agreement. Kendra Thomas committed to analyze the data from SPLSS and to publish the results in co-authored papers in international journals. The professor also suggested to add to SPLSS some questions related to legal socialization she has been working with. As a result of this partnership, Kendra Thomas and the SPLSS researchers have submitted a paper to Youth and Society Journal.

On the second day of meeting, two presentations of CEPID’s research were requested. The first was a talk with psychology and sociology students from University of Indianapolis about the development of the legal socialization field of inquiry in Brazil. To explain the specifics of studying this issue in non-American environments, USA and Brazil were briefly compared in some historical aspects. For the second presentation, the Department of Sociology of the University of Indianapolis invited the researchers to give a class on sociology to high school students from “Providence Cristo Rey High School” (http://www.pcrhs.org/). The objective of the class was to explain the career of research on sociology taking the CEPID’s experience in Brazil as an example. The students were curious about Brazil, especially because of the internationally notorious cases of violence.
B) SCIENTIFIC CONFERENCES

During this report period, the early adolescents legal socialization research team had the opportunity to present three papers at international conferences in 2016. Additionally, there is one paper already accepted for an international conference, and another two for national meetings in 2017.

IV CONGRESSO INTERNACIONAL TRANSDISCIPLINAR SOBRE A CRIANÇA E O ADOLESCENTE (BELO HORIZONTE, BRAZIL – JUL., 2016)

The paper presented was “Legal socialization field in Brazil: considerations on the victimization”. The main idea of this presentation was to introduce the Legal Socialization as an inquire field to investigate the beliefs and perceptions about rules and laws in Brazil. We summarized the concept of a process through which laws are legitimized (or not) according to the contacts individuals have with authorities during life, especially during adolescence, effecting personal decisions to comply (or not) with norms. As a field of inquiry, legal socialization has considered factors such as cognitive development, family and peers interactions, and quality of contact with legal and non-legal authorities. To bring this debate to Brazil it is necessary to consider contextual specificities, such as high criminality rates and violence. It is known that both exposure to violence and victimization effect individuals’ development, fostering moral disengagement, hostility and low levels of interpersonal and institutional trust. The main contribution of this work was to present this framework, emphasizing how violent experiences can influence the legal socialization process, affecting adolescents’ views on laws. This paper was presented in the session “juridical issues in childhood”, that explored the role and place of children and adolescents in the Brazilian justice system. Participating in this session allowed SPLSS research to dialogue with the fields of law, psychology and psychoanalysis in order to bring these perspectives to legal socialization researches. (Author: Debora Piccirillo)

THIRD ISA FORUM OF SOCIOLOGY - INTERNATIONAL SOCIOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION (VIENNA, AUSTRIA – JUL., 2016)

For this conference the paper presented was “Legal socialization process of children and early adolescents in Sao Paulo, Brazil”. It had the objective to present the process of development
of legitimacy and trust in democratic institutions in its roots, and its impact on the behavior
towards the law of early adolescents (11 years old) as they move into adolescence (15 years old).
The general assumption for this paper was: legitimacy and compliance with laws and democratic
institutions in the city of Sao Paulo (investigation focus) cannot be fully understood without a
detailed study about how compliance with laws, rule and norms develop and are internalized and
expressed among children and early adolescents. In conclusion, the legal socialization process is
one key issue in understanding phenomenon of urban violence and crime, and also in
understanding the persistence of serious human rights violations even in the democratic period
of Brazil. (Author: Herbert Rodrigues)

66TH ANNUAL MEETING OF THE SOCIETY FOR THE STUDY OF SOCIAL PROBLEMS - SSSP (SEATTLE,
USA – AUG., 2016)

The paper, “Early adolescents’ legal socialization process in São Paulo, Brazil” was
discussed at the round-table “Youth, Aging, and the Life Course”. The paper presented initial
descriptive results of five questions from the SPLSS: authorities’ right to make rules; interviewed
perceptions of duty to obey; procedural justice; trust in police and police contacts. The
presentation received positive feedbacks from the participants. It was also suggested some
improvements on trust measures. At age eleven, it was recommended to ask the students if they
trust the authorities in specific contexts. (Author: Renan Theodoro de Oliveira)

Papers accepted for conferences in 2017

73RD ANNUAL MEETING OF THE AMERICAN SOCIETY OF CRIMINOLOGY – ASC (PHILADELPHIA, USA
– NOV., 2017)

The general objective of the paper The Impact of Victimization over the Legal
Socialization: Results from São Paulo Legal Socialization Study (SPLSS) is to present some results
about legal socialization research among early adolescents in the city of São Paulo. Legal
socialization also encompasses the process through which the legitimacy of rules, and the
authorities that enforce these, may or may not affect the decision of individuals to violate or to
comply with the laws and rules. The main objective of the SPLSS is to investigate the process of
development of legitimacy and trust in legal authorities and institutions, and its impact on the
behavior towards the law of early adolescents (11-year-old) as they move into adolescence (15-
Previous studies of legal socialization have found a strong correlation between authorities’ procedural justice and legitimacy. This paper contributes to this body of work by investigating the factors associated with victimization in order to fill some gaps in the theoretical field of legal socialization studies. (Author: Herbert Rodrigues)

VII SIMPÓSIO INTERNACIONAL SOBRE A JUVENTUDE BRASILEIRA – JUBRA (FORTALEZA, BRAZIL – AUG., 2017)

Two papers were accepted for this international symposium:

1.) Duty to obey the police: from fear to consent

Adolescence and childhood are crucial moments for people to form their attitudes and behaviors toward legal authorities. In the last years, Brazil have been facing increased police lethality and it is alarming the numbers of young men and adolescents among the victims. Considering this scenario, presentation seeks to answer what do early adolescents expect the police work to be. The presentation explores data from the first wave of SPLSS. Two main questions from the survey were selected. First, if the interviewees believe that they should obey the police even when they do not agree with their orders. Second, why they believe it is or it is not a duty to obey the police. The analysis considers the types of contact the early adolescents from the study had with police officers. In general, respondents believes it is their duty to obey the police. However, one fourth of the sample justifies the obedience based on fear. Results suggests that Brazilian authorities should formulate security policies that guarantees adolescents’ contact with daily democratic and fair police practices. (Authors: Renan Theodoro de Oliveira; Debora Piccirillo; Aline Mizutani Gomes)

2.) Legal socialization: how youth’s perceptions about laws are formed

In Brazil, sociology, psychology and criminology consider the relationship among youth and legal authorities from two main approaches: one of victimization and other of delinquency. This presentation emphasizes another perspective, which highlights legal socialization, the process through which adolescents learn about rules, laws and authorities. Applying the procedural justice theory to the analysis of the Brazilian System of Guarantee of Rights, we claim that the way agents treat and relate to children and adolescents fosters models of socialization that has different impacts on youth’s future. Through a bibliographic review, we found that most research were conducted in north-American and European contexts, which reveals the necessity
to focus in Brazilian specificities, such as victimization. In this presentation, we introduce two models of legal socialization: a coercive and a consensual model. The coercive model stimulates an instrumental relationship with authorities, in which rights are granted as a favor. On the other hand, when the agents act within established boundaries there is a consensual orientation of the exercise of power. This orientation fosters a relationship that allows youth to learn about their rights and permits critical attitudes towards authorities, encouraging cooperation and compliance with institutions. We conclude that the formation of young people aware of their rights and of their transforming role depends on authorities’ behavior towards this public. In addition, the presentation sheds light on a new way of analyzing the relations of young people with the laws and authorities. (Authors: Debora Piccirillo Barbosa da Veiga; Renan Theodoro de Oliveira; Aline Mizutani Gomes)
### 3.4. Schedule for the Next Period (2017-2018)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JUL</td>
<td>AUG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Survey second wave</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making the (re)contact</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collecting data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Data analysis</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of the analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conferences</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII Simpósio Internacional sobre a Juventude Brasileira</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73rd Annual Meeting American Society of Criminology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Publications</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paper submissions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Survey third wave</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Research report</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final report</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. RESEARCHES ASSOCIATED WITH THE MAIN PROJECT

TITLE OF THE PROJECT: VIOLENCE, HEALTH AND PREVENTION: CONTRIBUTIONS FROM CRIMINOLOGY FOR THE STUDY OF HOMICIDES IN BRASIL AND FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF NEW INVESTIGATIONS TO IDENTIFY RISK FACTORS FOR INTERPERSONAL VIOLENCE AMONGST CHILDREN AND ADOLESCENTS

Scholarship for research abroad. Fapesp no. de processo: 2015/16142-4 (linked to CEPID process n. 2013/07923-7)

Period: November 2015-May 2016

Place: Violence Research Centre, Instituto of Criminology, University of Cambridge

Research: Since the 1990s, researchers have noted declining trends in crime and violence, particularly homicide, in Western countries. Studies have explored national and sub-national trends using latent trajectory analysis techniques and identified several factors associated with declining and/or increasing trajectories. Social disorganization (SD) has been consistently linked to increases in homicide rates over time, explaining at least some of the spatial and temporal heterogeneity of homicide. Similar studies have not yet been carried out in Latin America’s cities.

In this paper we use Group Based Trajectory models to study homicide mortality rate [HMR] trajectories in Brazilian municipalities between 1991 and 2010. Then, through binary and multinomial logistic regression we investigated the association between SD in 1991, and the likelihood of an increasing HMR trajectory. We carried out an ecological time series study using all Brazilian municipalities in the period between 1991 and 2010 (n=4,491). Data on homicide deaths were collected from the Mortality Information System of the Ministry of Health and standardized by age to calculate HMR per 100,000 population. Socioeconomic and demographic data for 1991 were used to compose the composite measure of SD. Our results highlight the spatial and temporal heterogeneity of homicide mortality in Brazilian municipalities. While national trends are steadily increasing, disaggregating municipal trajectories shows that this is driven by a small proportion of municipalities in the country. We found that SD is associated with an ascending homicide trajectory. This result generally supports the notion that poor social structural conditions can create ‘space’ for criminal behavior and groups and, consequently, violent death.

TITLE OF THE PROJECT: RISK AND PROTECTIVE FACTORS FOR ADOLESCENT VIOLENT BEHAVIOUR IN SAO PAULO, BRAZIL – THE SAO PAULO PROJECT ON THE SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT OF CHILDREN (SP-PROSO).
Abstract: The project was submitted to the British Academy, in response to the Newton Advanced Fellowship, having prof. Manuel Eisner as co-applicant. The project also requested budget complementation from FAPESP (regular research support n. process 2016/22259–4). The focus of this proposal is the investigation of risk and protective factors for violent behaviour and victimization among adolescents in Brazil, in a comparative, cross-cultural perspective. A school based cross-sectional survey in Sao Paulo, using the same methodology previously used in Zurich and in Montevideo, will be conducted from August to November 2017. The training component will consist in group discussions, workshops and short courses in UK institutions with emphasis in data analysis. A violence prevention intervention and a training module on youth violence prevention will be formulated. This project has a strong potential to result in practical interventions that will contribute to prevent, control and reduce violence levels in Brazil.

Activities: translations and adaptation of research instruments, pre-test of research instruments. Data collection will start in August 2017.

Two PhD Students: Letícia Araújo (under the supervision of Maria Fernanda Peres) and Maria Alvim (under the supervision of Renata Levy). The first international workshop of the São Paulo project on social development of children and adolescents (sp-proso) is set for July, 17, 2017.

COLLABORATION ON THE SÃO PAULO LEGAL SOCIALIZATION STUDY

Dr. Marcelo Nery’s collaboration with NEV’s São Paulo Legal Socialization Study is aimed at building an indicator defined by the frequency of domestic victimization or exposure to violence, based on the collected data, that is, based on variation of status of susceptibility to a direct, indirect, minor or severe violent act. Therefore, an sensitive indicator to status changes, from absence to presence of this susceptibility, and the chance to alter this "status". It has been noted that the higher the frequency of victimization or violence, the lower the number of cases in the study related to young people, a factor that differentiates and hierarchizes them.

In the longitudinal perspective it is worth emphasizing that the measurement of frequency between new and old cases may be an even more adequate measure, when considering older cases that remained. Those victimizations or exposures are characterized by an increase in the risk and involve, among other things, a comparison between the cumulative incidence among those exposed to the exposure factor regarding this same measure, and those who are not exposed.
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III. EDUCATION

NEV’s education area in the beginning of the CEPID project was directed mostly at the organization and participation in courses and educational videos. Since 2015, for example, NEV has promoted short courses/debate cycles with the Center for Practice and Education (CPF) of the Social Service of Commerce (SESC). We have renegotiated this partnership with SESC, and are now organizing the second course of 2017. We are also organizing an online video course on legitimacy to be uploaded in the online education platform Coursera, with the support of USP’ Pro-Rectory of Research.

NEV has started in January, 2017 its new educational project, the Human Rights Observatories in Schools, which aims at developing human rights education activities connected to students’ lives in public schools in São Paulo. A report of the project can be found below. Because of this project, we have initiated collaborations with USP research groups, such as the Collaboratory of Development and Participation, from the USP School of Arts and Human Sciences, and other research groups and social foundations devoted to innovation and education projects.

3.1. COURSES

PARTNERSHIP WITH SESC FOR COURSES

The ongoing partnership with SESC (Association of Trade and Commerce Workers), an acknowledged organization in the field of education and cultural activities in Brazil, has been renegotiated. A new series of lectures on the themes of the NEV CEPID Project has been organized. The objective of these lectures was to present to the academic researchers, students, civil servants and others from civil society the complexity of violence and to debate concrete actions and best practices.

THE COURSE "VIOLÊNCIAS, MÍDIAS E JUVENTUDE" WAS PROMOTED IN MAY, 2017
The next course in partnership with SESC has already been organized, and will occur in September 2017, with the following title and lectures:

**POLICE JOURNALISM AND THE COMMUNICATION OF VIOLENCE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lecture</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Researcher</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>De Mineirinho ao PCC</td>
<td>Cinquenta anos de transformações na cobertura policial</td>
<td>Marcelo Beraba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 anos de Jornalismo Policial e Comunicação da Violência</td>
<td>As características e evolução do jornalismo impresso e televisivo sobre crimes no Brasil</td>
<td>Vitor Blotta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jornalismo, Violência e Segurança Pública</td>
<td>Como entender e enfrentar as mudanças</td>
<td>Bruno Paes Manso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O crime organizado na mídia impressa nacional</td>
<td>Contextos, protagonistas e instituições retratadas em notícias que veiculam a presença do crime organizado no Brasil</td>
<td>Sergio Adorno</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Online short course on legitimacy in Brazil – Coursera Platform

This short course, firstly set to be promoted at the Faculty of Phisophy, Language and Literature, and Human Sciences of the University of São Paulo, is now being organized as an online course to be submitted to the online education platform Coursera. The Pro-Rectory of Research of the University has offered support in the production and dissemination of the course. The title and lectures program will be maintained: *Violência, Direitos Humanos e sociabilidade política no Brasil: como os brasileiros se relacionam com as leis e a democracia? (Violence, Human Rights and Political Sociability in Brazil: how to Brazilians relate to the laws and democracy?)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LECTURE</th>
<th>RESEARCHER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st class</td>
<td>The Formation of the public sphere in Brazil: between violence and spectacle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd class</td>
<td>Historical formation of São Paulo and Homicide Trends</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd class</td>
<td>State Violence and violence in society: social control and human rights violations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th class</td>
<td>Power of the State and Parallel Power: challenges of public security in face of organized crime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th class</td>
<td>Legal socialization: how does our youth deal with authority and the laws?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th class</td>
<td>Political socialization in Brazil through the studies of violence and human rights</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.2. **Human Resources**

**Qualification of Human Resources and Collaborations with Foreign Researchers**

In order to qualify our research team, especially in topics such as methodology and statistics and innovations in the justice system, NEV has enhanced its human resources, with the incorporation of new postdoctoral researchers, as well as younger PhD researchers who have been leading the teams with conditions to promote impact in the study areas.

We are also strengthening our international network, with researchers staying periods in partner institutions, participating in workshops and courses, as well as organizing seminars and
workshops in Brazil. Not only are some of the researchers taking graduate classes at the University of São Paulo in topics such as Econometrics and Epidemiology, but the Centre has also sent members of the team to specialized Summer and Winter Schools in Brazil – such as IPSA-USP Summer School on Methods and Concepts in Political Science, Intensive Training in Quantitative Methods Program (CPQES-UFMG) and Metodológicas (CEM-USP). Other researchers have participated in the LSE Summer School on Methods and Michigan University ICPSR Summer Program – especially on topics like longitudinal data analysis, latent variable modelling, sampling techniques, and MPlus, which are central to the on-going research.

The collaborations with foreign researchers and other partner research groups in Brazil, such as the Center for the Study of the Metropolis, have been leading to common activities, such as seminars and co-authored papers, increasing the output of international publications, and enhancing researcher mobility and other partnerships for possible cross-national studies.

**POST-DOCTORAL PROJECTS, PHDs, MASTERS, SCIENTIFIC INITIATION**

**POST-DOCTORAL**

**COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF INSTITUTIONS, PUBLIC POLICIES AND HOMICIDAL TRENDS IN FOUR SÃO PAULO DISTRICTS**

*Researcher: Bruno Paes Manso*

*Supervisor: Prof. Dr. Sergio Adorno*

In this past year, the post-doctoral research has continued on two different perspectives. First, I advanced in the debates on the legitimacy of the Building Democracy Daily: Human Rights, Violence and Institutional Trust, with a co-authored paper published in the Social Sciences journal Civitas. On the second perspective, referring to the investigations into homicides in São Paulo, this year I continued the research done in previous years, which resulted in the publication of the book *Homicide in São Paulo - an examination of trends from 1960 to 2010*, released in June 2016 by Springer Books.

**CRIMINAL IMPUNITY AND TRUST IN INSTITUTIONS**

*Researcher: André Zanetic*
The third period of the postdoctoral research "Criminal impunity and trust in institutions", was marked, above all, by the consolidation of the first more robust analyzes, constructed from the tools developed in the initial phase of the research, advancing in its theoretical foundation. The results appeared in publications during the period. These products refer to the central issues that underpin the research, focused on the relationship between institutional actions (from the field of justice and security), trust and legitimacy the population attribute to these institutions.

POLICING, AUTHORITY RELATIONS AND LEGITIMACY FOR SÃO PAULO STATE CIVIL AND MILITARY POLICE

Researcher: Giane Silvestre

Supervisor: Prof. Dr. Sergio Adorno

This research proposal intends to investigate authority relations in two police institutions in the State of São Paulo - Military and Civilian - and their impact on police “self-legitimacy” in the current democratic period, as well as how police services are performed. The research will focus on organizational differences and similarities between the two police institutions, noting things like hierarchical structure, selection and training of staff, disciplinary codes, and forms of institutional control, efficiency criteria, and authority classes between institutional members. The research will make use of qualitative and quantitative methods, seeking comparative approaches between State of São Paulo police institutions, those of other states in Brazil and/or other countries.

Keywords: Police Institutions; Authority; Legitimacy; Democracy

Beginning of the fellowship: May 2017

ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE AND SELF-LEGITIMACY: A COMPARATIVE STUDY BETWEEN THE CIVIL AND THE MILITARY POLICE FORCES IN THE STATE OF SAO PAULO

Researcher: Bruna Gisi

Supervisor: Prof. Dr. Sérgio Adorno

The proposed post-doctoral research aims to analyze the relationship between three dimensions of police organizations: i) the formal organizational structure and knowledge; ii) the
folk knowledge and practical codes of conduct; and iii) the self-legitimacy of police officers. Through a qualitative comparative study of the military and the civil police forces in the state of Sao Paulo, the research will investigate the hypothesis that the formal-informal tensions within the organizations affects the confidence of police officers in their moral right to exercise authority. Considering that the Brazilian military and civil police forces differ in its formal structure – having different functions, legislations, hierarchy and training –, the comparison would help underscore how formal structure relates to informal culture and, in turn, how the possible tensions between the two might impact the self-legitimacy of the police officers. The empirical research will comprise two phases: i) document analysis of internal regulations and other institutional documents from both police forces about the current organizational formal structures: training, regulations, instruction curriculum, hierarchy and functions; ii) fieldwork at two police stations, one of the military police and one of the civil police. This fieldwork will include observations of the routine practices and activities at the stations; interviews and informal talks with four different actors: military police officers; military police officials; civil police agents; and chiefs of police.

Key-words: Organizational Structure; Self-legitimacy, Civil Police; Military Police; Sao Paulo

Beginning of the fellowship: May 2017

PHD DEGREES

JESUS, Maria Gorete Marques de. 'O que está no mundo não está nos autos': a construção da verdade jurídica nos processos criminais de tráfico de drogas. 2016. Tese (Doutorado em Sociologia) - Faculdade de Filosofia, Letras e Ciências Humanas, Universidade de São Paulo, São Paulo, 2016.


PHD CANDIDATES

Title: Entre a Defesa e a violação da lei: percepções de policiais militares a respeito de seu papel, poder e legitimidade [Between the defense and the violation of the law: perceptions of military police officers about their role, power and legitimacy].

Researcher: Ariadne Lima Natal

Supervisor: Sergio Adorno / Department of Sociology FFLCH-USP

Title: A autoridade policial em São Paulo: os cidadãos e a eficiência e legitimidade da polícia [The police authority in São Paulo: the citizens and the efficiency and legitimacy of the police]

Researcher: Frederico Castelo Branco Teixeira

Supervisor: José Álvaro Moisés / Department of Political Science FFLCH-USP

MASTERS DEGREE


MASTERS CANDIDATE

Title: Estudo da distribuição espacial da violência contra a mulher em São Paulo (2009-2014) [Study of the spatial distribution of violence against women in São Paulo (2009-2014)]

Researcher: André Rodrigues de Oliveira

Supervisor: Lígia Vizeu Barroso / Faculty of Geography of FFLCH-USP

SCIENTIFIC INITIATION PROJECTS

Race, Police, and Legitimacy: Racial Effects in Police-Citizen Encounters
Rafael Castro Coelho Silva, 3rd year, Social Sciences, FFLCH-USP
May. 2016 - Apr. 2017 (FAPESP)
Police legitimacy in São Paulo: assessing social differences
Clara Taneguti Pimentel Costa, 4th year, Social Sciences, FFLCH-USP
may. 2016 - apr. 2017 (FAPESP)

Woman, Security, and Legitimacy: procedural justice and outcome
Maria Tranjan Prado, 4th year, Social Sciences, FFLCH-USP
apr. 2016 - june. 2017 (NEV-USP)

Occupation and urbanization processes in the key area of Cidade Ademar
Luísa Rocha Cardoso Santos, 5th year, Geography, FFLCH-USP
apr. 2016 - mar. 2017 (FAPESP)

Occupation and urbanization processes in the key area of Iguatemi
Hegle Mariano Silva Pereira, 4th year, Social Sciences, FFLCH-USP
apr. 2016 - mar. 2017 (FAPESP)

The impact of the local contact between citizens and institutions: exploratory investigations on stop and search by the police.
Vitor Dall’Acqua, 5th year, Social Sciences, FFLCH-USP, Jan 1st, 2016 to Dec, 31, 2016. (FAPESP)

The impact of the local level contacts between citizens and institutions: exploratory research related to local public schools.

3.3. Project Human Rights Observatories in Schools - PODHE

After evaluating our efforts on education in the first two years of the projects, NEV decided to propose a new project in the area, with the main goal to involve high school students in other dimensions of the research, facilitating their human rights education within their life context. The Project Human Rights Observatories in Schools (PODHE) was influenced by other intervention projects developed by NEV’s researchers, and gathers a specific team to articulate with the schools and organize the activities in partnership with the school actors.

In the pilot project, we have been developing activities with students, teachers and other actors in a state and a municipal public school in different areas of São Paulo. These activities include themes as identity, interpersonal relations, memory and life stories, knowledge of the school and the neighborhood, data collection and monitoring of social problems identified by the school actors. The activities make use of different languages and formats, such as arts, literature,
games and others, in dialogue with the different knowledge areas. The project aims to contribute to enhance student’s sensibilities, capacities and engagement for human rights monitoring in their life contexts, as well as to dissemination and network building for public policies of interest to the schools and communities around them.

In terms of schedule and activities, we have proposed to follow a logical path from activities on awareness of identity and rights, awareness of problems in the two schools that we work with, and in the end, problems involving the neighborhoods. At this point, we have managed to finish the first part, on awareness of identity and rights issues. Given that the beginning of the project demanded the first contacts and negotiations to enter the schools and start the activities, we believe that in the second half of the pilot project will be able to cover the issues concerning the school and the neighborhoods. On what follows, we present a summary of the project and a detailed report on the first six months (first half) of the pilot project.

SUMMARY OF THE PROJECT

The project aims to develop "Observatories of Human Rights in Schools" through awareness-raising and training activities for knowledge building and human rights monitoring in the students' school and daily contexts (in consonance with a similar project carried out by NEV-USP Between 2000 and 2002). In this way, we intend to support: discussions and experiences of these rights among students and other school agents; creation of spaces for listening and democratic school participation; school belonging and the protagonism of children and youth; promote collaborative work of different school agents (learners, educators, parents and support staff); peaceful ways of resolving interpersonal conflicts and attitudes of respect towards the other and their diversity. From this perspective, we have began to promote a pilot project for the construction of these "Observatories" in two schools in the city of São Paulo (MSP), developed through two stages: the first one aims to involve students in a diagnosis about their own school reality, proposing them to help transform the school in an citizenship prone environment; the
second stage is aimed at broadening the students' observations of the social context in which they live from the point of view of human rights. The first axis, therefore, focuses exclusively on the performance within the school and the second one requires greater contact with the school environment, regarding the monitoring of human rights violations and good practices in strengthening citizenship and consolidating rights.

ACTIVITIES REPORT . NEV PODHE . JAN-JUN, 2017

JANUARY AND FEBRUARY, 2017

• First activities for the implementation of the project and beginning of the work of the TT3 fellows: Reading and discussion of the project; Planning of the initial activities and integration of the two selected scholars (Clarice and Diego) to the team

• Development of the project logo

• First step of school selection for pilot experience: mapping and initial contact with schools. A mapping of schools was carried out, according to the following criteria: educational network (public: state or municipal); teaching offered (with classes of 6th grade of elementary school II and 1st year of high school, as defined in the project); location (proximity to USP and / or key areas - western and / or southern regions); performance evaluations of schools (SARESP); insertion in areas of greater socioeconomic vulnerability. An electronic map was produced from this survey, available at: https://drive.google.com/open?id=1tG0rzMPNZGmFSi2rfkBAUuRze0&usp=sharing

Based on this mapping, contacts (telephone and / or e-mail) were made with 33 schools, of which only 2 gave a return. Given this little return, it was also adopted as strategy of personal knowledge or previous work experience in some school institutions, without disregarding the criteria indicated above.

• Second step for school selection: visit to schools and more detailed presentation of the project to management / coordination professionals and teachers

This moment was intended for visits to school institutions, in order to present the project in a more detailed way to both management / coordination professionals and teachers (key partners in project development), and identify interests or resistance. In total, visits were made to a CIEJA - Integrated Center for Youth and Adult Education (which has links with different
schools) and to three other schools. The visits in general were positive, except for one of the schools, whose receptivity of the teachers was very negative. As a result, two schools were interested in developing the project: Municipal School Bernardo O’Higgins and State School Amélia Kerr Nogueira.

**MARCH, 2017**

- **Beginning of activities in the two selected schools**

  Two schools were selected for the pilot experience: EMEF Bernardo Higgins: 6th grade elementary students II (3 classrooms); and EE Amélia Kerr: 6th grade of elementary school II (2 rooms); and first year of high school (2 classrooms).

  In this pilot phase, the team decided that the development of the project in two schools belonging to different public administrations (municipal and state) could bring important results, in order to identify specific aspects of these educational networks and their differentiated impacts in the development of the project.

  As initial activities are planned reading and discussion of the project with professionals and teachers and joint planning to begin work with students. In general, staff expect weekly activities in schools (both with professionals and teachers as well as with students).

- **Weekly activity planning meetings**

  Concurrently with the development of the activities in the schools, weekly planning activities are being carried out by the NEV PODHE team.

- **Management of social networks to disseminate activities**

  The digital platforms for the dissemination of the project activities were created: site, blog, facebook page, youtube channel. Here are the links to two channels:


  [https://www.facebook.com/Observatoriodedireitoshumanosemescolas/](https://www.facebook.com/Observatoriodedireitoshumanosemescolas/)

- **Development of the project evaluation component**
For the development of the evaluation component, the team read specific literature on evaluation methodologies, aiding as well in the assistance of consultants, such as Prof. Gisele Craveiro, from Colab EACH-USP. Some of the most important indicators found were participation, better interpersonal relations in the school. A spreadsheet was made in order to be filled by the team after the activities. Every activity of the project has detailed reports, which will also help evaluate the impacts.

- **Identification of partners to assist in the implementation of the project**

  Partners have been assisting the team to gain new knowledge and design new activities with the students, such as COLAB a research group on information, management and participation, from EACH-USP, and the EduCommunication Course at the School of Communications and Arts of the University of São Paulo.

**APRIL – JUNE, 2017**

- **Implementation of the pilot project in the two selected schools**

  This period was dedicated to the first stage of implementation of the project, which consisted of two interconnected lines of action:

  1) Establishing collaborative work with school professionals, especially teachers and pedagogical coordinators, in order to optimize and make feasible and the results of the project. This work involved: i) raising the awareness of professionals to the theme, through joint and individual meetings; ii) joint planning of activities to be carried out with the students, taking into consideration the programmatic content and skills to be developed by each discipline and its connection with the project activities; iii) implementation of the planned activities with the students.

  2) Development of training activities and experiences in human rights with students. During this period, the implementation of the activities with the students began. They were adapted and reformulated according to the suggestions of the school professionals, as well as the answers and demands of the students themselves. In summary, it is possible to highlight the following accomplishments: i) activities of initial approach of the team with the students; ii) activities to raise awareness of self and others; iii) activities to increase student’s self-worth and knowledge of their life histories; iv) awareness-raising activities for experiencing human rights.
We adopted playful and artistic methodologies that favored the individual and the collective participation and expression of the students.

According to the initial project, we planned to initiate monitoring activities on the school reality in the first months of its implementation. These monitoring activities consist in the construction of a diagnosis of the school reality by the students themselves, aiming to identify situations of violation of human rights and elaboration of propositions to overcome them. However, the activities of approaching the students and raising awareness about the importance of the subject, as well as the joint construction work with the professionals, have taken more time than expected, changing the expectations of the initial schedule. The school calendar itself and school-planned activities (such as quizzes, celebrations, parenting meetings) have influenced this change. In this way, the specific monitoring activities will begin in the month of August, after school recess.

- **Weekly internal planning meetings**

  Weekly team meetings have been held for planning activities and ongoing evaluation of the project implementation process.

- **Management of social networks to disseminate activities**

  The Facebook page about the project is already active, being fed with content from the activities implemented activities. Available at: [https://www.facebook.com/Observatoriodedireitoshumanosemescolas/](https://www.facebook.com/Observatoriodedireitoshumanosemescolas/)

- **Development of the evaluation component of the project**

  In order to build an evaluation instrument that measures the impacts of the Project, the team carried out specific readings on evaluation methodology, as well as a first meeting with a specialized consultant in evaluation of social programs. The team built an evaluation matrix, defining expected results, evaluation questions, and process and result indicators. In general, the evaluation design is structured around three axes: i) learning processes (training and monitoring) in human rights provided by the project with the students; ii) impact in interpersonal relationships developed among the different school actors; iii) promoting participation and protagonism of the students.

  In addition, the whole course of the project is being recorded through detailed field reports as a way of constant monitoring and evaluation of the project.

- **Partnership with the School of Communications and Arts of the University of São Paulo**
A partnership was developed with the School of Communications and Arts of the University, in the Educommunication course, through Prof. Dr. Claudemir Edson Viana. This partnership allowed the team to receive voluntary interns for the Project. The interns participated as part of their course "Research Procedures in Educommunication", which involved training activities. This partnership was established with the purpose of exchanging knowledge and assisting in the development of educational practices focused on human rights in schools.

Images of some of the activities developed with the students

**PLAN FOR NEXT YEAR OF PODHE PROJECT**

In the second semester of 2017 we will start with human rights monitoring activities, beginning with the school environment. The idea is to create a sensorial map of the school,
leading the students to identify sensitive spots of problems. After this diagnosis, the team will assist the students in organizing a plan of action to deal with the identified problems. The protagonism of the students in these activities will be paramount. In order to promote that, we will involve different professionals from areas connected to the problems they identified, in order to help organizing feasible plans and creating networks of collaborators.

The second phase will consist of diagnosing and organizing an intervention plan on problems found by the students in the neighborhood. This will also involve the participation of external professionals and other researchers and educators that can supervise the activities of the students.

Before finishing the pilot project, by the end of 2017, we will promote an evaluation of the impacts, and will plan a new scale for the project for the next years. In order to raise the scale of the project, creating human rights observatories in new schools, we will search for other partnerships at the university, schools and other education institutions. The students that participated in the pilot project will also assist the new project, acting as multipliers outside of the schools.

**Activities planned for next year in the area of education**

The area of education in NEV will continue its activities focusing on online and presental short courses, as well as the Project Human Rights Observatories in Schools. The plan is to expand these projects with new activities and courses. They have enabled greater integration between the areas of education and dissemination, and allowed a deeper reach into relevant audiences of the research. We will also continue the efforts on recruiting and forming human resources in all levels of the research team, and engage in projects with international partners for researcher mobility, seminars and co-authorship papers, and organizing special courses with partner institutions.
IV. Knowledge Transfer

On innovation and knowledge transfer, the challenges of a polarized political environment and continued resistance to universal human rights in institutions and civil society have led NEV to consolidate new agreements and informal collaborations with public and social institutions, such as the police, NGOs, research groups, media outlets and schools, for the exchange of information and expertise, and for building networks that can facilitate the promotion and monitoring of public policies related to the research. The challenge is to deepen NEV’s contributions public and private sectors, while seeking articulations and activities that can generate deeper changes in values, behavior and institutional culture.

NEV has continued its participation the series of public dialogues with the Federal Prosecutor’s office and other public institutions on the theme of public security, as well as in the advisory board of institutions as the Federal Government Witness Protection Program (PROVITA). NEV has also given consultancy for the campaign that led to the National Plan for the Reduction of Homicides, Bill approved by the Deputies Chamber in October 2016, as well as renewed its position as expert partner of the violence prevention committee of the World Health Organization, having published in 2016 a Portuguese version of the WHO book Preventing Youth Violence: an overview of the evidence.

In order to promote greater innovative dissemination activities to the general public, NEV has also built new partnerships with technology foundations, newspapers and internet news channels. These partnerships revolve around projects such as a digital application on violence in the press, a tool developed by NEV along with a foundation from the USP Polytechnic School, as well as prospects of sharing data and analysis on violence with established and more independent digital news channels, such as G1.

The education activities promoted by NEV have also been opportunities for innovation and knowledge transfer, both within the University and the public sector. In the case of the Human Rights Observatories in Schools, a pilot project working with secondary school students, teachers and managers, aside from the exchange with these actors within the schools, we have made partnerships with NGOs and research groups with experience in human rights education, and in new technologies of information for citizenship engagement and public policies monitoring. These partnerships have been leading to more creative and transformative education activities, as well as new links between civil society and the public sector.
LIST OF KNOWLEDGE TRANSFER ACTIVITIES

KNOWLEDGE TRANSFER WITH CIVIL SOCIETY

- New Violence Database Project. Partnership with the Foundation for Innovation and Technology of USP Polytechnic School (FDTE), with newspapers Folha de S. Paulo and O Estado de São Paulo, as well as with the School of Communications and Arts and Cássper Libero Journalism School;
- Exchange of expertise with the human rights, public security and justice journalism platform Ponte.org. www.ponte.org
- Consultancy for: Case for Childhood Brasil

HIGHLIGHT IN TRANSFER WITH CIVIL SOCIETY

New Violence Database Project: Partnership with FDTE (Foundation for the Technological Development of Engineering - http://www.fdte.org.br): Mobile app that can also work as a desktop application to add value to our, NEV’s Press Database: 30 years (1981-2011) of collecting news clippings in the fields of violence and human rights. Bellow we have the App’s present interface:
Our MVP: a timeline with selected news about PCC phenomenon, January-May 2006. People can interact with these news timeline and comment each one.

The experience was supported by a user experience designer - UX (Jessica Tarasoff) and the first version was made in a hackaton with FDTE’s programmers. We already tested the “Minimum viable product” (MVP) at the UNESCO Global Media and Information Literacy Week 2016 - New Paradigms for Intercultural Dialogue (Workshop: “Press, Violence, Youth: Tools for News Literacy”), and in Professional Journalism Master (all students are already journalists) in Escola Superior de Propaganda e Marketing (ESPM - Superior School of Publicity and Marketing).

We are now in the solving problems (“bugs”) phase.

The expected results are:

- Analyses of news over time /different contexts and different meanings.
- Encourage greater media accountability.
- Knowledge transfer to researchers and undergraduate students, high school teachers: disciplines as History and Social Sciences; Contemporary issues.
- More use of databases in journalism
- Encourage editorial project based on media literacy;
- Transform data into information and information in data: a tendency in all areas.
KNOWLEDGE TRANSFER WITH PUBLIC INSTITUTIONS

- Participation in the Inter-institutional Forum for the Communication Rights - Findac
- Participation in the Victims and Witness Program - Provita Council
- Mediation of Brazilian civil society groups in EU-Brazil event on business and human rights and youth in problems with the law.
- Ombudsman Council of the Public Defender’s Office
- National Committee for Prevention and Combat of Torture
- Participation in public consultancy for the State Prosecutor’s Office on Freedom of Information in Protests.
- Participation in the USP Global Cities Program (Institute for Advanced Studies – USP)

HIGHLIGHTS IN KNOWLEDGE TRANSFER WITH PUBLIC INSTITUTIONS

PARTNERSHIPS WITH OTHERS CEPID RESEARCH CENTERS

One of the characteristics of our contemporary society is the fact that almost every data, which is potentially convertible in information, is accessible by networks. So, partnerships in dissemination are essential for developing innovative knowledge transfer activities.

**Partnership with CeMEAI** (Mathematical Science Center Applied to Industry, http://www.cemeai.icmc.usp.br): Marcely Nery, data specialist in NEV, is providing data about “vehicle thefts of years 2000 and 2005, geocoded by centroids of the 18,953 census tracts of the capital, according to the place where the occurrence was recorded, and with information on the nature, date and time of the crime. In total there are 339,637 occurrences and 601.689 registers”, according his words. The final version of the Big Data analytics will be in test in August, 2017.

**Partnership with NeuroMat** (Research, Innovation and Dissemination Center for Neuromathematics, http://neuromat.numec.prp.usp.br): Daniela Osvald Ramos, journalist and digital communication researcher and professor, who coordinates the NEV’s dissemination projects, is in contact with NeuroMat’s dissemination team in order to organize workshops with NEV researchers about scientific dissemination through Wikipedia. The NeuroMat team has
already visited NEV May 17, 2017 for a first approach. Basically, this partnership aims to improve articles about our main research, in Portuguese, such as the article about “Legitimacy”. Further, we will measure our contribution (August-December 2017).

**ACTIVITIES PLAN FOR NEXT YEAR**

In the area of knowledge transfer, we will continue to participate in public and private forums in our areas of expertise, exchanging information and knowledge for public policies. We will also form partnerships with public and private institutions in order to promote exchanges of knowledge and practices in the areas of the research. Projects such as NEVs news application will be revised and tested again with other publics. We highlight the importance of partnerships such as with the Military Police of the State of São Paulo, in order to apply the questionnaires, which will be deepened, as well as the partnerships with the schools for the Project Human Rights Observatories in Schools. The partnerships with the other CEPID centers and news channels have also enabled us to design new strategies for wider knowledge dissemination, and with greater impact.
V. Dissemination

NEV has accumulated great expertise in disseminating information on human rights violations and forms of violence. Given that the ongoing research program is entirely new, representing a new moment in NEV’s scientific and institutional history, the translation of its early results into dissemination strategies is in its early stages, drawing on both accumulated experience and new initiatives.

In order to promote stronger dissemination, NEV has continued publishing and participating in scientific and public events, producing educational videos in the areas of legitimacy and trust, creating partnerships with institutions and media channels, as well as expanding initiatives targeted to students and teenagers.

One of these innovative projects is the new application on violence in the press, which involves partnerships with newspapers, a technology foundation from USP Polytechnic School, secondary schools and colleges. Because this project is being developed through partnerships with other institutions, it was inserted in the knowledge transfer topic. Both this application and the website of the center have been used as spaces to explore techniques for monitoring, promoting and analyzing public debates and perceptions on human rights and violence. Our goal is to reach wider audiences in the public debate, online spaces for educational purposes, as well as for journalists and researchers.

NEV’s website has gone through a reformulation and migrated to a new platform in the 2015-2016 period, in order to adapt it to new technologies and promote more accessible information on NEV’s research, as well other sources on human rights, democracy and public security policies. Our social networks are also reference in these topics, with thousands of followers. Dissemination projects through the new website are underway, such public queries and debates on specific research related topics, as well a newsletter with research highlights and other articles of interest.

NEV’s dissemination team is organizing other important dissemination projects, such as partnerships with consolidated portals as G1 and independent online media outlets. The idea is to share information, research and analysis with reporters and share digital spaces for publishing articles and analyses on topics of the public debate that concern the center. NEV has also been in touch with colleagues from Wikipedia, and is organizing contributions to topics such as legitimacy, violence, human rights and institutional trust within the collaborative encyclopedia.
Because of the collaborations involved in these projects, we have also mentioned them in the knowledge transfer topic.

Two educational publications will also be published in the next two years. One of them is the *Essential Library on Legitimacy*, with articles from NEV’s researchers indicating and revisiting the most important works on the theme, and the other is a *Reader on Legitimacy and Institutional Trust*, which will be a translation of major contemporary works from the international literature. The objective is to bring new depth to the public and scientific debates on legitimacy in Brazil.

At last, NEV’s media interventions in the 2015-2017 period, which averages around 100 per year, has shown the importance of the center a source of qualified information to traditional and new media outlets. With our new partnerships with digital news channels, we expect to promote in the next years a more proactive feeding of news and qualified scientific interventions in the public debate on human rights, violence and security policies.

**PUBLICATIONS**

Here one can find some examples of publications within the projects, organized by the highlights of the research. For the complete list of publications in the period, please see Appendix 1, below.

**1. UNEQUAL EXPERIENCES, PERCEPTIONS AND INTERACTIONS BETWEEN CITIZENS AND INSTITUTIONS IN THE CITY**


**2. DIVIDED PERCEPTIONS OF LEGITIMACY AND “LEGITIMATE DISOBEEDIENCE”**


3. OPENNESS FOR WORKING WITH POLICE FORCES AND JUSTICE


4. A PRIORI LEGITIMACY OF PARENTS, PEERS AND TEACHERS, AND IMPORTANCE OF SOCIOECONOMIC CONTEXT


**SPECIAL PUBLICATIONS**

**ESSENTIAL LIBRARY ON LEGITIMACY**
The essential library on legitimacy is in the writing process. The texts are being produced and a first layout of the publication has been designed. We have chosen to publish the texts in volumes of three or four texts within the period of a year, until the half of 2018. This layout and a list of preliminary topics and authors are below. The expected launch date of the first volume is the second semester of 2017.

Preliminary contents

I. Legitimacy and obedience to the laws
    Sergio Adorno, Ariadne Natal and Thiago Oliveira

II. Legitimacy and Authority
    Sergio Adorno e Vitor Blotta

III. Legitimacy and Institutional Trust
    Nancy Cardia and Sergio Adorno e André Zanetic

IV. Legitimacy and the Police
    Viviane Cubas

V. Youth and legal socialization
    Herbert Rodrigues and Renan Theodoro and Aline Mizutani

VI. Longitudinal studies on perceptions of legitimacy
    Herbert Rodrigues and Marcelo Nery

VII. Violence and political sociability in Brazil
    Bruno Paes Manso and Caren Ruotti

VIII. Legitimacy and Justice
    Sergio Adorno and Maria Gorete Marques de Jesus

IX. Legitimacy and Public Administration
    Vitor Blotta and Renato Alves

X. Legitimacy, human rights and democracy
    Nancy Cardia, Paulo Sergio Pinheiro, Vitor Blotta

XI. Legitimacy and social movements
    Sergio Adorno and Vitor Blotta
READER ON LEGITIMACY

The Reader on Legitimacy and Institutional Trust is still being developed, with the organization of the first translations of the articles to Portuguese. Authors are being contacted for obtaining authorizations.

Below is the preliminary list of works to be included in the reader:

Reader of contemporary literature on Legitimacy and Institutional Trust Preliminary structure

1. INTRODUCTION. Sérgio Adorno, Nancy Cardia and Tom Tyler


8. JACKSON, J. et al. On the Justification and Recognition of police power: broadening the concept of police legitimacy. 2012 [s.l: s.n.].


Expected launch date: 2nd semester of 2018
**INTERNAL SEMINARS**

Title: Os múltiplos significados do policiamento comunitário na cidade maravilhosa: de proximidade a normalização  
Guest: Ludmila Ribeiro (UFMG)  
Date: September 15, 2016

Title: Dealing with the digital: police legitimacy in the age of social media  
Guest: Justin Ellis (Dep. Of Criminology at the University of Sydney)  
Date: November 23, 2016

Title: “Etnografia da Investigação Policial: resultados parciais de 4 anos de campo”  
Guest: Rafael Alcadipani (FGV-EAESP)  
Date: March 23, 2017

Title: “Investigando percepções sobre mobilização comunitária e crime no Brasil”  
Guest: Valéria Cristina Oliveira (Centro de Estudos da Metrópole)  
Date: April 26, 2017

Title: Meeting with Prof. Antony Pereira  
Guest: Antony Pereira (Kings College - London)  
Date: June 20, 2017

**RESEARCH SEMINARS**

Title: The question of Legitimacy on Social Theory  
Coordination: Prof. Marcos Cezar Alvarez (Sociology/USP)  
Description: in order to develop the theoretical perspectives of the project, the objective of the seminars is to examine the question of legitimacy in works such as Max Weber, David Beetham, Tom Tyler, Michel Foucault, David Garland and others.

April 4 2017:  

May 9 2017:  

May 23 2017:  

June 14 2017:


**DOCUMENTARY ON NEVs 30 YEARS**

NEV is organizing a few products, events and meetings in order to discuss its 30 years of existence in 2017. One of them is a Documentary on NEV’s thirty years, which is being Directed by associate researcher Vitor Blotta, in partnership with NEV’s dissemination team, which has offered human resources and produced a multimedia timeline with the Timeline JS tool (https://timeline.knightlab.com/) that will be linked with the documentary script, and the cultural production company Unnova. It will not be an institutional video, but a historical documentary that narrates NEV’s history within the last thirty years of human rights and violence in Brazil. The script is being written and archive materials are being collected. The expected period of the launch of the documentary is October of 2017. Aside from an introduction and a concluding part, the preliminary parts of the documentary script, and the years they cover are:

*Introduction*

**PARTE I – Unfinished redemocratization (87-93)**

**PARTE II – Public Security vs. Human Rights (94-98)**

**PARTE III - Violence and Democracy of Consumption (99-2011)**


**FINAL PART**

**SOCIAL MEDIA AND OTHER CHANNELS**

As mentioned in the last report, our strategy for NEV’s social media channels, Facebook and YouTube, the most used, is to understand them as a part of a digital media ecosystem. These social media, as well as NEV’s institutional website have accumulated along the years what can be seen as a big data on human rights, violence, democracy and public security. In this media ecosystem work in NEV’s platforms as a part of a dissemination cycle. Our goal is to complete this cycle:

1 - Publishing, advertising and posting: Facebook
2 - Informing: Facebook, YouTube and Website

3 - Serving as a reservoir of qualified information: website

These aims are combined with digital formats according to the needs of disseminating content produced by NEV’s researchers. Below are some examples of our strategy to disseminate NEV’s research contents:

VIDEOS – YOU TUBE AND WEBSITE:

Website home with Gorete Marques’s video on her PhD. Source: Print screen
Pesquisadora discute narrativas policiais

Defendida no final de 2016, a tese de doctorado da pesquisadora do NEV Gorete Marques – “O que está no mundo não está nos autos: a construção da verdade jurídica nos processos criminais de tráfico de drogas” parte da seguinte pergunta: “O que torna possível que narrativas policiais sobre flagrantes de tráfico de drogas sejam recepcionadas como verdade pelos operadores do direito, sobretudo juízes? Qual verdade jurídica é construída quando a testemunha consiste no próprio policial que efetuou o flagrante?”. Para saber mais, veja o vídeo abaixo e acesse o conteúdo integral da tese, no link abaixo do vídeo.

Leia a tese completa de Gorete Marques.

“O que está no mundo não está nos autos: a construção da verdade jurídica nos processos criminais de tráfico de drogas”

News in website home with Gorete Marques’ PhD video, with access to the thesis in our publication database. Source: Print screen

Post and metrics for publication and vídeo on Facebook. Source: Print screen.
NEV’s channel on Facebook is not sponsored, meaning we do not pay to boost the posts. This is not allowed, given the public nature of NEV’s activities. This type of strategy for digital dissemination proved to be very successful by metric data, as more than 22,000 people were reached organically (without sponsorship of the post), 6,000 views of Gorete Marques’ PhD video within the post, 951 reactions (feeling metadata in relation to the content) and 137 shares. The number of views of this video in the You Yube channel is 206, well below the number achieved in this social network. For purposes of comparison, the average of the month of April 2017 was around 900 to 1,000 people reached per post, and 40 to 100 tanned per post.

**NEV’S YOU TUBE CHANNEL**

In NEV’s Youtube channel, our most important outlet for videos, we had a growth from 1,068 (2015-2016) to 1,990 (2016-2017) subscribers from 51,233 views to 97,834 views. Our production in this area is continuously growing. We are now translating the videos subtitles for English, like this last one about Bruno Paes Manso’s book, “Homicide in São Paulo – An Examination of Trends from 1960-2010”:

NEV’s Facebook Channel:

In the July 2016-June 2017 period, NEV’s Facebook page has reached its peak of likes, with 12 thousand likes in May 2017, the same number of the peak in 2016, confirming our strategy, since the number has not decreased.
The number of people exposed to NEV’s content in the Facebook page has also increased from 10,050 people to almost 14,000 in the period, as one can see below.

Since April 2017, we have been posting twice a day, so, probably because of that we are having a slow, but organic growth in the number of likes and followers.

**ACTIVITIES PLANNED FOR NEXT YEAR**

- Continue publication plan and conventional disseminations
- Consolidate new website
- Complete new violence press database app;
- Consolidate dissemination of video content;
- Consolidate specialized knowledge of dissemination and innovation in NEV’s digital media;
- Special publications – Essential Library, Reader on Legitimacy and Documentary on NEV’s history (October, 2017)
- Keep and improving our digital dissemination strategy with more videos and complete english translation of our new website;
- Sign the agreement and begin the partnership with G1.
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APPENDIX 2. KNOWLEDGE TRANSFER

APPENDIX 2.1. COURSES, LECTURES, SEMINARS, CONFERENCES, WORKSHOPS AND CONGRESSES

INTERNATIONAL

Title of Presentation: Predictors and Impacts of Police Legitimacy in the City of São Paulo
Event: 3rd ISA Forum of Sociology
Host Institution: International Sociological Association - ISA
Researcher(s) involved: André Zanetic, Bruno Paes Manso, Ariadne Natal, Frederico Castelo Branco e Thiago Oliveira (co-autores)
Public (profile and aprox. number): approximately 30 participants, including academic researchers and graduate students.
Date: July 10 to 14, 2016
Venue: University of Vienna, Vienna, Austria

Title of Presentation: Self-Legitimacy and the Military Police in the State of Sao Paulo – Brazil
Event: 3rd ISA Forum of Sociology
Host Institution: International Sociological Association - ISA
Researcher(s) involved: Viviane de Oliveira Cubas
Public (profile and aprox. number): approximately 15 participants, including academic researchers and graduate students.
Date: July, 11th, 2016
Venue: University of Vienna, Vienna, Austria

Title of Presentation: Early adolescents’ legal socialization process in São Paulo, Brazil,”
Researcher(s) involved: Renan Theodoro de Oliveira
Public (profile and aprox. number): American researches and graduate students
Date: Aug 20, 2016
Venue: Westin Seattle Hotel 1900 5th Avenue Seattle, Washington

Event: The 2016 Violence Prevention Alliance Annual Meeting
Host Institution: World Health Organization
Researcher(s) Involved: Renato Alves
Date(s): 6-7 September, 2016
Venue: Cape Town, South Africa

Event: workshop with Professor Dr. Rick Trinkner for planned co-authored analysis and papers using São Paulo Legal Socialization Study data.
Researcher(s) involved: Renan Theodoro de Oliveira
Public (profile and aprox. number): Professor Dr. Rick Trinkner , graduate students and post-doc researchers from Arizona State University (5 participants)
Date: September 8th and 9th, 2016.
Venue: School of Criminology and Criminal Justice, Arizona State University

Title of Lecture: Legal Socialization: research among Brazilian youth
Event: presentation about the development of the legal socialization field of inquiry in Brazil  
Researcher(s) involved: Renan Theodoro de Oliveira  
Public (profile and aprox. number): psychology and sociology students from University of Indianapolis (aprox 60 participants)  
Date: Sept 16, 2016.  
Venue: School of Psychological Sciences, University of Indianapolis. Indianapolis, Indiana, USA.

Event: workshop with Professor Dr. Kendra Thomas for planned co-authored analysis and papers using São Paulo Legal Socialization Study data.  
Researcher(s) involved: Renan Theodoro de Oliveira  
Public (profile and aprox. number): Kendra Thomas  
Date: September 14 and 16th, 2016  
Venue: College of Applied Behavioral Sciences, University of Indianapolis

Title of Lecture: The sociological imagination: thoughts and experiences from a research on Legal Socialization in Brazil  
Event: The objective of the class was to explain the career of research on sociology taking the CEPID’s experience in Brazil as an example.  
Researcher(s) involved: Renan Theodoro de Oliveira  
Public (profile and aprox. number): high school students (aprox. 20 participants).  
Date: Sept 16, 2016.  
Venue: “Providence Cristo Rey High School”, Indianapolis, Indiana, USA.

Title of presentation: Police legitimacy in São Paulo: consensual obedience and legitimate disobedience  
Autor: André Zanetic, Thiago Oliveira, Ariadne Natal  
Event: 16th Annual Conference of the European Society of Criminology (EuroCrim 2016)  
Host Institution: European Society of Criminology  
Data: September 22, 2016  
Local: Münster, Germany

NATIONAL

Event: II Seminário sobre Tortura e Violência no Sistema Criminal – atuação do Poder Judiciário no enfrentamento da tortura, (Seminário) Apresentação da Pesquisa CNJ  
Researcher(s) involved: Maria Gorete Marques de Jesus  
Public (profile and aprox. number): 200 juízes do Brasil inteiro  
Date: June, 2016

Title of Presentation: Legitimidade e confiança na polícia na cidade de São Paulo  
Event: 10º Encontro da Associação Brasileira de Ciência Política – ABCP 2016  
Host Institution: Associação Brasileira de Ciência Política – ABCP  
Researcher(s) involved: André Zanetic (Article presented)  
Public (profile and aprox. number): approximately 20 participants, including academic researchers and graduate students.  
Date: August 30 to September 2, 2016  
Venue: Belo Horizonte – MG

Title of Tematic session: Dinâmicas das mortes violentas: determinantes, evolução e tratamento criminal  
Event: 10º Encontro da Associação Brasileira de Ciência Política – ABCP 2016  
Host Institution: Associação Brasileira de Ciência Política – ABCP  
Pesquisador envolvido: André Zanetic (Thematic Session coordinator)
Public (profile and aprox. number): 25 participants, including academic researchers and graduate students.
Periodo: August 30 to September 2, 2016
Venue: Belo Horizonte – MG

Title of Tematic session: A relação da polícia com os cidadãos: manifestação públicas, imagem institucional e qualidade da democracia
Event: 10º Encontro da Associação Brasileira de Ciência Política – ABCP 2016
Host Institution: Associação Brasileira de Ciência Política – ABCP
Researcher(s) involved: André Zanetic (Discussant of a thematic session)
Public (profile and aprox. number): approximately 25 participants, including academic researchers, police officers and students.
Date: August 30 to September 2, 2016
Venue: Belo Horizonte – MG

Title of Round Table: Desafios e inovações nas políticas de segurança pública
Event: 10º Encontro da Associação Brasileira de Ciência Política – ABCP 2016
Host Institution: Associação Brasileira de Ciência Política – ABCP
Researcher(s) involved: André Zanetic (Round Table coordinator)
Public (profile and aprox. number): approximately 30 participants, including academic researchers and students.
Date: August 30 to September 2, 2016
Venue: Belo Horizonte – MG

Title of Presentation: “Discursos policiais sobre a audiência de custódia”
Event: 10º Encontro do Fórum Brasileiro de Segurança Pública (Encontro) Sessão 21 - Audiências de Custódia e seus resultados
Researcher(s) involved: Maria Gorete Marques de Jesus
Public (profile and aprox. number): 70 pessoas
Date: September, 2016
Venue: Belo Horizonte – MG

Title of Tematic session: Custos socioeconômicos da violência na América Latina,
Event: 10º Encontro do Fórum Brasileiro de Segurança Pública – FBSP
Host Institution: Fórum Brasileiro de Segurança Pública – FBSP
Researcher(s) involved: André Zanetic (Thematic Session coordinator)
Public (profile and aprox. number): approximately 50 participants, including academic researchers, police officers and students.
Date: September, 2016
Venue: Universidade de Brasília (UnB), em Brasília – DF

Title of lecture: A era das contradições: religião, política e sociedade
Event: II Congresso Nacional em Direitos Humanos e Cultura de Paz.
Researcher involved: Vitor Blotta
Public: 150 post-graduation students, professors, undergraduation students
Date: October 04, 2016
Venue: Federal University of Recife (UFPE)

Title of Presentation: Survey Legitimidade das Instituições
Event: “Seminário Internacional de Polícia Comunitária”
Researcher(s) involved: Viviane de Oliveira Cubas
Public (profile and aprox. number): 400 police officers
Date: October 10, 2016
Venue: Auditorium of Centro de Convenções Rebouças – São Paulo

Title of Presentation: Questões sobre violência e segurança pública
Event: Encontro com os candidatos à prefeitura de São Paulo - Programa USP Cidades Globais
Researcher(s) involved: Marcelo Batista Nery
Title of Presentation: Legitimidade da polícia: Teoria da Dissuasão e Justeza Procedimental.
Researcher(s) involved: Natal, Ariadne; Zanetic, André; Paes Manso, Bruno; Oliveira
Event: 40º Encontro Anual da Anpocs 2016
Host Institution: Anpocs
Date: October 26, 2016
Venue: Caxambu - MG

Title of Presentation: Como mensurar o que não é observável? Abordagem reflexiva e modelagem de variáveis latentes em análises de survey.
Researcher(s) involved: Oliveira, Thiago Rodrigues; Oliveira, André Rodrigues de; Natal, Ariadne Lima.
Event: 40º Encontro Anual da Anpocs 2016
Host Institution: Anpocs
Date: October 21, 2016
Venue: Caxambu – MG

Título: Violência Institucional
Autor: Ariadne Natal
Evento: VI Encontro de Formação da Clínica de Direitos Humanos PUC-SP
Instituição Promotora: PUC-SP
Data: November 29, 2016
Local: São Paulo – SP

Title of event: Desconstruindo a crença da neutralidade do Juiz
Researcher involved: Bruno Paes Manso
Public: judges and lawyers
Date: December 6, 2016
Link: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=XoS-Qfv4uO4

Title of lecture: A Pós-Graduação em Direitos Humanos: desafios da interdisciplinaridade
Event: IX Seminário Internacional de Direitos Humanos da UFPB
Researcher involved: Vitor Blotta
Public: 50 researchers, professors and students
Date: December 7, 2017
Venue: Federal University of Paraíba (UFPB)

Title of Lecture: “Tortura: políticas de combate e os mecanismos preventivos”
Event: Laboratório de Ciências Criminais, curso anual realizado pelo IBCCRIM
Researcher(s) involved: Maria Gorete Marques de Jesus
Public (profile and aprox. number): 50 alunos
Date: 2016

Title of Presentation: NEV-USP: Centro de Pesquisa, Inovação e Difusão (CEPID)
Event: Divulgação científica dos centros de pesquisa, Inovação e Difusão (CEPIDS)
Researcher(s) involved: Marcelo Batista Nery
Public (profile and aprox. number): estudantes e professores, 100
Date: 2016
Venue: EE Emiliano Augusto Cavalcanti de Albuquerque e Melo, São Paulo

Title of event: Debate about Crack: Reduzir Danos
Organized by Open Society Foundation
Researcher involved: Bruno Paes Manso
Public: students and civil servants and civil society  
Date: February 7, 2017  
Venue: Olinda, Pernambuco.  
Link: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=OlDcBVUDlno

Title of event: A Ameaça do crime organizado ao Estado de Direito, mediado  
Researcher involved: Bruno Paes Manso  
Public: participants in the Fernando Henrique Cardoso Institute  
Date: February 13, 2017  
Venue: FHC Institute.  
Link: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=caP7MnNrXG0

Title of event: Lançamento do estudo Tortura Blindada: Como as Instituições do Sistema de Justiça perpetuam a violência nas audiências de custódia, organizado pela Conectas Direitos Humanos  
Researcher involved: Bruno Paes Manso  
Public: researchers and general public  
Date: February 21, 2017  
Venue: Memorial da Resistência.  
Link: https://www.rets.org.br/?q=node/3061

Title of event: Debate promovido pelo Cebrap e pelo Caderno Ilustrissima da Folha de S. Paulo chamado “Presídios e PCC”.  
Researcher involved: Bruno Paes Manso  
Public: researchers and journalists  
Date: March 10, 2017  
Venue: CEBrAP

Title of lecture: A Violência na Sociedade, no Direito e na Comunicação  
Event: Inaugural lecture of the Post-Graduation course on human rights  
Researcher involved: Vitor Blotta  
Public: 150 post-graduation students, professors, undergraduation students  
Date: March 14, 2017  
Venue: Federal University of Recife (UFPE).

Title of Presentation: Violência, crime e seus contextos: o cenário brasileiro e paulista  
Event: Violência, Cidades e Políticas Públicas de Segurança  
Researcher(s) involved: Marcelo Batista Nery  
Public (profile and aprox. number): Pesquisadores acadêmicos, estudantes, professores e outros da sociedade civil, 100  
Date: March 21, 2017

Title of Presentation: Police and self-legitimacy  
Event: “Policia Militar e a Defesa da Dignidade Humana”  
Researcher(s) involved: Viviane de Oliveira Cubas  
Public (profile and aprox. number): 200 police officers  
Date: May 05, 2017  
Venue: Auditorium of Centro de Operações da Polícia Militar do Estado de São Paulo (COPOM) – São Paulo

Title of lecture: Jovens na Mídia, mídias da juventude e cidadania  
Event: Ciclo de palestras Violências, mídias e juventude  
Researcher involved: Vitor Blotta  
Public: 30 students, media professionals and social scientists.  
Date: May 14, 2017  
Venue: SESC Social Service of Commerce.

Title of Lecture: Youth offenders: selective mechanisms in the Brazilian juvenile justice system
Event: Youth and media -- program provided by NEV-USP at SESC
Researcher(s) involved: Thiago Oliveira
Public (profile and aprox. number): Pesquisadores acadêmicos, estudantes, agentes públicos e outros da sociedade civil, 30
Date: May 15, 2017
Venue: SESC, São Paulo

Title of lecture: Brigas de bar: o conflito interpessoal na violência banal
Name of the Course: Violência, Mídias e Juventude
Host institution: Social Service of Commerce (SESC)
Researcher(s) involved: Renan Theodoro de Oliveira
Public (profile and aprox. number): undergraduate students from different areas; workers associated to SESC
Date: May 17, 2017
Venue: Center for Practice and Education (CPF) of the SESC

Title of lecture: Homicídio de jovens, a nacionalização do crime e o caso de São Paulo
Name of the Course: Violências, mídias e juventude
Host institution: Centro de Pesquisa e Formação do Sesc São Paulo
Researcher(s) involved: Bruno Paes Manso and Marcelo Batista Nery
Public (profile and aprox. number): Pesquisadores acadêmicos, estudantes, agentes públicos e outros da sociedade civil, 20
Date: May 24, 2017
Venue: São Paulo

Title of workshop: Oficina de Programação de R para Ciências Sociais
Host institution: CeUPES "Ísis Dias de Oliveira"
Researcher(s) involved: Rafael Coelho
Public (profile and aprox. number): Social science students
Date: May 31, 2017
Venue: USP, São Paulo, SP
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Date: 01/07/2016
Researcher: Bruno Paes
Media: Jornal Folha de SP
Theme: Morte de crianças pela polícia

Date: 01/07/2016
Researcher: Bruno Paes
Media: Revista Isto é
Theme: Violência no Brasil
Link: http://istoe.com.br/a-violencia-venceu/

Date: 01/07/2016
Researcher: Herbert Rodrigues
Media: Rede TV
Theme: Pedofilia

Date: 04/07/2016
Researcher: Renan Theodoro
Media: Site UOL
Theme: Mortes causadas por policiais em SP

Date: 04/07/2016
Researcher: Renan Theodoro
Media: Radio USP.
Theme: Homicídios de crianças e adolescentes

Date: 05/07/2016
Researcher: Gorete Marques
Media: Agência Pública
Theme: Relação entre drogas e crimes violentos

Date: 07/07/2016
Researcher: Bruno Paes
Media: Folha de SP
Theme: Desafios na segurança pública de SP

Date: 07/07/2016
Researcher: Bruno Paes
Media: Jornal Folha de SP
Theme: Mortes na zona sul de SP / Cemitério São Luiz
Date: 12/07/2016
Researcher: Gorete
Media: Rádio USP
Theme: Violência policial / morte de crianças e adolescentes

Date: 15/07/2016
Researcher: Ariadne
Media: TV Brasil
Theme: Realidades policiais
Link: http://goo.gl/ngAhHW

Date: 06/08/2016
Researcher: André Zanetic
Media: O Estado de SP
Theme: Análise: A longo prazo, vale mais a ação social na Cracolândia

Date: 10/08/2016
Researcher: Bruno Paes
Media: TV TVT
Theme: Aumento de mortes causadas por policiais em folga

Date: 18/08/2016
Researcher: André Zanetic
Media: Correio Braziliense
Theme: Especialistas criticam ministro

Date: 18/08/2016
Researcher: André Zanetic
Media: Diário de Pernambuco
Theme: Declaração ministro justiça; menos pesquisa em segurança e mais armamento

Date: 22/08/2016
Researcher: Federico Castelo Branco
Media: TV TVT
Theme: Declaração ministro justiça; menos pesquisa em segurança e mais armamento

Date: 02/09/2016
Researcher: Maria Fernanda
Media: Jornal da USP
Theme: Redesignação do NEV como centro colaborar da OMS
Link: http://jornal.usp.br/universidade/nucleo-de-estudos-da-violencia-da-usp-integra-rede-de-colaboracao-da-oms/

Date: 05/09/2016
Researcher: André Zanetic
Media: NEXO Jornal
Theme: Mecanismos internos e externos de controle da polícia militar
Link: https://www.nexojornal.com.br/expreso/2016/09/06/Como-funcionam-os-mecanismos-internos-e-externos-de-controle-da-Pol%C3%A9cia-Militar

Date: 07/09/2016
Researcher: André Zanetic
Media: O Estado de SP
Theme: Análise: Sem acordo entre Prefeitura e Estado, pode haver conflito na Cracolândia

Date: 08/09/2016
Researcher: Marcelo Nery
Media: Jornal da USP
Theme: Vítimas de homicídios por armas de fogo

Date: 09/09/2016
Researcher: Bruno Paes
Media: TV TVT
Theme: Repressão policial nas manifestações

Date: 13/09/2016
Researcher: Bruno Paes
Media: TV Câmara
Theme: Violência policial nas manifestações
Link: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Isu06Op53nc

Date: 09/09/2016
Researcher: Bruno Paes
Media: Jornal El País
Theme: Black Blocs
Link: http://brasil.elpais.com/brasil/2016/09/10/politica/1473461724_961425.html
Date: 14/09/2016
Researcher: Bruno Paes
Media: Jornal El País
Theme: Candidatos a prefeito da bancada da bala

Date: 19/09/2016
Researcher: Marcelo Nery
Media: Jornal da USP
Theme: Estatuto do desarmamento

Date: 23/09/2016
Researcher: Marcelo Nery
Media: Jornal A gazeta de Vitória
Theme: Problemas no combate à violência nas capitais

Date: 30/09/2016
Researcher: Bruno Paes
Media: Jornal El País
Theme: Candidatos da Bancada da Bala à prefeituras

Date: 02/10/2016
Researcher: Renan Theodoro
Media: A Tribuna de Santos
Theme: Impasses e conflitos na sociedade

Date: 06/10/2016
Researcher: Vitor Blotta
Media: TV Câmara
Theme: Cultura do ódio nas redes sociais
Link: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=TmOxRjhDOIU

Date: 10/10/2016
Researcher: Bruno Paes
Media: Revista Brasil de Direitos
Theme: Perfil do Movimento Mães de Maio feito em comemoração aos 10 anos da ONG Fundo Brasil de Direitos Humanos.

Date: 10/10/16
Researcher: Bruno Paes
Media: Programa João Soares da Rede Globo
Theme: A tática black bloc e sobre o livro Mascarados.

Date: 19/10/2016
Researcher: Bruno Paes
Media: Jornal Floripa
Theme: Mortes em Roraima- ruptura entre PCC e CV
Link: http://www.jornalfloripa.com.br/noticia.php?id=753693

Date: 18/10/2016
Researcher: Camila Nunes
Media: BBC Brasil
Theme: Ruptura entre PCC e CV
Link: http://www.bbc.com/portuguese/brasil-37663153

Date: 19/10/2016.
Researcher: Marcelo Nery
Media: jornal da USP
Theme: PCC

Date: 02/11/2016
Researcher: Ariadne Natal
Media: Rádio Bandeirantes
Theme: A publicação dos resultados do anuário do Fórum Brasileiro de Segurança Pública e a alta concordância com a frase "Bandido bom é bandido morto".

Date: 02/11/2016
Researcher: André Zanetic
Media: TV GloboNews
Theme: Gastos com segurança pública no Brasil somaram R$ 76,2 bilhões em 2015
Date: 04/11/2016
Researcher: Vitor Blotta
Media – USP
Theme: documentário “Guerra Sem Fim: resistência e luta do povo Krenak”
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=jzJ0Wk3UVMQ

Date: 09/11/2016
Researcher: Bruno Paes
Media: TV Globo Bom dia Brasil
Theme: Chacina de 5 jovens em SP

Date: 09/11/2016
Researcher: Bruno Paes
Media: Jornal Ponte
Theme: Desmilitarização da PM

Date: 14/11/2016
Researcher: Sergio Adorno
Media: Revista do Instituto de Humanitas Unisinos
Theme: Desmilitarização da Polícia

Date: 27/01/2017
Researcher: Bruno Paes
Media: Jornal The Globe and Mail
Theme: Crime organizado no Brasil

Date: 09/12/16
Researcher: Bruno Paes
Media: Revista Liberdades do Instituto Brasileiro de Ciências Criminais (IBCCRIM)
Theme: Violência e letalidade policial
Link: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=lxM6vgpN

Date: 14/12/2016
Researcher: Ariadne Natal
Media: TV Gazeta
Theme: Mortes decorrentes de intervenção policial

Date: 14/12/2016
Researcher: Sergio Adorno
Media: Revista Exame
Theme: PCC

Date: 09/01/2017
Researcher: burger Adorno
Media: Agence France Presse
Theme: Massacres nas penitenciárias

Date: 20/01/2017
Researcher: Vitor Blotta
Media: TV Al Jazeera
Theme: Crime organizado no Brasil

Date: 16/01/2017
Researcher: Vitor Blotta
Media: TV Al Jazeera
Theme: Crime nas penitenciárias do Brasil
Link: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=fsPlxadOMK

Date: 17/01/2017
Researcher: André Zanetic
Researcher: Gorete Marques  
Media: Revista Brasileiros  
Theme: Quem fiscaliza o que acontece nos presídios  
Link: http://brasileiros.com.br/2017/02/quem-fiscaliza-o-que-acontece-nos-presídios/

Date: 10/02/2017  
Researcher: Bruno Paes  
Media: Site UOL  
Theme: Por que cidadãos saqueiam lojas quando não há PM nas ruas?  
Link: https://noticias.uol.com.br/cotidiano/ultimas-noticias/2017/02/10/por-que-cidadãos-saqueiam-lojas-quando-nao-tem-pm-nas-ruas.htm

Date: 10/02/2017  
Researcher: Sérgio Adorno  
Media: Site UOL  
Theme: Por que cidadãos saqueiam lojas quando não há PM nas ruas?  
Link: https://noticias.uol.com.br/cotidiano/ultimas-noticias/2017/02/10/por-que-cidadãos-saqueiam-lojas-quando-nao-tem-pm-nas-ruas.htm

Date: 15/02/2017  
Researcher: Gorete Marques  
Media: Portal Setor 3 Senac  
Theme: Sistema penitenciário no Brasil

Date: 14/02/2017  
Researcher: Bruno Paes  
Media: TV Globo  
Theme: Crise no Espírito Santo

Date: 13/02/2017  
Researcher: Bruno Paes  
Media: Site Instituto FHC  
Theme: Ameaça do crime organizado ao Estado de Direito  
Link: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=y_iRFQX-OVE

Date: 05/02/2017  
Researcher: Bruno Paes  
Media: Revista Paiuí  
Theme: A metástase do PCC  
Link: http://piaui.folha.uol.com.br/materia/a-guerra/

Date: 16/02/2017  
Researcher: Ariadne Natal  
Media: Rádio Cidadã  
Theme: Segurança Pública - imagem e papel do policial

Date: 17/02/2017  
Researcher: André Zanetic  
Media: Jornal O Estado de SP  
Theme: Decisão do Supremo sobre indenização aos presos por danos morais  
Link: http://noticias.r7.com/brasil/indenizacao-de-presos-so-deve-impactar- orcamento-dos-estados-a-longo-prazo-19022017

Date: 17/02/2017  
Researcher: André Zanetic  
Media: GloboNews  
Theme: Decisão do Supremo sobre indenização aos presos por danos morais  

Date: 23/02/2017  
Researcher: Bruno Paes  
Media: Site Vix  
Theme: Violência no Brasil

Date: 06/03/2017  
Researcher: Renato  
Media: TV Record  
Theme: História e rotina das gestantes e lactantes da Penitenciária Feminina de Tremembé

Date: 03/03/2017  
Researcher: Bruno Paes  
Media: TV Record  
Theme: Tráfico de Drogas nas fronteiras

Date: 06/03/2017  
Researcher: André Zanetic  
Media: Jornal Nexo  
Theme: Legislação que governa a segurança privada no Brasil  
Link: https://www.nexojornal.com.br/expresso/2017/03/06/Quais-sao-as- atribuições-da-seguranca-privada-no-Brasil

Date: 13/03/2017  
Researcher: Bruno Paes  
Media: TV Record  
Theme: Números de homicídios e números de mortes por intervenção militar
Date: 15/03/2017  
Researcher: André Zanetic  
Media: Rádio CBN  
Theme: Unificação da polícia civil e militar  

Date: 22/03/2017  
Researcher: André Zanetic  
Media: Tribuna de Minas  
Theme: Vigilância Privada

Date: 24/03/2017  
Researcher: Bruno Paes  
Media: Jornal NEXO  
Theme: Câmeras de segurança em SP para ajudar a combater a violência

Date: 28/03/2017  
Researcher: André Zanetic  
Media: Agência Pública  
Theme: Dos porões às agências de segurança privada  

Date: 29/03/2017  
Researcher: Marcelo Nery  
Media: Site UOL  
Theme: Medos privados em lugares públicos  

Date: 30/03/2017  
Researcher: Bruno Paes  
Media: Revista Cidade Nova  
Theme: Medo e segurança  
Link: [https://mail.google.com/mail/u/1/#inbox/15b17e578134a612?projector=1](https://mail.google.com/mail/u/1/#inbox/15b17e578134a612?projector=1)

Date: 30/03/2017  
Researcher: André Zanetic  
Media: Site Agência Pública  
Theme: Atuação de policiais em empresas de segurança  

Date: 03/04/2017  
Researcher: Bruno Paes  
Media: Gazeta on line  
Theme: Aumento de posse de armas depois da greve de PMs no ES

Date: 09/04/2017  
Researcher: Renan Theodoro  
Media: Site UOL  
Theme: Mortes por motivos banais  

Date: 05/04/2017  
Researcher: Ariadne Natal  
Media: TV Cultura Jornal da Cultura  
Theme: Letalidade policial  
Link: [https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=qX7txI9Cas](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=qX7txI9Cas)

Date: 06/04/2017  
Researcher: Vitor Blotta  
Media: Radio USP  
Theme: Violence against journalists

Date: 03/05/2017  
Researcher: Marcelo Nery  
Media: Rádio USP  
Theme: Evento Sesc - Violência Mídias e juventude  

Date: 25/04/2017  
Researcher: Vitor Blotta  
Media: Jornal Sào Remo  
Theme: fake news  

Date: 27/04/2017  
Researcher: Bruno Paes  
Media: Site Motherboard  
Theme: Dronepol - drones nas mãos da GCM SP  

Date: 10/05/2017  
Researcher: Bruno Paes  
Media: Site Instituto Millenium  
Theme: Violência contra profissionais de imprensa

Date: 10/05/2017  
Researcher: Marcelo Nery
Media: Jornal da USP
Theme: Políticas de segurança pública
Link: http://jornal.usp.br/radio-usp/radioagencia-usp/usp-analisa-debate-politicas-de-seguranca-publica/

Date: 05/05/2017
Researcher: André Zanetic
Media: Agência Brasil
Theme: Criminalização da Cracolândia

Date: 12/05/2017
Researcher: André Zanetic
Media: Revista Isto é
Theme: Cracolândia
Link: http://istoe.com.br/cracolandia-o-inferno-e-aqui/

Date: 18/05/2017
Researcher: André Zanetic
Media: Site Brasil de Fato
Theme: Agressão e racismo provocados por seguranças privados
Link: https://www.brasildefato.com.br/2017/05/sofrer-racismo-e-intimidacao-por-parte-de-seguranca-e-corriqueiro-dizem-jovens/

Date: 18/05/2017
Researcher: Bruno Paes
Media: TV Globo Fantástico
Theme: Tráfico de Drogas na fronteira de MS / Paraguai e Bolívia
Link: https://globoplay.globo.com/v/5948586/programa/

Date: 22/05/2017
Researcher: André Zanetic
Media: Jornal NEXO
Theme: Cracolândia

Date: 29/05/2017
Researcher: Bruno Paes
Media: Jornal Metro
Theme: Cracolândia

Date: 30/05/2017
Researcher: Bruno Paes
Media: Jornal da Globo
Theme: Crescimento dos homicídios no Brasil e a discussão sobre a diminuição no sudeste e aumento no norte e nordeste
Link: http://g1.globo.com/jornal-da-globo/noticia/2017/05/violencia-se-torna-epidemia-e-registra-recordes-annuais-de-mortes-no-brasil.html

Date: 09/06/17
Researcher: Bruno Paes
Media: Estadão
Theme: Atlas da Violência 2017
Link: https://www.facebook.com/metropoleestadao/videos/vb.20992265728043/1678508238856431/?type=2&theater

Date: 12/06/17
Researcher: Ariadne Natal
Media: Uol
Theme: Jovem teve a palavra “ladrão” tatuada na testa. Por que tantos apoiam esse ato?

Date: 13/06/17
Researcher: Ariadne Natal
Media: TVT
Theme: Jovem teve a palavra “ladrão” tatuada na testa. Por que tantos apoiam esse ato?

Date: 13/06/17
Researcher: Ariadne Natal
Media: El País
Theme: Jovem torturado com a palavra “ladrão” tatuada na testa.

Date: 14/06/17
Researcher: Renan Theodoro e Herbert Rodrigues
Media: TV Cultura Jornal da Cultura
Theme: Tortura e linchamento

Date: 14/06/17
Researcher: André Zanetic
Media: Jornal Gazeta do Povo
Theme: Pesquisa Pré Adolescentes

Date: 14/06/17
Researcher: Sérgio Adorno
Media: Rádio USP - Observatório do Terceiro Setor
Theme: Violência no Brasil

Date: 16/06/17  
Researcher: Ariadne Natal  
Media: TV Globo Fantástico  
Theme: Tortura e linchamento  
Link: https://globoplay.globo.com/v/5948508/progama/

Date: 21/06/17  
Researcher: Giane Silvestre  
Media: Rádio Justiça  
Theme: Presos Provisórios  
Link: http://www.radiojustica.jus.br/radiojustica/especiais/init.action?menuSistema=mn315

Date: 23/06/2017  
Researcher: Bruno Paes  
Media: Revista Rolling Stone

Theme: Violência no Brasil – jovens negros são as principais vítimas

Date: 23/06/2017  
Researcher: Herbert Rodrigues  
Media: TV Record – Domingo Espetacular  
Theme: Pedofilia – abuso cometidos por membros da igreja  

Date: 26/06/2017  
Researcher: Ariadne Natal  
Media: Canal Futura – Conexão Futura  
Theme: Reação à violência e tortura

Date: 27/06/2017  
Researcher: Sérgio Adorno  
Media: TV Cultura  
Theme: 80 anos de Wladimir Herzog, persistência da tortura e graves violações de direitos humanos.
APPENDIX 2.3. PARTICIPATION IN BOARDS, COMMISSIONS AND COMMITTEES

PARTICIPATION IN EDITORIAL BOARDS

Journal: Revista Liberdades
Researcher(s) involved: Maria Gorete Marques de Jesus
Date: 2015 - 2016
Web-site: http://www.revistaliberdades.org.br/site/home/home.php

PARTICIPATION IN COMMISSIONS AND COMMITTEES

PROGRAMA ESTADUAL DE PROTEÇÃO À VÍTIMAS E TESTEMUNHAS – PROVITA-SP (STATE PROGRAM FOR ASSISTANCE TO VICTIMS AND WITNESSES OF CRIMES)
Member: Renan Theodoro de Oliveira

VIOLENCE PREVENTION ALLIANCE - World Health Organization
Member: Renato Alves

COMISSÃO DE DIREITOS HUMANOS DO CONSELHO REGIONAL DE PSICOLOGIA DE SÃO PAULO (HUMAN RIGHTS COMMISSION OF REGIONAL BOARD OF PSYCHOLOGY OF SÃO PAULO)
Member: Renato Alves (2016-2017)

WHO COLLABORATING CENTRE FOR RESEARCH ON VIOLENCE PREVENTION
Head: Maria Fernanda Tourinho Peres

PARTICIPATION IN KNOWLEDGE TRANSFER EVENTS

Event: public consultancy
Host institution: State Prosecutor’s Office
Researcher: Vitor Blotta
Public: 100 people, amongst journalists, prosecutors and other members of civil society.
Date: September, 28, 2016
Venue: State Prosecutor’s Office Auditorium

Title of event/activity: Solenidade de Outorga da Medalha do Mérito Comunitário
Host Institution/publication: Diretoria de Polícia Comunitária e Direitos Humanos da Polícia Militar do Estado de São Paulo
Researcher(s) involved: Viviane de Oliveira Cubas
Public: 400 police officers
Date: September 30, 2016
Venue: Auditorium of Centro de Operações da Polícia Militar do Estado de São Paulo (COPOM) – São Paulo

Title of presentation: Building Democracy Daily: Human Rights, Violence and Institutional Trust Innovation Initiatives and Challenges
Event: BIN@SP Business Innovation Network São Paulo
Host Institution: University of São Paulo
Researchers Involved: Sergio Adorno, Vitor Blotta, Daniela Ramos
Public: 10 researchers/students from different countries
Date: November 7, 2016.
Venue: International Relations Office of the University of São Paulo

Title of event/activity: Solenidade de 8º Aniversário da Diretoria de Polícia Comunitária e Direitos Humanos da Polícia Militar de São Paulo
Host Institution/publication: Polícia Militar do Estado de São Paulo
Researcher(s) involved: Viviane de Oliveira Cubas
Public: 300 police officers
Date: November 28, 2016
Venue: Espaço Immensità – São Paulo

Event: Seminário Diálogos Públicos: Polícia Democrática e Direito à Segurança
Researcher(s) involved: André Zanetic (Organizer and Speaker)
Public: About 120 people, among parliamentarians, experts, members of social movements and students.
Date: December 1 to 2, 2016

Event: Meeting with NGO’s, research groups and human rights defenders with Amerigo Incalcaterra, Regional Representative of the OHCHR.
Host Institution/publication: Fundação Getúlio Vargas
Researcher(s) involved: Viviane de Oliveira Cubas, Renato Alves, Maria Gorete de Jesus
Public: research groups and human rights defenders
Date: June 01, 2017
Venue: Law School – Fundação Getúlio Vargas

OTHER EVENTS/EXTERNAL ACTIVITIES AND PUBLICATIONS

Title of event: At the age of 11, children do not doubt: the adult has the right to make rules
Host Institution/publication: Núcleo de Divulgação Científica da USP
Researcher(s) involved: Renan Theodoro de Oliveira
Public: social media in general
Date: May 25, 2017
Venue: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ptyHODoOpio&t=32s

Title of event: International Conference. Violence Prevention: From Scientific Excellence to Effective Practice
Host Institution: Safety and Violence Initiative (SaVi)/University of Cape Town
Researcher(s) involved: Renato Alves
Date: 8-9 September 2016
Venue: Cape Town – South Africa
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Research, Educational, Knowledge Transfer and Administrative Staff

3.1. Director of the Center and Research Coordinator

Sérgio Adorno. Professor of the University of São Paulo. PhD. Sociology, USP.

3.2. Principal Investigators

Principal Investigator and Vice-Director (2013-2016)

Nancy Cardia, Ph.D. Psychology, London School of Economics and Political Science.

Principal Investigator

Paulo Sérgio Pinheiro. Professor of the University of São Paulo. PhD. Political Science, Université Paris 1 Pantheon-Sorbonne.

Education and Technology Transfer Coordinator:

Vitor Blotta. Professor of the School of Communication and Arts, USP. Ph.D. Philosophy of Law, USP.

Dissemination Coordinator:

Daniela Osvald Ramos. Professor of the School of Communications and Arts, USP. PhD. Social Communications, USP.

3.3. NEV’s Research Associates

1. Camila Caldeira Nunes Dias. Ph.D. Sociology, USP. Professor of the Universidade Federal do ABC, SP
2. Caren Ruotti. Sociology, USP
3. Daniela Osvald Ramos, PhD. Social Communications, USP - Professor of the School of Communications and Arts, USP
4. Fernando Afonso Salla. Ph.D. Sociology, USP
5. Herbert Rodrigues. PhD Sociology, USP
7. Marcos César Alvarez. Ph.D. Sociology, USP. Professor of the Faculty of Philosophy, Literature and Language and Human Science, USP.
8. Maria Fernanda Tourinho Peres. Ph.D. Public Health, UFBA - Professor of the School of Medicine, USP
9. Maria Gorete Marques de Jesus. Sociology, USP
11. Vitor Blotta, Ph.D. Philosophy of Law, USP - Professor of the School of Communication and Arts, USP
3.4. Staff Researchers

Staff researchers - Post-Doc Fellow
1. André Zanetic, Ph.D. Political Science, USP
2. Bruna Gisi. Ph.D. Sociology, USP

Staff researchers - Ph.D Candidates
1. Ariadne Lima Natal. Sociology, USP
2. Frederico Castelo Branco Teixeira. Political Science, USP

Staff researchers - Master’s degree
1. Aline Morais Mizutani Gomes. Psychology, USP
2. Renan Theodoro de Oliveira, Sociology, USP
3. Thiago Rodrigues Oliveira, Sociology, USP

Staff researchers - Ms.Sc candidates
1. André Rodrigues de Oliveira, Geography, USP
2. Damião Cândido Medeiros Filho, Geography, USP

Staff Researchers - Graduates
1. Débora Piccirillo Barbosa da Veiga, Social Sciences, USP
2. Cecília Magalhães Penteado, History, USP
3. Clarice Lopes, Social Sciences, USP
4. Diego Correa, Social Sciences, USP
5. Isadora Aragão Rodrigues Pereira, History, USP

Staff Researchers - Undergraduate students
1. Clara Taneguti Pimentel Costa, Social Sciences, USP
2. Hegle Mariano Silva Pereira, Social Sciences, USP
3. Luisa Rocha Cardoso dos Santos, Geography, USP
4. Rafael Cardoso de Brito, Psychology, Mackenzie
5. Rafael de Castro Coelho Silva, Social Sciences, USP
6. Vitor José Bruzon Dallacqua, Social Sciences, USP

3.5. Student with Technical Scholarships

1. Daniella Pazmiño Terranova, Technical School Roberto Marinho, São Paulo

3.6. Technical and Administrative Support

1. Sergia Maria dos Santos. Administrative Manager
2. Emerson Fragoso da Silva. Administrative Assistant at the Center for the Study of Violence
3. Edmilson de Lima Araújo. Consultant for computers, servers and Date basis
4. Edmara Lucia de Souza Lima. Academic Secretary at the Center for the Study of Violence
5. Claudete Pires. Recepcionist
FORMER MEMBERS OF THE STAFF

Staff researchers - Undergraduate students
1. José Benigno Ribeiro Jr., Film and Audio-Visual Communication, Universidade Anhembi Morumbi (until Ago. 2016)
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Professor of Comparative Politics, Department of Political Science and director of the Kellogg Institute for International Studies, University of Notre Dame.
June 13, 2017

Dear Professor Adorno:

Thank you for including me on your international advisory board for your research project on “Building Democracy Daily: Human Rights, Violence and Institutional Trust.” I read the summary of the research project and learned much from the workshop discussion we had last week.

In addition to the comments I made last week, and thought it would be useful to summarize my reaction to the project.

Let me being by underscoring just how critical this research is. So much of the academic literature has focused on the formal attributes of democracy. While this is useful, it often misses what is to my mind a far more important task, namely understanding when and how a democracy can be deepened. Your project goes to the heart of this question. Not only does it explore the nature of “daily democracy” and the actual practices of citizenship, but it does so by exploring these questions at the interface of state-citizen relations. In this respect I should emphasize that I found your research design to be very innovative, focusing as it does on the police, judges and how young people are socialized into the principles of citizenship. One of the key theoretical claims that you are testing – the extent to which internal institutional practices shape institutional actors values – is especially important and key to understanding the dynamics of democratization.

I found the document very impressive in terms of the methodology laid out. The survey work is based on very rigorous sampling and impressive longitudinal data collection. I was also
impressed by how thoughtfully the team has adjusted the survey instrument to take current developments in Brazil into account.

But as rigorous as the statistical work is, I was even more taken by the qualitative work. As became clear from the workshop, your team had done an extraordinary job of gaining access to the police and in general finding its way into the institutions. In research projects on democracy the question of how institutions actually work is all too often taken for granted (including in much of the international literature your report refers to). That your project has instead chosen to problematize this issue is commendable and will significantly add to our understanding of democracy in Brazil.

Finally, I found the range of dissemination strategies that you have developed to be especially impressive. Your team has obviously worked extremely hard to engage with schools, the media and civil society. In its substantive focus and design, there is no doubt that this project can inform policy and public debates in incredibly important ways. As such, having an ambitious dissemination strategy is commendable.

NEV has a long and distinguished track record of making important scholarly contributions to public debates. I believe that this project in every way continues in that tradition. The substantive research outputs of the project will be of very broad interest to international scholars but also to the larger debate on deepening democracy. I hope the project receives continued funding.

Thank you for allowing me to participate in this project and I wish all the best.

Sincerely,

Patrick Heller

Lyn Crost Professor of Social Science
Professor Sergio Adorno  
Núcleo de Estudos sobre a Violência 
Universidade de São Paulo 

June 5, 2017  

Dear Professor Adorno:  

I write in my capacity as a member of your international advisory board, in response to your request for feedback on NEV’s document prepared for FAPESP, “Building Democracy Daily: Human Rights, Violence, and Institutional Trust.”  

NEV has a long and distinguished history as a leading interdisciplinary academic center dedicated to the study of violence and human rights, with an admirable effort to reach out to sectors of the state, civil society, and the media. It was one of the pioneering centers of its kind in the western hemisphere, and it remains one of the most important centers in our hemisphere dedicated to analyzing these issues. NEV began this work at a time when serious work on human rights and violence required courage, steadfastness, and great dedication.  

“Building Democracy Daily” has many commendable qualities. It would be easy and reasonable for a center of NEV’s tradition and prestige to continue working on the same issues that it did thirty years ago. The NEV made a great mark working on these issues, which remain important for the contemporary agenda of democracy and human rights. But instead, “Building Democracy Daily” shows that NEV has evolved in remarkable ways, taking on important new issues. One of the innovations of “Building Democracy Daily” is the attempt to study and work with the police. A generation ago, a dialogue between NEV and the police would have been unimaginable. A serious study of the police, involving a large number of unfettered interviews with police, would also have been impossible. Such a dialogue is possible today in part because of the work of NEV and similar organizations. I believe it is an excellent move.  

“Building Democracy Today” also shows innovation relative to its past in embracing contemporary statistical methods. Earlier work on violence and human rights used quantitative indicators, but little of it used sophisticated statistical methods. The combination of qualitative and quantitative methods, with well-designed surveys, is a good choice.
The combination of research, teaching, and dissemination is well conceived. The three main pillars of the new research agenda are promising and important. The network of Brazilian and international collaborations is impressive. At our meeting on June 2, the other international advisors and I praised your dissemination efforts.

I would also like to commend you for helping to form a new generation of scholars and activists working in this field.

Congratulations on NEV’s exceptional contributions over the last 30 years. On a personal note, I greatly admire the work you have done as a scholar, mentor, and institution builder over this time.

I wish you and your colleagues great success as you move forward.

Sincerely,

Scott Mainwaring

Scott Mainwaring
Jorge Paulo Lemann Professor for Brazil Studies
Harvard University
The title of the five-year research program in itself is an indication of the widespread extent and depth of the research that was conducted over the last five years at the University of Sao Paulo.

Substance

Concerning the substance of the issues, they all seem excellently chosen and challenging. The scientific approach to the legitimacy of key institutions in a country like Brazil is based on Tom Tyler’s approach who all along tried to understand why people obey the law. Are civil servants, policemen, judges behaving in a fair, just and impartial way? If not, why do people obey them? The results to this question allow international comparisons and the need to understand where divergences are located from one country to another.

Another related question is whether people will cooperate with institutions. In a country like mine, France, more and more people are disenchanted with institutions which do not meet expectations. The resentment results in populism, abstention or street demonstrations. Is the same trend observed in Brazil? Close to that question is the issue of rights. Do people feel that they have rights and that they are respected? The term people has to be deconstructed as the way the youngest, poorest, and most vulnerable categories are treated reveals the quality of a democracy. Longitudinal surveys and those focused on civil servants and on adolescents confronting violence bring answers to those questions. They raise intriguing paradoxes. Why is police abuse tolerated in Brazil?

Methodology

According to several variables --where and when and for whom--, the retained methodology to answer such important questions related to legitimacy and its variation is convincing. Quantitatively, the samples are large, established from 19,000 census units and
identifying eight patterns highly representative of the studied areas’ residents in the city of Sao Paulo. It is also relevant to have invited Jonathan Jackson, Ben Bradford and Justice Tankebe for their expertise in the elaboration of the theoretical and methodological framework of data collection instruments. They led to choose the most pertinent ones for this research. On the whole, a questionnaire made of 69 questions was tested allowing data from 1200 residents to be collected in two waves (2015 and 2017). Another wave is planned in 2018.

The aim of understanding why people obey a police widely seen as abusive was best tackled with a qualitative methodology which was reliable. It confirmed the deterrence theory. People obey the police for coercive reasons but that does not mean that they grant them legitimacy. This is an important finding.

Another good path consists in correlating the way the police are treated by their institution and hierarchy and the way they behave towards citizens. It is difficult for police officers to be fair when they are so frustrated and resentful with their poor working conditions and the lack of respect granted to their identity.

The research established a distinction between the civil and the military police in Brazil, the latter being feared more than the former.

A questionnaire of 99 closed questions and four open questions on the military police brings answers to important topics such as disciplinary proceedings carried out in the institution, the killings of police officers and proposals for reforms. Such topics allow comparisons with the situation in the United States where such issues are currently being debated. Would the reform of consent decree applied to delinquent police agencies in the US be efficient in Brazil? It would imply that an independent monitor checks whether reforms are implemented. If not, fines will be paid. How strong is the legal cynicism of police institutions in Brazil which are resisting reforms?

It is relevant to point out that some words do not carry the same weight according to national contexts. In the Brazilian case, police authority does not make sense. We would have the same confusion in France where authority refers more frequently to civil or political elites or to justice.

Another questionnaire was applied to the civil police to find out whether internal procedural justice is correlated with the self-legitimacy of police officers in Sao Paulo and over the state of Sao Paulo.
It was also relevant to interview judges with open-ended questions but we do not know what they were asked and what was found out.

Regarding the quantitative survey among adolescents, there again, the sampling process is impressive, meant to explore legal socialization via the experiences, languages and values of early adolescents born in 2005. This was not done previously in Brazil and experts from abroad were asked to participate in the research, helping to define seven thematic sets around legal socialization as well as victimization and exposure to violence. 112 schools and 800 students participated in the study. It appeared that the students obey the police for coercitive reasons and not so much so when their parents or their teachers ask them to do so. If they have a model behavior of fairness at home, they tend to reproduce it. This is less the case in poor households.

**Dissemination**

The dissemination of results has been carefully planned and leads to practical interventions, which is good. New agreements and informal collaborations have been established with institutions, NGOs, media outlets and schools, for instance. Such networks and contacts hopefully will contribute to prevent, control and reduce violence levels in Brazil.

**NEV researchers**

The NEV researchers’ background is impressive and so is their outreach. No doubt the digital application on violence developed by NEV and the sharing of data and analyses will support the goal of transferring knowledge to civil society and to public institutions. It will be essential to find out what action follows after knowledge is transferred. What leverage researchers have to make sure that their reports do not remain in a drawer as it is so often the case in France...

It is excellent for NEV to have established links and partnerships with different institutions within or outside the University of Sao Paulo, thus nurturing dialogues and innovation. This point is particularly strong in the sector of education and the involvement of NEV researchers in the Human Rights Observatories in Schools, allows to establish paths towards future adult citizens.

**Publications**
Several publications are work in progress and no doubt, there will be great interest when they are released by good journals such as the *Law and Society* one. In particular, the question of who supports the police and why abuse of force is accepted if there is no identification with the author of a crime will reveal what is singular about Brazil due to its history and what can be compared with other backgrounds.

**Conclusion**

The work conducted in the last five years is excellent and we are pleased to hear that a new five-year contract allows this research to be pursued. Hopefully, international comparisons will show how singular and similar the experience of Sao Paulo is in building democracy with a focus on human rights, violence and institutional trust.

_Sophie Body-Gendrot_
## APPENDIX 5. RESEARCH TOOLS

### SECOND WAVE QUESTIONNAIRES

### APPENDIX 5.1. THE LONGITUDINAL PANEL WITH RESIDENTS IN SÃO PAULO

#### SET 1. NEIGHBORHOOD

**P03**) Since you moved to this neighborhood, would you say TODAY this area is:
- ( ) a better place to live, or
- ( ) a worse place to live
- ( ) no changes; it was always good
- ( ) Don’t know
- ( ) no changes; it was always bad
- ( ) No answer

**P04**) When you think about the streets, squares and parks in your neighborhood how much you would say that:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A lot</th>
<th>A little</th>
<th>None</th>
<th>Does not apply</th>
<th>DK</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A) People are proud of such spaces?</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B) Residents care for such spaces</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C) Local authorities care for such spaces?</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**P05**) If you could choose, would you continue to live in the same neighborhood or would you move out?
- ( ) continue to live here
- ( ) Don’t know
- ( ) move out
- ( ) No answer

**P06**) Which services exist in your neighborhood? (show the list)
**P06A** *(if the service exists)* Considering the quality and quantity of each service in your neighborhood how satisfied are you?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternate</th>
<th>P06) Exist / Does not exist</th>
<th>P06A) ...how satisfied are you ......</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(B) Places for leisure</td>
<td>( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )</td>
<td>( ) ( )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Alternate Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternate</th>
<th>P06) Exist / Does not exist</th>
<th>P06A) ...how satisfied are you ......</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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Now we would like you to evaluate some things about your neighborhood:

P07) Thinking about the conditions of your NEIGHBORHOOD today, in general, how often would you say there is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Very Often</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>DK</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A) Graffiti on the walls / houses</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B) Trash or waste thrown on the pavement/streets/vacant lots and streams</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C) Very loud music during the night</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D) Abandoned cars</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E) Illegal drugs use in public areas</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SET 2. LOCAL ADMINISTRATION

P08A) Since our last interview, did you go to the City Hall or the local administration to request some service or information?
1( ) Yes
2( ) No
8( ) Don’t know
9( ) No answer

P08B) Why did you ever go to the City Hall or the local administration to request some service or information?
01( ) Request a building permit
02( ) Request a permit to carry out a renovation
03( ) Request a document that confirms that the building can be occupied. (building has followed the plans approved by the Municipality)
04( ) Permit to operate a business/service
05( ) To solve problems with Municipal taxes: services or real state taxes.
06( ) Request infrastructural repairs/reform (against floods)
07( ) Social Services provision- Family/Support grant
97( ) Other, please specify __________
**P08C) Considering this contact with the Municipal Hall or the local administration: how satisfied were you with the contact:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>...you were:</th>
<th>Very satisfied</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Not satisfied</th>
<th>Not at all satisfied</th>
<th>Neither satisfied or dissatisfied (spont.)</th>
<th>DK</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A) The way you were treated</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B) The attention paid to the information you provided them</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C) The information they provided about the measures they would take</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D) The solution given to the problem/request you presented</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**P08D) Considering how the Municipality dealt with your request would you say that the civil servants from the Municipality or local administration acted according with the law or did not act according with the law?**

1( ) Yes, it did  
2( ) No, it did not  
8( ) Don’t know  
9( ) No answer

**P09A) Were you called or summoned by the Municipality since our last interview?**

1( ) Yes  
2( ) No  
8( ) Don’t know  
9( ) No answer

**P09B) Why were you called or summoned by the Municipality or the local administration?**

01( ) Need to build/reform a fence.  
02( ) Reform pavement.  
03( ) Garbage was placed outside the property to be picked up before the established hour.  
04( ) Violation of some zoning law.  
05( ) Building or reform without authorization  
06( ) Pay taxes  
07( ) Need to move out because of threat of landslide  
08( ) Social Services provision- Family/Support grant  
97( ) Other (Please specify): _________________________  
98( ) Don’t know  
99( ) No answer
P09C) Considering this contact with the Municipal Hall or the local administration when your called or summoned, how satisfied were you with the contact:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>...you were:</th>
<th>Very satisfied</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>not satisfied</th>
<th>Not at all satisfied</th>
<th>Neither satisfied or dissatisfied (spont.)</th>
<th>Does not apply</th>
<th>DK</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A) The way you were treated</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B) The attention paid to the information you</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C) The information they provided about the measures they would take</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D) The solution given to the problem/request you presented</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

P09D) Considering how the Municipality dealt with this summons, would you say that the civil servants from the Municipality or local administration acted according with the law or did not act according with the law?

1( ) Yes, it did
2( ) No, it did not
8( ) Don’t know
9( ) No answer

Changing the subject a little...

P10) Could you please tell me how much you trust or do not trust the municipal workers of the City of São Paulo?

If he/she says trust: “Trust a lot, Trust, or Trust just a little?

1( ) Trusts a lot
2( ) Trust
3( ) Trusts just a little
4( ) Does not trust
8( ) Don’t know
9( ) No answer

SET 3. SOCIAL CAPITAL

P11. In general, how well do you know your neighbors:

( ) Don’t know them
( ) only know by sight
( ) talk, but are not friends
( ) know them and are friends

( ) Don’t know
( ) No answer

P12) In general based on your contacts, how much would you say that your neighbors respect the laws: would you say that they respect the laws the same way you do?

1( ) Yes
2( ) No
8( ) Don’t know
P13) I am going to describe some situations and would like you to tell me, in your opinion if your neighbors would try, or not try, to prevent such things from happening:
For a Yes or for a No answer read: definitely or probably?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>... and your neighbors would try or would not try to prevent:</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A) That a child is severely beaten by the parents</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B) That children or youth graffitti a building</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C) That elderly people be assaulted</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D) That policemen beat up and insult youth</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

P14) How often do you:
Scale: Always; Often; Sometimes; Rarely; Never
(A) attend neighborhood meetings to discuss community problems
(B) attend meetings involving local officials (municipal civil servants) to discuss community problems
(C) participate in local associations and councils.

## Only in case of answers: “rarely” and “never”.

P14A) Why you do not attend/participate?
( ) have no time
( ) not interested
( ) have no information
( ) do not see any result
( ) there is no such meeting/activity
( ) Other, please specify __________
( ) Don’t know
( ) No answer

P15) Since our last interview, have you:
[Scale: Yes; not; Don’t know; No answer]
(A) participated in a protest or demonstration
(B) signed a petition

Changing again the subject...

P16) Could you tell me how much you trust or do not trust:
If he/she trusts read: “Trusts a lot, Trusts, or Trusts just a little?”
[Scale : “Trust a lot, Trust, or Trust just a little, Does not trust , Does not apply]
(A) ordinary people in general
(B) family members
(C) your friends
(D) your neighbors
(E) your co-workers / schoolmates
(F) unknown persons
( ) Does not apply ( ) Don’t know ( ) No answer

P17) I am going to describe to you a few situations and whether they have ever happened to you. Please, tell me what are the chances that you will
[Scales: Very high; Not so high; Low; Very low]
(A) ask for information from a stranger on the street
(B) ask someone to watch your belongings for a few minutes
(C) lend your mobile phone to a stranger
( ) do not know ( ) did not answer

SET 5. FEAR AND ATTITUDES TOWARDS VIOLENCE

P18) In your opinion, since our last interview, violence in your neighborhood:
(1) increased a lot
(2) increased a little
(3) remained the same
(4) decreased a little
(5) decreased a lot
( ) Don’t know / Does not apply
( ) No answer

P19) How often do you feel safe while walking through your neighborhood:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Very Often</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Does not apply</th>
<th>DK</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A) During the day</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B) During the night</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

P20) Now, thinking about your daily life. Would you please tell us how much you worry about
[Scales: Worry a lot, Worry a little, Not worried at all, DK, NA]
(A) someone stealing from your house when it is empty
(B) someone breaking into your house with your family in it
(C) being robbed on the street
(D) suffering “quicknapping” (sequestro relâmpago)
(E) being victim of sexual violence
(F) having a close relative murdered

P21) The fear of violence may lead people to change some daily life habits. Have you done any of these moves because of violence fear?
[Scale: Yes; not, DK, NA]
(A) avoid walking on foot
(B) cease to circulate for some neighborhoods or streets
(C) avoid going out at night
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(D) avoid carrying money
(E) bought a gun
(G) Did you leave the house carrying some object to protect yourself (such as knife, pepper spray or teaser shock)?

P21A) In general do you feel safer after changing your daily habits?
1( ) Yes 8( ) Don’t know
2( ) No 9( ) No answer

P22) Is it right or wrong if people use violence to:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Right</th>
<th>Wrong</th>
<th>Neither right nor wrong (ESP.)</th>
<th>DK</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A) to defend him/herself from an assault in the street?</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B) to defend him/herself from a robber that entered her/his house/</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C) to solve a dispute with neighbors?</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D) to punish someone if the authorities fail?</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E) to revenge for injuries to a relative?</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F) to protest against things considered unjust?</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SET 6. COMPLY WITH THE LAW

P23) I am going to read to you a series of phrases and would like you to tell whether you feel this happens and if so, how often:

In case of a YES answer read: “Always, Very Often, Sometimes, Rarely”?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>DK</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Always</td>
<td>Very Often</td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>Rarely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A) You feel that the laws protect you?</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B) That laws attend to the interests of the most powerful people?</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C) That laws represent your opinion of what is right?</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E) That what the law considers express what people think?</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
P24) Talking about the laws, do you think that they must be obeyed, even if you do not agree with them?  
Scales: Yes; No; Don’t know; No answer.

P24a) Why do you think you should/should not obey the laws?

---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

P24B) I will read some sentences and would like you to tell me whether you agree or disagree with them:  
Scales: Strongly agree, Agree, Neither agree nor disagree, Disagree, Strongly disagree.  
(A) People must obey laws even if they do not agree with them  
(B) Laws must be obeyed in any situation  
(C) Sometimes you have to disregard the laws to get things right  
(D) People like you have no choice but to obey the law

P25) I will describe a series of situations and I would like you to tell me if you ever have done any of these things in your life:  
Scale: Yes; No, Don’t know; No answer.  
(B) Buy counterfeit goods  
(C) Use cable TV signal without paying for it  
(D) Bought goods without a receipt, to pay less  
(E) Paid for a private doctor or a private dentist without a receipt  
(F) Take a product from a store without paying for it  
(G) Disrespect parking spaces or preferential seats for the elderly or disabled people

P25A) Now, in your opinion how right or wrong do you think it is that people in general :  
Scale: Yes; No, Don’t know; No answer.  
(B) Buy counterfeit goods  
(C) Use cable TV signal without paying for it  
(D) Buy goods without a receipt to pay less  
(E) Pay for a private doctor or a private dentist without a receipt?  
(F) Take a product from a store without paying for it  
(G) Disrespect parking spaces or preferential seats for the elderly or disabled people

P25B) I am going to read to you a number of situations and would like you to tell me if you believe that you would be caught by the police or some authority if you took any of these actions.  
Scale: Always be caught, almost always, sometimes, rarely or never  
(B) Buy counterfeit goods  
(C) Use cable TV signal without paying for it  
(D) Buy goods without a receipt to pay less  
(E) Pay for a private doctor or a private dentist without a receipt  
(F) Take a product from a store without paying for it  
(G) Disrespect parking spaces or preferential seats for the elderly or disabled people
SET 7. VICTIMIZATION

P26) Now, I will describe some situations that may happen to people. Please tell me if any these situations have ever happened to you since our last interview.
   (A) has anyone threatened you with a knife
   (B) has anyone threatened you with a fire gun
   (C) have you suffered some physical assault (punch, kick, etc.)
   (D) have you been assaulted by a police officer
   (E) have you been verbally offended by a police officer
   (F) have you ever been injured by a knife
   (G) have you ever been injured by a fire gun
   (H) have you ever been threatened with death
   (I) have you ever suffered “quicknapping” (sequestro relâmpago)
   (J) do you have any relative/friend who was murdered
   (K) have you ever suffered sexual violence
   (L) have you ever heard fire gun shots
   (M) have you ever seen a murdered person on the street

P26B) Have you ever been a victim of a theft?
Scale: Yes; No, Don’t know; No answer.

## Only for those who report been victim of a theft in P26B.

P26C) Has this theft happened since our last interview?
Scale: Yes; No, Don’t know; No answer.

SET 8. POLICE

P28) Since our last interview, have you called, or contact, to the police in the State of São Paulo?
Scales: Yes; No; Don’t know/do not remember; No answer.

P28A) For what type of assistance?
   (1) to make a report
   (2) to report a crime
   (3) to inform a witnessed crime
   (4) to inform an accident or medical emergency
   (5) to ask for information
   (6) Other, please specify __________
   ( ) Don’t know   ( ) No answer

P28B) Thinking about the last time you contacted the police in the State of São Paulo, how did you make this contact?
   (1) by phone
   (2) talked to a policeman on the street
   (3) went to police station
   (4) through the Internet
   (5) through other ways
   ( ) Don’t know / do not remember   ( ) No answer

P28C) Still considering the last time you contacted the police in the state of São Paulo: how satisfied were you with:
Scales: Very satisfied, Satisfied, Slightly satisfied, Not at all satisfied
   (A) speed to respond
(B) how you were treated  
(C) attention paid to the information you provided  
(D) how well they explained what they would do  
(E) solution given to your problem  
( ) Does not apply  
( ) Do not know  
( ) Did not answer

P28D) Considering how police officers conducted the case, would you say that they acted according to the law or that they did not act according to the law?
1 ( ) Yes, they did  
2 ( ) No, they did not  
8 ( ) Don’t know  
9 ( ) No answer

P31) Since our last interview, in the State of São Paulo, how many times have you been stopped by the police?

P31B) And this happened  
Scales: Yes; No; Don’t know/do not remember; No answer.  
(A) when you were in a car  
(B) when you were on a motorcycle  
(C) when you were walking on the street  
(D) Other, please specify __________

###Only for those who were stopped by the police ###

P31A) The last time that you were stopped by the police in the State of São Paulo, the policemen explained clearly why you were being searched:  
Scales: Yes; No; Don’t know/do not remember; No answer.  
(A) Did they point a gun at you?  
(B) Do you think the police treated you as they would treat anyone else?  
(C) Did you feel threatened during the approach?  
(D) Did the cops address you as if you were a criminal?

P31B) Still considering this last time you were stopped by the police in the state of São Paulo how satisfied/dissatisfied were you with:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very satisfied</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Not satisfied</th>
<th>Not at all satisfied</th>
<th>Neither satisfied or dissatisfied (spont.)</th>
<th>DK</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A) How you were treated</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B) attention paid to the</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>information you provided</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C) The explanation of why they</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>approached you</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D) The way they spoke to you</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

P33) Now, considering the police in your neighborhood:
Scale: Always, Very Often, Sometimes, Rarely, Never
(A) treat all people, rich or poor, black or white, equally
(B) explain clearly why it pulls over or arrests someone
(C) Make impartial and just decisions
(D) Pay attention to the information that people provide them with
(E) recognize and correct their own mistakes
(F) treat people with respect
(H) guarantee your safety

P33A) Now I would like you to tell me if, in general, the police in your neighborhood:

Scale: Always, Very Often, Sometimes, Rarely, Never
(A) act according to what you believe is right
(B) Has the same expectations you have about your community
(C) Defends values that are important to a person like you

P34) Do you think you should obey the police even when you believe they are wrong?
Scale: Yes; No; Don’t know; No answer

P35) Why do you think you should/should not obey the police even when you believe they are wrong?
( ) Don’t know ( ) No answer

P36A) I would like you to tell me whether you agree or disagree with each of the sentences below:

Scales: Strongly agree, Agree, Neither agree nor disagree, Disagree, Strongly disagree.
(A) It is your duty to do what the police say, even if you do not understand or agree with their reasons.
(B) It is your duty to do what the police say, even when you do not like the way you are treated by the police.
(C) You only obey the police due fear

P37) In a hypothetical situation: should you witness a robbery at gun point while walking around you neighborhood, how likely it is that you would:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>DK</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...you would..</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A) Call the police?</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B) Tell the police everything you saw?</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C) Offer to help identify the robber?</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

P38A) I'm going to present some situations and I'd like you to tell me what you think of the police action in each one of them. READ THE SCENARIO. Considering the situation and its outcome, you would say that the police action was:

Scales: Terrible; Bad; Neither good nor bad; Good; Excellent
(A) Officers are called after a motorcycle is robbed. Thieves are identified and officers start chasing one of them. The guy tries to hide on a dark alley, but gets captured by the policemen who handcuffs him. By radio, the officers find out the guy was already a justice fugitive who was condemned by drug trafficking. Officers then release the guy, tell him to run away, and then shoot against him. The guys dies right away.
(B) During a demonstration with thousands of people demanding improvements in the city, some participants break mirrors and throw litter cans on fire. The police, who was watching the demonstration, intervenes
macing all protesters. In the middle of the smoke, protesters start running and a young woman is hit by a rubber bullet in the eye, this losing her visions forever.

(C) Officers catch in the action and arrest a man accused of being a drug dealer. Before taking him to the station, they decide to go to his place with no warrants to look for more evidences. At the man’s place, officers torture him so that he would tell them where he keeps the rest of the drugs and give his partners’ names.

P41) Considering the police officers in your neighborhood, how often:

Scale: Always, Very Often, Sometimes, Rarely, Never

(A) Do people feel afraid of the police
(B) Are you afraid of the police?
(C) Do you feel that the police can be aggressive towards you?

P46) How do you rate the work being done by the police in your neighborhood:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>They are doing ..........job.</th>
<th>Very good</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Bad</th>
<th>Very bad</th>
<th>Neither good nor bad (spont.)</th>
<th>They are doing nothing</th>
<th>Does not apply</th>
<th>DK</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A) Reducing drug trades</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B) Reducing armed robbery</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C) Responding to emergency calls (190)</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D) Police Station services</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E) Criminal investigation</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F) Marches and protests</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G) Keeping neighborhood safe</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

P47) Thinking about the police in your neighborhood, how often would you say that policemen there:

Scale: Always; Almost always; Sometimes; Rarely; Never; Don’t know; No answer.

(A) Accept bribes
(B) Protect drug dealers
(C) Act as if above the law
(D) Intimidate and hassle people
(E) The police in your neighborhood are honest

P48) Could you please tell me how much you trust or do not trust police in the state of São Paulo?

If he/she says trust: "Trust a lot, Trust, or Trust just a little?"

1( ) Trusts a lot
2( ) Trust
3( ) Trusts just a little
4( ) Does not trust
5( ) Don’t know
6( ) No answer

P48B) Thinking about your personal experience with the police, considering what you know or have heard:

Scale: Always; Almost always; Sometimes; Rarely; Never; Don’t know; No answer.

A) Would you say that the police will always act in the best way possible?
C) Do you believe that the São Paulo police deserve your respect?
E) Do you feel that you should support the São Paulo police?

SET 9. JUSTICE

P49) Thinking about justice system in Brazil in general, how often would you say that:
Scale: Always; Often; Sometimes; Rarely; Never; etc.
(A) It is easy to go to court?
(B) The trials are rapidly judged
(D) The criminals are punished

P50) Considering how the justice system works, how often would you say that:
Scale: Always; Often; Sometimes; Rarely; Never.
(A) That courts hear all sides before reaching a decision
(B) That courts treat everyone with dignity and respect
(C) The courts secures only the interests of the rich and powerful
(D) The Courts decisions are fair

P51) Suppose that you have witnessed a crime in your neighborhood, would you:
(A) Volunteer to testify in court
(B) Tell the judge everything you saw
(C) Identify the accused of the crime

P52) Since our last interview, have you gone to court on some demand?
( ) Yes
( ) Not
( ) Don’t know ( ) No answer

P52A) Considering THIS experience, how satisfied were you with:
Scale: Very satisfied; Satisfied; Not satisfied; Not all satisfied; Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied, Don’t know; No answer.
(A) The treatment received
(B) The attention given to your point of view
(C) The explanation about how the process would continue
(D) The outcome – the decision reached by the court
(E) The time spent
(F) The costs
( ) Does not apply ( ) Don’t know ( ) No answer

P53) Since the last interview, have you been called to court?
( ) Yes
( ) Yes, to be part of a jury
( ) No
( ) Don’t know ( ) No answer

P53A) Why you were called?
(01) witness / testimony
(02) prosecuted
(03) being part of process
( ) Other, please specify ___________
P53B) Considering this experience with courts, how satisfied were you with:
Scale: Very satisfied; Satisfied; Not satisfied; Not all satisfied; Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied (spont); Don’t know; No answer.
(A) the treatment received
(B) the attention given to your point of view
(C) the explanation about how the process would continue
(D) the outcome – the decision reached by the court
(E) the time spent
(F) the costs
( ) Does not apply   ( ) Don’t know   ( ) No answer

P54) Do you think you should obey the court decisions, even when you believe they are wrong?
( ) Yes
( ) No
( ) Don’t know   ( ) No answer

54A) And for which reason do you think (you should/should not obey) the court decisions even when you believe they are wrong?

( ) Don’t know   ( ) No answer

P54B) I would like you to tell me whether you agree or disagree with each of the sentences below:
Scales: Strongly agree, Agree, Neither agree nor disagree, Disagree, Strongly disagree.
(A) It is your duty to do what the court decides, even if you do not understand or agree with these reasons.
(B) It is your duty to do what the courts decides, even when you do not like the way they treated you.
(C) You only obey justice due fear of consequences.

P55) Could you please tell me how much you trust or do not trust justice in Brazil?
If he/she says trust: “Trust a lot, Trust, or Trust just a little?”
1( ) Trusts a lot
2( ) Trust
3( ) Trusts just a little, or
4( ) Does not trust
8( ) Don’t know
9( ) No answer

SET 10. POLITICAL AND INSTITUTIONAL TRUST

P56) Which of these statements do you agree most?
(1) democracy is the best form of government
(2) a dictatorship is the best form of government
(3) democracy or dictatorship: it does not really matter
( ) Don’t know
( ) No answer

P56B) I would like you to tell me whether you agree or disagree with each of the sentences below:
Scales: Strongly agree, Agree, Neither agree nor disagree, Disagree, Strongly disagree.
(A) Democracy can have its problems, but it is the best system of government
(B) In a democracy the government, seeks the well-being of the people
(C) Democracy creates conditions so that people can thrive by their own efforts.

P57) In general, how satisfied are you with democracy in Brazil?
   (1) very satisfied
   (2) satisfied
   (3) neither satisfied nor unsatisfied
   (4) not satisfied
   (5) not satisfied at all
   ( ) Don’t know
   ( ) No answer

P58) Can you tell me how often do you feel that:
   Scale: Always; Often; Sometimes; Rarely; Never.
   (A) Civil servants really care about their work and their responsibilities
   (B) Those in power work for the common good
   (C) Government uses tax money correctly

P59A) I would like you to tell me whether you agree or disagree with each of the sentences below:
   Scales: Strongly agree, Agree, Neither agree nor disagree, Disagree, Strongly disagree.
   (A) One of the main sources of corruption is the great quantity of taxes.
   (B) Abandoned buildings can be broken in by homeless people.
   (C) In a country such as Brazil, it is the government duty to decrease the gap between the very poor and the very rich ones.
   (D) Gay couples should have the right to adopt children.
   (E) Programmes such as the Bolsa Família make people accommodate and no longer want to work.
   (F) It is fair that people pay taxes to provide for prisoners.

P60A) Imagine a scale from 0 to 10, where the "0" is the poorest people and the "10" are the richest people in the city of São Paulo. Where would you locate yourself?

0       1      2      3      4      5      6     7     8     9      10

P60B) What situation are you in?
   1. Family income meets all needs without difficulties, and can even save money.
   2. Family income meets all needs, but with difficulty.
   3. The family income supplies part of the needs, only the essential
   4. Family income does not meet needs.

P60C) How often do you feel that:
   Scale: Always; Often; Sometimes; Rarely; Never.
   (A) You are happy with what you have and what you have achieved
   (B) Can solve most of your problems
   (C) Your quality of life is better than that of your parents.
   (D) You feel recognized for your dedication

SET 11. SOCIAL AND DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILE

P59) I will now ask a question use by the Census Bureau about colour or race. Your colour or race is:
   1( ) White
   2( ) Black
   3( ) Mulato

222
4( ) Yellow
5( ) Native Brazilian
9( ) None of the above

**P61) Occupation:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Working</th>
<th>Not working</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Formally employed</td>
<td>5 Unemployed- looking for a job</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Informally employed</td>
<td>6 Retired</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Self-employed</td>
<td>7 Housewife</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Civil servant</td>
<td>8 Others (studying, on health insurance, etc.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9( ) No answer

**P63) Are there one or two heads of family in this house?**

1( ) One
2( ) More than one
9( ) No answer

**P64A) REND1) what was your personal income last month?**

**P65) REND2) What was the total Family income last month?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>REND 1) Personal Income</th>
<th>REND 2) Family income</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - MAIS DE R$ 17.600,01 / Mais de 20 SM</td>
<td>1 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - MAIS DE R$ 8.880,01 ATÉ R$ 17.600,00/ Mais de 10 a 20 SM</td>
<td>2 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - MAIS DE R$ 4.400,01 ATÉ R$ 8.880,00/ Mais de 5 a 10 SM</td>
<td>3 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - MAIS DE R$ 1.760,01 ATÉ R$ 4.400,00/ Mais de 2 a 5 SM</td>
<td>4 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - MAIS DE R$ 888,01 ATÉ R$ 1.760,00/ Mais de 1 a 2 SM</td>
<td>5 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - ATÉ R$ 888,00/ Até 1 salário mínimo</td>
<td>6 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 - Não tem rendimento pessoal</td>
<td>8 /////</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 - No answer</td>
<td>9 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**P66) Is this house:**

1( ) Owned by the family, all paid for but no documents,
2( ) Owned by the family, all paid for and all documents
3( ) Owned by the family, still paying for it,
4( ) Rented,
5( ) Borrowed (by employer, relative, or else)
6( ) Others () ____________________________
98( ) Don’t know
99( ) No answer

**P67) How many rooms in the house (total number including kitchen, bathroom etc.)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ROOMS</th>
<th>98 – Don’t know</th>
<th>99 – No answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Social Economic rating**

CE1) Now some questions about household goods
**In this house there is....**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Does not have</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4 or +</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bathrooms? (include all). How many?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maids or others working five days a week. How many?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cars. How many?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Microcomputers, including PCs, laptop and netbook. How many?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dishwasher</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refrigerator. How many?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freezer. How many?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washing machine. How many?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DVD player. How many?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Microwave. How many??</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motorcycles. How many?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dryer. How many?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C2) Water source:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SCORE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A) Public network</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B) Spring or well</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C) Other means</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C3) Considering your street block would you say that this block is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SCORE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A) Paved</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B) Earth road / Gravel</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C4) What is the highest educational level of the head of the family.

1 ( ) Illiterate/ Incomplete primary school
2 ( ) Primary complete / Middle school incomplete
3 ( ) Middle school complete / High School incomplete
4 ( ) High School complete / College incomplete
5 ( ) College complete

P69) What is your religion?

01( ) Roman Catholic
02( ) Assembleia de Deus
03 ( ) Baptist / Methodist / Presbyterian
04( ) Universal do Reino de Deus
05( ) Deus é Amor
06( ) Evangelho Quadrangular
07( ) Igreja Internacional da Graça
08( ) Renascer em Cristo
09( ) Sara Nossa Terra
10 ( ) Other Evangelical
11 ( ) Evangelical - Do not know
12 ( ) Adventist
13 ( ) Jehovah’s Witness
14 ( ) Judaism
15(  ) Spiritualism / Kardecist
16(  ) Afro-Brazilian religions (Umbanda, Candomblé, etc.)
17(  ) Eastern religions (Buddhism, Islam, etc.)
18(  ) Congregação Cristã do Brasil
19(  ) Other religions
20(  ) I am religious but do not practice any religion/Agnostic
21(  ) Atheist, no religion
99(  ) No answer

###Only for those practicing a religion:

**P69A) How important is your religion to you, when you make decisions in your daily life?**

1(  ) Very Important
2(  ) Important
3(  ) Indifferent *(SPONT.)*
4(  ) Not important
5(  ) Not important at all.
APPENDIX 5.2. THE EARLY ADOLESCENTS LEGAL SOCIALIZATION

| NEV/USP | IBOPE | | | |
|----------|-------|---|---|
| SÃO PAULO | 800 INTERVIEWS | 2017 |

SCHOOL NAME:

SCHOOL TYPE: 1( ) Private 2( ) State 3( ) City

PARENTS NAME:  PARENTS NAME:

INTERVIEWEE NAME:  PHONE 1: ( )

PHONE 2: ( )

ADDRESS

PHONE 3: ( )

CEL PHONE: ( )

CITY:  NEIGHBORHOOD:  ZIP: |_|_|_|_|-|_|_|_|

Email:

SEX

Birthday

Male 1 D M Y

Female 2 | | | | | | | |

1. Are you in the 7th grade?
1( ) 6th
2( ) 7th

2. Are you still studying at the school [NAME OF THE SCHOOL]?
1 ( ) Yes
2 ( ) No (Ask for the name and the type of the current school)
98 ( ) Don’t know
99 ( ) No answer

3. Do you still have __ siblings?
1 ( ) Yes
2 ( ) No [Ask 3B]

3B. How many? ___

3C. How many siblings live with you? ___
97 ( ) Don’t have siblings
98 ( ) Don’t know
99 ( ) No answer

FAMILY

4. [Parents involvement] I will describe some situations, please tell me how often they happen to you:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Almost never</th>
<th>Almost always</th>
<th>Always</th>
<th>DN</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Support you for all the things you do?</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Praise you when you make a good job?</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Demand you doing well at school?</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Follow your studies (go to school meetings, and help you doing homework)?</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Do fun activities with you?</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Want to know who your friends are?</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. [Rules] Please, tell me about the rules at your home:

**5A.** Do you agree that your parents have the right to make this rule? (Totally disagree, disagree, agree, totally agree)

For those who answered “yes” to 5:

**5B.** How often do you obey this rule: never, almost never, almost always, always?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6. At your home, do your parents...</th>
<th>6A. Do you agree that your parents have the right to make this rule?</th>
<th>6B. How often do you obey this rule?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Demand you to clean and organize your bedroom?</td>
<td>(   ) (   )</td>
<td>(   ) (   )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Control your curfew, sleep schedule, homework, and usage of the computer/tv/cell phone?</td>
<td>(   ) (   )</td>
<td>(   ) (   )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Control the music you hear, video games you play, and what you watch on the TV/internet?</td>
<td>(   ) (   )</td>
<td>(   ) (   )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Forbid you to fight with your siblings?</td>
<td>(   ) (   )</td>
<td>(   ) (   )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Forbid you to play in the street?</td>
<td>(   ) (   )</td>
<td>(   ) (   )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Demand you always tell the truth?</td>
<td>(   ) (   )</td>
<td>(   ) (   )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Forbid you to say cuss words?</td>
<td>(   ) (   )</td>
<td>(   ) (   )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h) Forbid you to date?</td>
<td>(   ) (   )</td>
<td>(   ) (   )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) Forbid you to drink or smoke?</td>
<td>(   ) (   )</td>
<td>(   ) (   )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j) Control who you hang out with?</td>
<td>(   ) (   )</td>
<td>(   ) (   )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k) Demand you do study and do your homework?</td>
<td>(   ) (   )</td>
<td>(   ) (   )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l) Determine what you can and what you cannot eat?</td>
<td>(   ) (   )</td>
<td>(   ) (   )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7. [Obedience] When you do not obey any of these rules, how often do your parents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7. How often do your parents...</th>
<th>7A. Do you agree that your parents do this?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Never</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Reprimand you?</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Shout / verbally offend you?</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Punish you? (prohibit use of computer / phone / TV / video game)</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Prohibit you to leave the house / play with friends?</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Beat you up</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Threaten to beat you up or to punish you?</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Talk to you about what happened?</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. [Procedural justice] If your parents find out you did something wrong, they would:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Almost never</th>
<th>Almost always</th>
<th>Always</th>
<th>DK</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Give you the opportunity to express your story side?</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Explain why they are reprimanding you?</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Listen to all sides of the story before making any decision?</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Talk to you politely?</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. [Legitimacy] Still about your parents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Totally disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Totally agree</th>
<th>DK</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Do you agree your parents have the right to do the rules?</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Do you must obey your parents even if you do not agree with their decisions?</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Do you think your parents act according to what you believe is right or wrong?</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Do you trust your parents make the right decisions for you?</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Do you think your family works better when you listen to your parents?</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Do you agree that sometimes it is not a problem to ignore what your parents say?</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**10. [Home victimization]** Please, tell me if any of these situations have happened in your house: (If yes, it happened once, few times or many times?)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Since the last time we interviewed you...</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Have you seen fights and arguments between adults in your family/home?</td>
<td>Once</td>
<td>Few</td>
<td>Many</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(   )</td>
<td>(   )</td>
<td>(   )</td>
<td>(   )</td>
<td>(   )</td>
<td>(   )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Have you been assaulted by any people of your age at home (slapped, punched, kicked or hit by an object)?</td>
<td>Once</td>
<td>Few</td>
<td>Many</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(   )</td>
<td>(   )</td>
<td>(   )</td>
<td>(   )</td>
<td>(   )</td>
<td>(   )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Have you been assaulted by any adult at home (slapped, punched, kicked or hit by an object)?</td>
<td>Once</td>
<td>Few</td>
<td>Many</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(   )</td>
<td>(   )</td>
<td>(   )</td>
<td>(   )</td>
<td>(   )</td>
<td>(   )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**11. [Exposure to violence]** Since the last time we interviewed you:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Since the last time we interviewed you...</th>
<th>Y</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>DK</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Has any of your relatives or friends been robbed? (On the street or at home)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(   )</td>
<td>(   )</td>
<td>(   )</td>
<td>(   )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Has any of your relatives or friends been murdered?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(   )</td>
<td>(   )</td>
<td>(   )</td>
<td>(   )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Has any of your relatives or friends been arrested?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(   )</td>
<td>(   )</td>
<td>(   )</td>
<td>(   )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PEERS**

**12. [Rule violating behavior]** Please, tell me if any of these things below have happened to your friends or siblings: (If yes, it happened once, few times or many times?)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Since the last time we interviewed you, have your friends or siblings...</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Taken something from a store without paying for it?</td>
<td>Once</td>
<td>Few</td>
<td>Many</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(   )</td>
<td>(   )</td>
<td>(   )</td>
<td>(   )</td>
<td>(   )</td>
<td>(   )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Broken something on the street? (including graffiti)</td>
<td>Once</td>
<td>Few</td>
<td>Many</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(   )</td>
<td>(   )</td>
<td>(   )</td>
<td>(   )</td>
<td>(   )</td>
<td>(   )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Beaten someone up with the idea of seriously hurting them?</td>
<td>Once</td>
<td>Few</td>
<td>Many</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(   )</td>
<td>(   )</td>
<td>(   )</td>
<td>(   )</td>
<td>(   )</td>
<td>(   )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Used any drugs?</td>
<td>Once</td>
<td>Few</td>
<td>Many</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(   )</td>
<td>(   )</td>
<td>(   )</td>
<td>(   )</td>
<td>(   )</td>
<td>(   )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**13. [Bullying]** Please, tell me if you have done any of these acts: (If yes, it happened once, few times or many times?)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Since the last time we interviewed you, have you...</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Verbally offended someone (a friend or schoolmate)?</td>
<td>Once</td>
<td>Few</td>
<td>Many</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(   )</td>
<td>(   )</td>
<td>(   )</td>
<td>(   )</td>
<td>(   )</td>
<td>(   )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Excluded someone from a group of friends on purpose?</td>
<td>Once</td>
<td>Few</td>
<td>Many</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(   )</td>
<td>(   )</td>
<td>(   )</td>
<td>(   )</td>
<td>(   )</td>
<td>(   )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Made fun of someone (a friend or schoolmate)?</td>
<td>Once</td>
<td>Few</td>
<td>Many</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(   )</td>
<td>(   )</td>
<td>(   )</td>
<td>(   )</td>
<td>(   )</td>
<td>(   )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Spread lies about someone (personally or on the internet)?</td>
<td>Once</td>
<td>Few</td>
<td>Many</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(   )</td>
<td>(   )</td>
<td>(   )</td>
<td>(   )</td>
<td>(   )</td>
<td>(   )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Posted embarrassing pictures or videos about someone on the internet?</td>
<td>Once</td>
<td>Few</td>
<td>Many</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(   )</td>
<td>(   )</td>
<td>(   )</td>
<td>(   )</td>
<td>(   )</td>
<td>(   )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
14. [Bullied] Please, tell me if any of these situations has happened to you: (If yes, it happened once, few times or many times)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Situation</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Have you been verbally offended (by a friend or schoolmate)?</td>
<td>( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Have you been excluded from a group of friends on purpose?</td>
<td>( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Has anyone made fun of you (friend or schoolmate)?</td>
<td>( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Has anyone spread lies about you (personally or on the internet)?</td>
<td>( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Has anyone posted embarrassing pictures or videos about you on the internet?</td>
<td>( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15. [Moral alignment] About your relationship with your friends, please tell me:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Almost never</th>
<th>Almost always</th>
<th>Always</th>
<th>DK</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Would you argue with your parents to defend your friends?</td>
<td>( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Do you think your friends’ opinions are important for your decisions?</td>
<td>( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Would you protect your friends even if they did something wrong?</td>
<td>( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Would you change the way you are to be accepted by your friends?</td>
<td>( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Do you think your friends have always the same opinion as you?</td>
<td>( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16. [Belonging] About your school, please tell me how often:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Almost never</th>
<th>Almost always</th>
<th>Always</th>
<th>DK</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Do you enjoy going to school?</td>
<td>( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Do you like your teachers?</td>
<td>( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Do you like school activities (inside the classroom and/or outside the classroom)?</td>
<td>( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Do you like your classmates?</td>
<td>( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Do you wish you could move to another school?</td>
<td>( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

17. [Procedural justice] If your teachers find out you did something wrong, would they:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Almost never</th>
<th>Almost always</th>
<th>Always</th>
<th>DK</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Give you the opportunity to express your story side?</td>
<td>( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

231
b) Explain why they are reprimanding you? (   ) (   ) (   ) (   ) (   )
c) Listen to all sides of the story before making any decision? (   ) (   ) (   ) (   ) (   )
d) Talk to you politely? (   ) (   ) (   ) (   ) (   )

18. [Legitimacy] Still about your teachers, please tell me:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Totally disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Totally agree</th>
<th>DK</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Do you agree your teachers make the rules for the classroom?</td>
<td>(   )</td>
<td>(   )</td>
<td>(   )</td>
<td>(   )</td>
<td>(   )</td>
<td>(   )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Do you think you should obey your teachers even if you do not agree with them?</td>
<td>(   )</td>
<td>(   )</td>
<td>(   )</td>
<td>(   )</td>
<td>(   )</td>
<td>(   )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Do you think your teachers act according to what you believe is right or wrong?</td>
<td>(   )</td>
<td>(   )</td>
<td>(   )</td>
<td>(   )</td>
<td>(   )</td>
<td>(   )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Do you trust your teachers make the right decisions for you?</td>
<td>(   )</td>
<td>(   )</td>
<td>(   )</td>
<td>(   )</td>
<td>(   )</td>
<td>(   )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Do you think your classroom works better when you listen to your teachers?</td>
<td>(   )</td>
<td>(   )</td>
<td>(   )</td>
<td>(   )</td>
<td>(   )</td>
<td>(   )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Do you agree that sometimes it is not a problem to ignore what your teachers say?</td>
<td>(   )</td>
<td>(   )</td>
<td>(   )</td>
<td>(   )</td>
<td>(   )</td>
<td>(   )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19. [Victimization at school] Please, tell me if any of these situations have happened to you at school: (If yes, tell me if it was once, few times or many times)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Since the last time we interviewed you...</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Once</td>
<td>Few times</td>
<td>Many times</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Have you seen students fighting each other at school?</td>
<td>(   )</td>
<td>(   )</td>
<td>(   )</td>
<td>(   )</td>
<td>(   )</td>
<td>(   )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Have you been assaulted by a student at school (slapped, punched, kicked or hit by an object)?</td>
<td>(   )</td>
<td>(   )</td>
<td>(   )</td>
<td>(   )</td>
<td>(   )</td>
<td>(   )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Have you been assaulted by an adult at school (slapped, punched, kicked or hit by an object)?</td>
<td>(   )</td>
<td>(   )</td>
<td>(   )</td>
<td>(   )</td>
<td>(   )</td>
<td>(   )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Has anyone stolen something from you at school?</td>
<td>(   )</td>
<td>(   )</td>
<td>(   )</td>
<td>(   )</td>
<td>(   )</td>
<td>(   )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

INTERPERSONAL TRUST

20. [Trust in authorities] Please, tell me if you trust in these people:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>DK</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Your father</td>
<td>(   )</td>
<td>(   )</td>
<td>(   )</td>
<td>(   )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Your mother</td>
<td>(   )</td>
<td>(   )</td>
<td>(   )</td>
<td>(   )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Your stepfather / stepmother</td>
<td>(   )</td>
<td>(   )</td>
<td>(   )</td>
<td>(   )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Your siblings</td>
<td>(   )</td>
<td>(   )</td>
<td>(   )</td>
<td>(   )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Your friends</td>
<td>(   )</td>
<td>(   )</td>
<td>(   )</td>
<td>(   )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Your classmates</td>
<td>(   )</td>
<td>(   )</td>
<td>(   )</td>
<td>(   )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
g) Your neighbors
h) Your teachers
i) The police
j) Unacquainted

21. [Trust] I’m going to read some sentences and I want you to tell me how much do you agree or disagree with them:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sentence</th>
<th>Totally disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Totally agree</th>
<th>NS</th>
<th>NR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) People in my neighborhood are trustworthy.</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Most people care about the others.</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) In general, I trust promises people make.</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) If they have the opportunity, people would take advantage of me.</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) In general, I trust people I have just met.</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PERCEPTION OF LAWS

22. [Rule violating behavior] Please, tell me if you have been involved in any of these situations: (If yes, it happened once, few times or many times?)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Situation</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Have you taken something from a store without paying for it?</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Have you broken something on the street? (including graffiti)</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Have you beaten someone up with the idea of seriously hurting them?</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Have you used drugs?</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Have you purchased counterfeit goods?</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Have you cheated at school?</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

23. [Perceptions about laws] Thinking about the laws, please tell me:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perception</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Almost never</th>
<th>Almost always</th>
<th>Always</th>
<th>DK</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Do you think laws must be obeyed even if people do not agree with them?</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Do you think some laws can be disobeyed?</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Do you think the laws are the same for everyone?</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Do you think there are people who are above the law?</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
e) Do you think people who break the law should be punished (w/ fines, prison)? ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )
f) Do you think laws exist to protect people? ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )
g) Do you think the laws can be changed? ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )
h) Do you think all laws are good for the country? ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )

24. [Just world belief] I’m going to read some sentences and I want you to tell me how much do you agree or disagree with them:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Totally disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Totally agree</th>
<th>DK</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) I believe that, in general, I deserve the things that happen to me.</td>
<td>( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) I am usually treated with fairness.</td>
<td>( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) I believe that I usually get what I deserve.</td>
<td>( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Overall, events in my life are just.</td>
<td>( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) I believe that most of the things that happen in my life are fair.</td>
<td>( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) I think that important decisions that are made concerning me are usually just.</td>
<td>( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

25. [Just world belief] I’m going to read some other sentences and I want you to tell me how much do you agree or disagree with them:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Totally disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Totally agree</th>
<th>DK</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) I believe that, in general, people get what they deserve.</td>
<td>( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) I think basically the world is a just place.</td>
<td>( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) I am confident that justice always prevails over injustice.</td>
<td>( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) In the long run, people will be compensated for the injustices they suffer.</td>
<td>( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) I think people try to be fair when making important decisions.</td>
<td>( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

26. [Legal cynicism] Please, tell me what you think about these things below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Almost never</th>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Almost always</th>
<th>DK</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Do you think it is right people taking something from a store without paying for it?</td>
<td>( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Do you think it is right people breaking something on the street? (including graffiti)</td>
<td>( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Do you think it is right people beating someone up with the idea of seriously hurting them?</td>
<td>( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Do you think it is right people using drugs?</td>
<td>( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Do you think it is right people buying counterfeit goods?</td>
<td>( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Do you think it is right people cheating at school?</td>
<td>( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
27. [Legal cynicism] I’m going to read some other sentences and I want you to tell me how much do you agree or disagree with them:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Almost never</th>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Almost always</th>
<th>DK</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Laws exist to be disrespected.</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) It’s okay to do anything you want as long as you don’t hurt anyone.</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) To make money, there are no right and wrong ways.</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) When two people are fighting no one should interfere.</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) People should live pretty much for today without thinking about the future.</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

28. [Fear] How often are you afraid of:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Almost never</th>
<th>Almost always</th>
<th>Always</th>
<th>DK</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Walking alone in the streets of your neighborhood?</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Having your house robbed?</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Being robbed at your school or vicinities?</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Taking a stab or shot?</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Being stalked on the streets?</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

29. [Victimization] In your neighborhood, have you seen...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Since the last time we interviewed you, have you seen...</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Almost never</th>
<th>Almost always</th>
<th>Always</th>
<th>DK</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) People selling drugs on the streets?</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) People being robbed?</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) People carrying guns? (without being a police officer)</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Have you heard gunshot?</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

30. About the police:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Since the last time we interviewed you...</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Almost never</th>
<th>Almost always</th>
<th>Always</th>
<th>DK</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Have you seen the police stop and search anyone in the street?</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Have you seen the police handcuffing and arresting anyone?</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Have you seen the police beating anyone up?</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
31. [police contact] Since the last time we interviewed you, how often have you had any of these contacts with the police? (Don’t consider relatives that are police officers)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Since the last time we interviewed you ...</th>
<th>Once</th>
<th>Few times</th>
<th>Many times</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>DK</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) have you participated to a campaign or attended to a talk with police officers?</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) have you asked for help to a police officer (including asking information on the street)?</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Have you been stopped by police?</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Have you been searched by police?</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Have you been taken to a police station?</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

32. [Procedural justice] If a police officer think you did something wrong, do you think he or she would:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Almost never</th>
<th>Almost always</th>
<th>Always</th>
<th>DK</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Give you the opportunity to express your story side?</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Explain why you are being approached?</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Act the same way with you like anyone else?</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Talk to you politely?</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

33. [Legitimacy] Still about the police:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Totally disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Totally agree</th>
<th>DK</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Do you agree that police have the right to stop and frisk people on the street?</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Do you think police officers have the right to tell people what to do?</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Do you agree that people should obey police officers even if they do not agree with them?</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Do you trust police officer make the right decisions for you?</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Do you think the city works better when people listen to police officers?</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Do you agree that, sometimes, is not a problem to ignore what the police officers say?</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

34. Overall, do you think police treats people in a way that is:
1( ) Extremely unfair  
2( ) Unfair  
3( ) Fair  
4( ) Extremely fair  
5( ) Neither fair nor unfair

35. What is your racial background, according to IBGE? (Read them all)  
1( ) White
2( ) Black  
3( ) Mixed race (pardo)  
4( ) Asian  
5( ) Native (indigenous)  
97( ) None of them  
99( ) Don’t know  

**36. What is your religion? (Spontaneous)**  
1( ) Catholic  
2( ) Assembleia de Deus  
3( ) Baptist / Methodist / Presbyterian  
4( ) The Universal Church of the Kingdom of God  
5( ) Deus é Amor  
6( ) Evangelho Quadrangular  
7( ) Igreja Internacional da Graça  
8( ) Renascer em Cristo  
9( ) Evangelical / Gospel  
10( ) Evangelical - does not specify  
11( ) Seventh-day Adventist Church  
12( ) Jehovah’s Witness  
13( ) Jewish  
14( ) Spiritism / Kardecism  
15( ) Afro-Brazilian (Umbanda, Candomblé, etc.)  
16( ) Orientals (Buddhist, Muslim, etc.)  
17( ) Congregação Cristã do Brasil  
18( ) Religious, but does not follow any / Agnostic  
19( ) Atheist  
20( ) Messianic  
21( ) Mormon  
99( ) No answer
# Appendix 6: Civil Servants Field Work Calendar

**Civil Police Precincts and Military Police**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field work calendar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>July</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7       Thursday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11      Monday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12      Tuesday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26      Tuesday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27      Wednesday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28      Thursday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>August</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2       Tuesday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9       Tuesday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12      Friday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19      Friday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23      Tuesday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24      Wednesday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26      Friday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28      Sunday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29      Monday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30      Tuesday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31      Wednesday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>September</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1       Thursday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2       Friday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5       Monday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6       Tuesday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8       Thursday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9       Friday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12      Monday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13      Tuesday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14      Wednesday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16      Friday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19      Monday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**October**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Day</th>
<th>Company</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>Cia</td>
<td>Pirituba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>Cia</td>
<td>Jd. Ângela</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>Cia</td>
<td>V. Andrade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>DP e Cia</td>
<td>V. Andrade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Friday</td>
<td>DP</td>
<td>V. Andrade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>Cia</td>
<td>Jd. Ângela</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>Cia</td>
<td>V. Andrade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>DP</td>
<td>Jd. Ângela</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Friday</td>
<td>DP</td>
<td>V. Andrade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>Cia</td>
<td>Cidade Ademar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>DP</td>
<td>Jd. Ângela</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>Cia</td>
<td>V. Andrade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>Cia</td>
<td>Cidade Ademar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Friday</td>
<td>Cia</td>
<td>Cidade Ademar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>Cia</td>
<td>Cidade Ademar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>DP</td>
<td>Cidade Ademar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>Cia</td>
<td>V. Andrade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>Cia</td>
<td>Jd. Ângela</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**November**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Day</th>
<th>Company</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>Cia</td>
<td>Cidade Ademar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>DP</td>
<td>Pirituba</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix 7. Sample Profile Chart

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questionnaires</th>
<th>Military Police</th>
<th>Civil Police</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>298</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Sex             | 84% male       | 83% male     |

| Age             | 38% from 20 to 29 years | 7% from 20 to 29 years |
|                 | 36% from 30 to 39 years | 37% from 30 to 39 years |
|                 | 24% from 40 to 49 years | 35% from 40 to 49 years |

| Education        | 29% undergraduate complete | 76% undergraduate complete |
|                 | 25% undergraduate incomplete | 14% undergraduate incomplete |
|                 | 40% high school complete | 9% high school complete |

| Color            | 59% white | 76% white |
|                 | 32% mixed colour | 17% mixed colour |
|                 | 8% black | 5% black |

| Rank             | 63% soldier | 32% clerck |
|                 | 25% corporal | 18% detective |
|                 | 10% sergeant | 17% agent |
|                 | 1% warrant officer | 17% scribe |
|                 | (5) lieutenant or captain | 9% jailer |
|                 |                | 7% chief |

| Work activity    | 78% pattroling | Does not apply |
|                 | 17% administrative service | |

| Length of service in police | 50% up to 5 years | 25% up to 5 years |
|                            | 10% from 6 to 10 years | 11% from 6 to 10 years |
|                            | 13% from 11 to 15 years | 19% from 11 to 15 years |
|                            | 13% from 16 to 20 years | 21% from 16 to 20 years |
|                            | 9% from 21 to 25 years | 8% from 21 to 25 years |
|                            | 3% from 26 to 30 years | 11% from 26 to 30 years |
|                            | 1% more than 31 years | 4% more than 31 years |
The amount used under the rubric of technical reserve covered the costs to:

1) Visit the Centre for the Study of Violence of University of São Paulo in order to discuss with researches of that centre conceptual and methodological issues related to the Project CEPID/FAPESP Building Democracy Daily: Human Rights, Violence and Institutional Trust:

   **Mariana Thorstensen Possas**  
   Salvador/São Paulo - 25/08/2016  
   São Paulo/Salvador - 27/08/2016  
   **Air tickets and per diem**

   **Ludmila Mendonça Lopes Ribeiro**  
   Belo Horizonte/São Paulo - 15/09/16  
   São Paulo/ Belo Horizonte - 15/09/16  
   **Air tickets and per diem**

   **Justin Ellis**  
   Miami/ São Paulo - 21/11/2016  
   São Paulo/ Miami - 27/11/2016  
   **Per diem**

2) Participated in seminar: Public Ministry and Society: Democratic Police and the Right to Security (Ministério Público e Sociedade: Polícia Democrática e Direto à Segurança) at the Office of the State Prosecutor of Rio de Janeiro:

   **Patricia de Oliveira Nogueira Pröglhöf**  
   São Paulo/Rio de Janeiro - 30/11/16  
   Rio de Janeiro/São Paulo - 03/12/16  
   **Per diem**