BEST CENTRE
Behavioural Economics . Society . Technology

The Strategy Outlook:
This strategy involves a three-stage approach to achieving long-term, sustainable behavioural change rooted in self-determination theory and gamification. Our strategy, REAL Justice, aims to increase *police officer* referrals by providing resources to make referrals easier, providing incentives to make referral more attractive, and rebranding restorative justice as a more credible judicial pursuit. In the short term, this will reduce the barriers to, and therefore increase the number of referrals to these programs. In the long-term, the strategy will ideally shift perceptions of restorative justice through dissemination of strategy success and anecdotal evidence from key influencers; both of which will contribute to increased utilisation of the restorative justice program within Queensland.

Tactic 1: Police, Victim and Perpetrator Ticketing
According to Mascarenhas, Kesavan, & Bernacchi (2008)[1] there is an information asymmetry with regard to the knowledge police officers have of restorative justice processes. Purnell et al.[2] states that convenience is a key barrier to behavioural change. Drawing on dimensions of the EAST framework[3], friction costs and checklists are effective concepts for implementation to increase convenience and encourage behaviours. The first nudge of this strategy is operationalised through a referral ticket system. The idea is to provide police officers with a ticket book that includes a checklist for case suitability, contact information fields for both victim and perpetrator, and two rip-off cards that are given to victim and perpetrator respectively with information and contact details. The branding of the ticketing refers to restorative justice as "REAL Justice" and employs more authoritative brand colours associated with the QPS, as brand colours, logos, and names all contribute to brand perceptions and influence consumption behaviour.

The Big Idea:
The goal is to make referral easier for police officers by providing eligibility criteria, and through prompts to obtain contact details for both parties. It will use language and information to frame restorative justice as an attractive option to both victim and perpetrator for co-operation to occur. The rebranding of restorative justice through this ticketing aims to bolster the legitimacy of the program and perceptions of its credibility.

Tactic 2: REAL Justice Competition
Gamification draws on consumers' intrinsic motivation to play games in order to foster intrinsic motivation in non-game behaviour such as financial decision-making[4]. Gamification has demonstrated behavioural impact due to the creation of positive value for consumers with more motivating and rewarding experiences provided by game design elements[5]. This addresses the inherent negative exchange of many switching behaviours (Binney. Hall & Shaw, 2009). Cost-efficiency is one of the main arguments for gamification as an effective behavioural change strategy[6]. Gamification has been effective in the energy sector for reducing energy usage[7], and improving attitudes and intentions towards exercise (Hamari & Koivisto, 2013).

The REAL Justice Competition is rooted in competition and motivation theory. Herzberg (1959) found that there are two broad types of workplace motivational factors; those driven by a need to prevent loss or harm and those driven by a need to gain personal satisfaction or achievement. Our approach focuses on the second of these motivations. Further to this, factor analysis reveals five broad Prime Motivational Factors that motivate police in their work. These are: feeling valued, achievement, workplace relationships, the work itself and pay and conditions[8]. The implementation of a competition to motivate police will enable them to feel a sense of achievement and value from participating. This strategy is used to encourage the police to comply with Tactic 1, as they will be more motivated to make referrals to Restorative Justice knowing that their efforts will receive recognition and help their peers within the precinct.

[1] Mascarenhas, O., Kesavan, R., & Bernacchi, M. (2008). Buyer–Seller Information Asymmetry: Challenges to Distributive and 68–84. https://doi.org/10.1177/0276146707311515

[2] Purnell, J., Thompson, T., Kreuter, M., & Mcbride, T. (2015). Behavioral economics: "nudging" underserved populations to b E06. https://doi.org/10.5888/pcd12.140346

[3] Service, O., Hallsworth, M., Halpern, D., Algate, F., Gallagher. R., Nguyen, S., Ruda, S., Sanders, M., (2014) EAST Four simple *Insights Team*. Retrieved 9 September 2019 from https://www.bi.team/wp-content/uploads/2015/07/BIT-Publication-EAST

[4] Bharamgoudar, R. (2018). Gamification. *Clinical Teacher*, 15(3), 268–269. https://doi.org/10.1111/tct.12787

[5] Mitchell, R., Schuster, L., & Drennan, J. (2017). Understanding how gamification influences behaviour in social marketing. Au https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ausmj.2016.12.001

[6] Lefebvre, C. (2009). Integrating Cell Phones and Mobile Technologies Into Public Health Practice: A Social Marketing Perspective. Health Promotion Practice, 10(4), 490–494. https://doi.org/10.1177/1524839909342849

[7] Gustafsson, A., Katzeff, C., & Bang, M. (2009). Evaluation of a pervasive game for domestic energy engagement among teenagers. Computers in Entertainment (CIE), 7(4), 1–19. https://doi.org/10.1145/1658866.1658873

[8] Sommerfeldt, V. (2010). An identification of factors influencing police workplace motivation. Doctoral Thesis. Queensland University of Technology. Brisbane, Australia.

In practice, this competition involves leveraging the use of the ticket system and gamifying the experience by creating an industry competition among different police districts, as well as intra-organisational competition. A referral goal poster will be provided to stations nationwide that will set visual goals and show progress through sticking tickets to the board. The number of hours saved refers to the 7.5 hour reduction per case borne out of restorative justice referrals[9]. The incentive is that the station with the most referrals will receive a plaque from the chief police commissioner, and the top three referrers in each station will receive a "Champion of Justice" badge.

The Big Idea:
The idea is to leverage relative ranking and network nudging to increase referral behaviour. Framing is also used in this instance, where goals are compared to the number of hours saved on each case as a result of referring to REAL Justice thus reinforcing the benefits of referral to encourage positive behaviours.

Tactic 3: Dissemination of Results
Publishing results and leveraging key influencers will reinforce the positive aspects of restorative justice, as well as shift long-term perceptions of the program as a 'soft option'. This nudge will leverage descriptive norms to emphasise the commonality and effectiveness of the program and frame it as a credible justice avenue. This is a long term strategy that will be informed by the success of the first two nudges.

Implementation:
The chosen design meets the requirements of being largely scalable, feasible, and realistic to operationalise.
Full Implementation will be achieved mid-2021, as per follows:

The guiding framework for this strategy is **Self Determination Theory[10],** which consists of the following components: autonomy - the ability to control actions and achieve the final outcome, competence- belief that the outcomes are influenced by them, and relatedness - the feeling of belonging with others.

Behaviour Bias	Nudge	Application	Self Determination Theory
Selective perception	Framing	Framing was the primary way this bias was mitigated. Instead of attempting to shift the attitudes of the officers who believe that justice is punitive, restorative justice was reframed in a way that was more serious (less 'fluffy'), and highlighted benefits to the officers.	This aligned with the social norms (relatedness) of police officers. We did not ask them to give up their norms and their 'belongingness'.
Stereotyping	Check list Foot in the door Simplification Reduce friction costs	Police stereotype restorative justice as being difficult and time costly therefore the nudges to reduce that perception relate to making it as easy as possible. The police officer has a simple checklist when considering restorative justice. All green tick boxes and the case is eligible. This also allows foot in the door where we ask the police officer, victim and offender to start the process by filling out some fields and therefore they are more likely to finish the referral. In addition to this, the competition goals were attainable and offered consistent rewards therefore reducing the perception of 'too much effort' to achieve an outcome.	This relates to the autonomy aspect of SDT as it enables the police to initiate a referral and make change themselves. In addition to this we enable them the tools for competency where they can be confident they are referring the right cases through the checklist.
Availability heuristic	Framing Reduced friction costs	To increase the understanding of the process of restorative justice an information sheet is attached to the front of the notebook as well as information presented on the competitor board. The purpose of this information is not only to give a better understanding of the process, but to highlight that it is not an 'easy' option.	This enabled the police to make more informed decisions, improving competency.

Budget:
Implementation of the REAL Justice Program will be low cost and dependent on the number of stations implementing the program.
Costs estimates, before considering economies of scale which will be relevant, are:
- Production of rewards chart, tickets and prizes $270 for three stations
- Program training and education costs $27 for three stations
- Cost to undertake internal review of program $5,000 once-off cost

[9] Gavin, P., & MacVean, A. (2018). Police perceptions of restorative justice: Findings from a small-scale study.(Colloquy on Restorative Justice, part 1). Conflict Resolution Quarterly, 36(2), 115–130. https://doi.org/10.1002/crq.21235
[10] Sheldon, K., & Schüler, J. (2011). Wanting, having, and needing: integrating motive disposition theory and self-determination theory. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 101(5), 1106–1123. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0024952