Police Use of Force
Objectives

After reading this chapter you will be able to:

• Define reasonable force, unnecessary force, and brutality in relation to the continuum of force
• Discuss the meaning and importance of threat assessment in situations where officers make decisions about the use of force
• Identify the various types of physical force that can be used by the police, the circumstances in which they can be used, their frequency, and their effects
• Explain the phenomenon of suicide by cop, how frequently it occurs, and the characteristics of such incidents
• Evaluate patterns of police use of force among officers
• Assess early intervention systems and other methods of controlling police use of force

Fact or Fiction

To assess your knowledge of police use of force prior to reading this chapter, identify each of the following statements as fact or fiction. (See page 266 at the end of this chapter for answers.)

1. The continuum of force can be thought of as a tool of the police that basically eliminates discretion in use of force situations.
2. By law every police department in the United States operates under the same continuum of force policy.
3. The twenty-one-foot rule basically eliminates police discretion in deadly force situations.
4. Bodily force is the most common type of physical force used by police officers.
5. Data collected by the FBI show more citizens were killed by the police in 2015 than any other year in history.
6. The phenomenon known as suicide by cop is basically a media construction; in reality, it does not actually exist.
7. Tasers have been shown to be more effective than OC spray in incapacitating subjects without the need for additional force to be used.
8. Research has shown that subjects’ risk of death in a Taser-related use of force incident is less than 0.25%.
9. Early intervention systems are designed to identify officers that represent a potential problem and correct their behavior before they engage in more serious conduct.
10. The best predictor of how often officers use force is the number of arrests that they make.

As discussed in Chapter 4, the ability to use force is a fundamental responsibility of the police; to use force only when necessary is a major legal and moral obligation of the police. The right to use force can be thought of as a powerful tool of the police: With this ability officers can intervene in situations in which order needs to be maintained and offenders need to be arrested. However, it is also the use of force that makes the police inherently controversial. Simply stated, the police protect the rights of people by limiting the actions of other people, and in order to limit the actions of other people, sometimes force must be used.

Because of the central role that force plays in policing, the use of force by officers may influence citizens’ attitudes and behaviors toward the police, and the misuse of force may erode confidence in the police and the entire criminal justice system. Even when it is necessary and justified, the use of force never photographs well. As seen in numerous well-publicized incidents, when it appears police use of deadly force is racially motivated or otherwise improper, the effects can be devastating. It is critical that officers be trained in the proper use of force and that all citizens have confidence in the police’s ability to use force only when necessary.

Deadly force: Forms of force used by the police that have a high likelihood of resulting in the death of a subject.
Police departments are sometimes criticized and distrusted by community residents because they do not share important information with citizens. Citizens may interpret this unwillingness to share information as the police hiding misconduct or mismanagement. Indeed, sometimes police departments are reluctant to share information with the public for fear citizens may criticize police actions and operations, due to misinterpretation of the information or otherwise. Nowhere is this more the case than when it comes to releasing information about citizen complaints against police officers (and the disposition of those complaints; see Chapter 12) and police use of force. However, some police departments routinely collect, analyze, and make available such information for public consumption. Arguably, this openness leads to a greater degree of accountability for departments and their officers, which is a good thing.

For example, the New York City Police Department publishes an annual report that provides descriptive information on each incident in which an NYPD officer discharged a firearm. In 2014 the department reported thirty-five people were shot (or shot at) by NYPD officers and eight were killed. Two bystanders were injured by police bullets, and one other person (a victim of a violent assault) was inadvertently shot and killed by officers. The NYPD also reported the following:

- Most incidents occurred:
  - On a Sunday (ten of thirty-five incidents; 29%)
  - Between 3:30 p.m. and 11:30 p.m. (57%)
  - On the street, sidewalk, or highway (60%)

- And involved:
  - A patrol officer (91%) who was on duty (98%) and in uniform (72%)
  - A white (47%) male officer (93%) (52% of NYPD uniformed personnel are white; 82% are male)
  - An officer with 0–5 years of experience
  - A call that related to an “armed subject/person with gun” (26%)
  - More than one shot at the subject (59%)

- The subject:
  - Was armed with a firearm (66%)
  - Was male (94%), twenty-six years of age or younger (47%), and black (65%) (similar to the characteristics of criminal shooting suspects)
  - Had a prior arrest history (87%)
  - Was not fatally injured by police gunfire (77%), although was struck by gunfire (63%)

motivated, this can lead to riots and community destruction. Within the last few years, police shootings of black citizens have sparked riots in Ferguson (Missouri), Baltimore, and Milwaukee, among other cities. Police use of deadly force against black individuals has also led to the creation of the Black Lives Matter movement and severely strained police-minority relations in many cities across the country.

There is no doubt that an understanding of the complexities, controversies, and dilemmas of police work depends on an understanding of police use of force. This chapter is devoted to this critical issue.
### Reasonable Force and Use of Force Guidelines

Although the police are authorized to use force and can use it in virtually any situation, they are legally not allowed to use force in an arbitrary or excessive manner. As explained by the U.S. Supreme Court in *Graham v. Conner* (1989), force must be “objectively reasonable in view of all the facts and circumstances of each particular case.” Accordingly, the obvious question is, what makes force “objectively reasonable”? To define *reasonable force*, most police departments provide guidelines for officers in the form of a *continuum of force.*

While there are many variations in continua of force across police departments, and there are limitations to the continuum of force principle, the basic idea is the police can and should only use as much force as necessary to overcome the resistance offered by the subject (see Figure 11.1 for an example of a police department’s continuum of force). In this sense the use of force by the police is a stepwise progression in which the officer uses the next more severe form of force only if the previous form of force did not induce subject compliance. In a typical force continuum, the first step is the mere presence of the police. In many situations, when order needs to be restored or subjects controlled, the simple presence of the police at the scene is enough to resolve the situation. If mere presence of the police does work, then verbalization would be appropriate. The characteristics and tone of the verbalization may depend on the nature of the situation. Verbalization can take several different forms:

- **Search talk** (e.g., “Good afternoon, sir. May I please see your driver's license?”)
- **Persuasion** (e.g., “Sir, would you mind stepping over here?”)
- **Light control talk** (e.g., “Show me your hands.”)
- **Heavy control talk** (e.g., “Drop the knife or I will shoot!”) Sometimes “stun” words are used in an attempt to gain the attention of the subject and to emphasize the seriousness of the command. Stun words are typically swear words.

---

**FIGURE 11.1 Example of a Use of Force Continuum**

- **Officer Presence**
- **Verbal Commands**
- **Control Talk, Hands-On Techniques**
- **Bodily Force**
- **Impact Weapons: Baton, Taser, OC Spray**
- **Deadly Force**

---

*Reasonable force*: The minimum amount of force necessary to overcome the resistance offered by the subject.

*Continuum of force*: The principle that police can and should only use as much force as necessary to overcome the resistance offered by the subject.
If verbalization does not induce compliance, then the use of hands-on techniques is often the next step on the continuum. These techniques can include putting hands on the subject or using escort holds or compliance holds to control subject movements. If these actions are not effective and resistance continues or escalates, then bodily force would be appropriate. Bodily force includes vertical stuns (moving the subject forcefully into a vertical structure such as a wall), takedowns (decentralizations), and punches or kicks (focused strikes). If bodily force is ineffective at inducing compliance, then impact weapons would be appropriate. Impact weapons include batons; flashlights; chemical sprays (e.g., OC spray, otherwise known as pepper spray); and conducted energy weapons (CEWs; e.g., Tasers). Finally, the last option in the continuum of force is the use of deadly force, which usually involves the use of a firearm.

VARIATIONS AND LIMITATIONS OF THE CONTINUUM OF FORCE

As noted above, different police departments have different guidelines for continua of force. One study found 123 different variations of continua in a survey of 662 police and sheriff’s agencies. Much of the variation relates to weapons such as OC spray and Tasers, which are less likely to be lethal. While OC spray and Tasers are usually placed at the same level in force continua, there is little agreement between and among departments at which level this should be. In some departments they are placed at the lower end of the continuum, which authorizes their use against passive resisters, but other departments place them closer to lethal force on the continuum, thus authorizing their use only against active resisters. Where OC spray and Tasers are located on the continuum of force matters when understanding the circumstances in which these weapons are used and their effectiveness in inducing compliance among subjects.

Some police departments do not equip their officers with Tasers, and in some departments that do have them, not all officers are authorized to carry them. Obviously, the weapon is not even an option in a continuum of force if it is not available.

There are at least three major limitations to using continuum of force as a guide for police action. First, although the idea of a continuum is to apply just as much force as necessary to overcome subject resistance, most agencies do not actually incorporate elements of citizen resistance in the continuum of force. In other words, it is not clear what type of force is appropriate given different forms of resistance, only that some forms of force are less severe than other forms. For example, it is not clear from the continuum of force itself if it is appropriate to use a Taser on a subject who continues to offer verbal resistance, or if it is acceptable to use a baton on a subject who is resisting being handcuffed. When citizen resistance is part of the continuum of force (see Table 11.1), most agencies make distinctions between (1) passive resistance, (2) verbal resistance, (3) physically defensive resistance, (4) physically active or aggressive resistance, and (5) deadly resistance (see Table 11.2).

Police agencies may not include subject resistance as part of the force continuum because there may be circumstances in which it would be necessary to use more force against a subject who is presenting less resistance. For example, if an officer encounters a subject who is making threats (verbal resistance), hands-on or even intermediate weapons may be most appropriately used, even though the force continuum may indicate that verbal commands and control talk would be justified. Even though a higher level of force may actually be appropriate given the circumstances of the situation, it would not be congruent with the force continuum and therefore could be judged as unnecessary force according to department policy. A less specific policy allows for more flexibility and discretion.

The second limitation is that many factors need to be considered in assessing the threat posed by a subject, but these factors are not explicitly incorporated into force continua. These factors may include the following:

**Bodily force:** Force that involves physical restraining maneuvers, such as vertical stuns, takedowns, and punches or kicks.

**Impact weapons:** Weapons used to induce compliance; they include batons, flashlights, chemical sprays, and Tasers.

**Subject resistance:** Subject resistance to police; can involve (1) passive resistance, (2) verbal resistance, (3) physically defensive resistance, (4) physically active or aggressive resistance, and/or (5) deadly resistance.

**Control talk:** A police officer’s verbalization to induce compliance from a subject.

**Threat assessment:** An officer’s assessment of the degree of danger posed by a subject; factors involved in the assessment can be physical or situational.
Age: A significant age difference between the officer and the subject may affect the officer’s threat assessment. A twenty-five-year-old officer facing a nine-year-old child would probably assess the threat differently than if he or she were facing another adult.

Size: If the subject is much bigger or smaller than the officer, it will change the threat assessment.

Strength: If the subject is much stronger or weaker than the officer, it will change the threat assessment.

Skill level: If the subject is a skilled fighter, that fact may change the threat assessment (if the officer is aware of it). On the other hand, if the officer is highly skilled, that will also affect the threat assessment.  

Availability of backup: If backup is far away or not available, the threat assessment may be higher than if immediate help is available.

Degree of stabilization: Stabilization refers to the subject’s ability to use force. An unrestrained, standing subject is in a much better position to be able to deliver force against an officer than a subject who is prone on the ground and in handcuffs. However, an officer should never assume that just because a subject is restrained he or she no longer poses a threat.  

Weapon: If the subject is known to be in possession of a weapon, or even suspected of being in possession of a weapon, the threat assessment may be substantially different.

A third limitation is that use of force situations often unfold in a matter of seconds, making a stepwise progression of force unrealistic. A continuum appears neat and
orderly on paper, but use of force incidents are seldom neat or orderly. Officers may find themselves in situations where their mere presence escalates events to the use of impact techniques or deadly force in a matter of a few seconds.

It must be understood a continuum of force is simply a guideline; it does not specify or dictate appropriate officer action in every use of force situation. Training and educating officers on the appropriate interpretation and application of the continuum of force, along with appropriate threat assessment, is necessary. Even then officers must use their discretion in determining the appropriate type of force to be used.

THE TWENTY-ONE-FOOT RULE AND ITS LIMITATIONS

Another guideline sometimes associated with police use of force is the twenty-one-foot rule, also known as edged-weapon defense. This concept was created thirty years ago but is still discussed and/or trained in some police departments today. The concept should not be considered a rule, but a guideline at best. This principle holds a person can pose a significant threat to a police officer when that person is within a twenty-one-foot boundary of the officer; this is particularly true for someone who possesses a knife. (Obviously, this principle does not apply to a subject with a firearm as a firearm can present a threat to an officer well beyond twenty-one feet.) The reasoning holds that it takes 1.5 to 2.0 seconds for a police officer to unholster, aim, and fire a gun. In that amount of time, a person with a knife can cover about twenty-one feet and could attack the officer.

There are several problematic issues with this principle. Overall, its validity depends on many variables and, as such, is subject to misinterpretation. For example, it does not explicitly take into account any other important characteristics of the situation besides the distance between the subject and the officer. A potential threat does not mean the subject is an actual threat. Clearly, not every subject who is within twenty-one feet of an officer poses grave harm to the officer—for example, when a subject is moving away from the officer and no other people are in the area. A subject may not be an actual threat until the subject faces the officer or movements are made toward the officer. The actions of the subject need to be considered. Also, as presented, the principle does not take into account the characteristics of the subject. Is the subject intoxicated, or is the subject coherent and verbally threatening? Is the subject a seven-year-old child, an eighty-five-year-old lady, or a twenty-four-year-old man? It also does not take into account the capabilities of the officer or the environmental conditions of the situation. For instance, a subject who is on ice and snow may not be able to cover the same distance in the same amount of time as someone on a dry surface. Another obvious limitation of the principle is the judgment as to the actual distance between the subject and the officer. Finally, the twenty-one-foot rule does not necessarily indicate when a firearm should be used; it may be appropriate for an officer to unholster the firearm, but actually shooting may not be justified. Similarly, other, less lethal weapons could be appropriately deployed when the situation allows for it. The bottom line is the twenty-one-foot rule should be carefully interpreted as a threat assessment technique.

Justified use of force by the police depends on the amount of resistance offered by the subject and the overall threat presented by the subject.
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Deviations in Use of Force: Unnecessary Force versus Brutality

When force is used beyond what is prescribed in the continuum of force, it is deemed unjustified, unnecessary, or excessive, or sometimes it is referred to simply as police brutality. However, because use of force situations are often complex and use of force continua do not specify the exact actions officers should take in each use of force situation, the determination of what is actually “unnecessary” or “excessive” is often a matter of judgment. A situation may be viewed differently by different people: The subject upon whom force was used may see the use of force differently than the officer who actually used the force. Citizens, other officers, police administrators, the media, the prosecuting attorney, the judge, and the jury may all have different perspectives on whether the force used in a particular incident was excessive or not, which can help make police action controversial. Sometimes it appears to citizens that the police “got away with murder” if the use of force is ruled as justified.

Some scholars have made a distinction between unnecessary force and force that constitutes brutality. In this case, brutality “is a conscious and venal act committed by officers who usually take great pains to conceal their misconduct.” According to Jerome Skolnick and James Fyfe,

Unnecessary force, by contrast, is usually a training problem—the result of ineptitude or insensitivity, as, for instance, when well-meaning officers unwisely charge into situations from which they can then extricate themselves only by using force. Hasty cops who force confrontations with emotionally disturbed persons and who consequently must shoot them to escape uninjured have used unnecessary force.

They also maintain that “unnecessary force may be a good-faith police mistake. Good faith plays no part in brutality.” It may be difficult to differentiate one form of force from the other as it depends on the officer’s intent, but the distinction is potentially an important one in that unnecessary force and brutality have different causes and, as a result, different remedies.

Types of Force

As noted, there are many types of force that can be used by the police as part of the continuum of force. Several of these options are discussed in more detail here.

BODILY FORCE

Bodily force can take many different forms. Most common are take-downs or decentralizations (where officers get a resisting subject off of his or her feet) and punches and/or kicks, designed to make the subject stop resisting. The primary goal is to minimize the subject’s overall movements and limit resistance by securing his or her arms; the use of handcuffs is particularly useful in this regard. Bodily force is the most common type of physical force used by the police. Analyses have shown that approximately 70% of all use of force incidents involve the use of bodily force alone. Another 10% involve bodily force along with some other form of force.
Of all types of force, bodily force is most likely to result in injuries to officers and subjects. Studies show when police use bodily force on a subject, approximately 60% of the incidents result in at least minor injuries to the subject, and 15% result in injuries to the officer. The most common injuries sustained by officers and subjects in these situations are abrasions or contusions; serious injuries as a result of bodily force are very uncommon.18

When controlling resisting subjects, officers must be aware of what is known as **positional asphyxia** (Exhibit 11.1).

**Positional asphyxia**: A dangerous condition that occurs when a person’s body position prevents normal and adequate breathing.

Exhibit 11.1

**Positional Asphyxia**

Subjects in police custody have died as a result of positional asphyxia. Positional asphyxia occurs when a person’s body position prevents normal and adequate breathing. Usually this relates to when the subject is face down with hands secured behind the back. Positional asphyxia may also result when a subject’s hands and feet/legs are secured via a specially designed belt (e.g., “hobble” belt or restraint) or the person is hog-tied.

The following factors contribute to positional asphyxia deaths:

- **Obesity**: A large abdomen or “beer belly” means that when the person is prone, the contents of the abdomen can be forced upward under the diaphragm, restricting breathing.
- **Psychosis**: Stimulant drugs (amphetamine, speed, “ICE,” ecstasy) can create an “excited delirium” in which the person is paranoid, overexcited and potentially violent. The stimulation of the heart can produce cardiac rhythm disturbances that can be fatal. In this situation any difficulty breathing can result in sudden deterioration in condition and death.
- **Preexisting physical conditions**: Any condition that impairs breathing under normal circumstances will put a person at a higher risk when they are physically restrained. Examples are heart disease, asthma, emphysema, bronchitis and other chronic lung diseases.
- **Pressure on the abdomen**: Even a thin person will have difficulty breathing if there is pressure on the abdomen. The more police officers there are holding a person down in a prone position, the greater the risk that there will be pressure on the person’s abdomen, making it difficult to breathe.

The following actions will reduce the likelihood of a positional asphyxia death occurring:

- **Identify persons at risk**: Knowledge of the risk factors will help identify potential situations.
- **Avoid prone restraint unless absolutely necessary**: Consider alternative methods for resolution. The person should be repositioned from the face down/prone position as soon as practical.
- **Do not sit or lean on the abdomen EVER**.
- **Identify danger signs of asphyxia**: [Police] officers must remember that some restraints put the subject in danger and they should avoid tactics that are associated with deaths.
- **Constantly monitor the person**: Continuously monitor a restrained person and where possible utilize a person not involved in the restraint to monitor the restrained person’s condition.
- **Seek medical attention**: Immediate medical attention should be obtained where there is any concern over the health of a person who has been actively restrained.19

As part of arrest tactics training, police officers are educated about the risks associated with such actions and on proper procedures to avoid their potentially serious consequences.

DEADLY FORCE

Deadly force typically refers to an officer’s use of a firearm to shoot a subject, although other forms of force could also potentially cause fatal injuries to a subject. Officers may use deadly force in defense of their own lives or the lives of others. Although this statement may sound straightforward, it is not because its interpretation depends somewhat on the situation at hand and the officers involved. In some situations an officer may feel that his or her life is in jeopardy, whereas a different officer in a similar situation may not. Prior to 1985 officers in many states were authorized to use deadly force to apprehend all fleeing felony suspects, but the U.S. Supreme Court decision in Tennessee v. Garner (1985) changed that. As a result of this case, officers are only authorized to shoot fleeing suspects who are demonstrably dangerous, such as a suspect with a gun. Most police departments have written rules and guidelines relating specifically to the use of deadly force (Exhibit 11.2).

Sometimes questions arise about the appropriateness and necessity of police officers pointing their firearms or threatening to use their firearms without actually firing them. The most informed policy and training on this issue provides for officers “to draw their guns only when circumstances present a reasonable expectation that they will encounter life-threatening violence.” In larger cities where officers encounter potentially dangerous situations more often, it is not uncommon for them to draw their weapons. It is less common that they point or threaten to use those weapons. Rarely do officers actually fire their firearms at a suspect. For example, in Milwaukee, Wisconsin, from 2009 to 2015, there were no more than fifteen incidents per year in which police officers fired at another person. To put that number in context, officers had hundreds of thousands of contacts with citizens and arrested thousands of violent criminals during each of these years. In 2015 there were approximately 700 incidents in which officers used some type of physical force against a subject, but only twelve involved the police use of a firearm.

In incidents involving police use of firearms, injuries to subjects are usually either catastrophic (fatal) or the subject is uninjured. If a subject is killed as a result of the use of force, it is nearly always as a result of police use of a firearm. Still using the Milwaukee Police Department in 2015 as an example, of the twelve incidents in which a subject was shot at, one subject died. However, seven other subjects were struck by gunfire and did not die. In other words, approximately 33% of subjects who were the intended target of the firearm were uninjured (four of twelve). In New York City in 2014, thirteen of thirty-five (37%) subjects who were shot at were uninjured. An analysis of Miami-Dade (Florida) Police Department data found that 52% of subjects who were shot at were uninjured.

Surprisingly, there is not currently a federal government–sponsored mechanism for keeping track of incidents in which police officers shoot and kill subjects. Such an effort was made in the past, but the data were incomplete and invalid because many police departments chose not to submit information. However, beginning in 2015, the Washington Post began to tally these incidents based on publication and review of online media reports (search Washington Post police shooting count). In 2015, 990 citizens were shot and killed by the police. In 2016, as of October 26, 788 people had been shot and killed...
To ensure that officers use only the minimal amount of force necessary, the department has nine rules that guide a New York City police officer in the use of deadly physical force. They are as follows:

1. Police officers shall not use deadly physical force against another person unless they have probable cause to believe they must protect themselves or another person present from imminent death or serious physical injury.

2. Police officers shall not discharge their weapons when, in their professional judgment, doing so will unnecessarily endanger innocent persons.

3. Police officers shall not discharge their weapons in defense of property.

4. Police officers shall not discharge their weapons to subdue a fleeing felon who presents no threat of imminent death or serious physical injury to themselves or another person present.

5. Police officers shall not fire warning shots.

6. Police officers shall not discharge their firearms to summon assistance except in emergency situations when someone’s personal safety is endangered and unless no other reasonable means is available.

7. Police officers shall not discharge their firearms at or from a moving vehicle unless deadly physical force is being used against the police officer or another person present, by means other than a moving vehicle.

8. Police officers shall not discharge their firearms at a dog or other animal except to protect themselves or another person from physical injury and there is no other reasonable means to eliminate the threat.

9. Police officers shall not, under any circumstances, cock a firearm. Firearms must be fired double action at all times.20


A Question of Ethics

The Value of Police Restraint in Deadly Force Situations

Police officers often find themselves in situations in which it would be legal and justified to use deadly force, yet it is rare the police actually shoot a subject. Because of this the police are sometimes said to act with “great restraint.” Why do you think police restraint in deadly force situations is a good or bad thing?

The Washington Post data also provide information on the characteristics of deadly force incidents (see Figure 11.2).

It is important to be clear that, unlike in some media depictions, police officers are not expected to be, or trained to be, heroes. Being a hero is not part of the continuum of force or the police position description. Police officers are not expected to risk life or limb; they are not expected to jump in front of bullets. Police officers are also not trained to wrestle guns away from suspects, shoot to wound, or use martial arts techniques to disarm subjects with knives. Officers are expected and trained to use as much force as necessary, and only as much force as necessary, to stop the threat with which they are confronted. If a police officer is confronted with a situation in which she or he needs to use a firearm, the goal is to stop the threat. When facing a subject armed with a firearm, an officer who tries to shoot the subject in the hand is not achieving the goal of stopping the deadly threat, of keeping the subject from trying to kill an officer or someone else. It bears repeating: An officer is trained to fire his or her weapon as many times as necessary to stop the threat before harm can come to officers and/or citizens.
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Suicide by Cop

Suicide by cop (SBC) is evidenced by a subject’s intentional life-threatening behaviors displayed “to coerce a law enforcement officer to respond with lethal force.”27 The SBC subject has the goal of being killed by officers, and a highly motivated SBC subject may do whatever it takes to reach this goal. The subject’s actions usually involve jeopardizing the lives of officers and/or other citizens by threatening them with a deadly weapon. Generally speaking, SBC situations are much more dangerous for police officers and
PART III • THE HAZARDS OF POLICE WORK

The Hazards of Police Work

bystanders than are conventional suicides or suicide attempts in which the person seeks to harm only himself or herself. In fact, SBC situations are just as dangerous as other situations that may require police deadly force against a subject.

Accurately determining the extent to which SBC occurs is difficult for at least three reasons. First, the critical factor that determines SBC is the intent of the subject. Did the subject intend to be killed by the police or display threatening behavior for some other reason that led to his or her death? In some SBC cases, the intention is clear: The subject may actually beg officers to shoot. In one SBC case, the subject left a suicide note on his phone addressed to the police. It read, “Dear Officer(s), you ended the life of a man who was too much of a coward to do it himself. Please don’t blame yourself. I used you. I took advantage of you.”28 The subject had failed to comply with the orders of the police, pulled a gun from his waistband (which turned out to be a BB gun), and was fatally shot. More often than not, however, SBC is not so easy to discern.

Another reason it is difficult to accurately tally SBC situations is all of these incidents may not end up involving deadly force. A subject may have SBC intentions, but the police resolve the situation without shooting or even causing injury to the subject. Analyses designed to identify SBC situations may miss those that do not involve firearms or any significant force, as would be the case if officers were able to de-escalate the incident. Of all incidents in which a subject intended to commit SBC, only a fraction may actually have been successful.

Finally, different researchers use different samples of cases (e.g., only officer-involved shooting cases versus all use of force cases) and different criteria for classifying SBC intent. Sometimes SBC is measured by degrees of intent,29 whereas other times subjects are classified as having SBC intent or not.30 Simply stated, there is no agreed-upon measure of what constitutes SBC ideation or intent; what might constitute SBC in one study may not constitute it in another. Therefore, estimates of frequency can vary dramatically depending on different research approaches—in fact, an article in Archives of Suicide Research reported estimates of officer-involved shootings involving SBC have varied between 11%31 and 80%.32

While suicide calls are primarily about suicide prevention, SBC situations are about suicide prevention and public safety. SBC incidents pose a serious risk to police officers and other people involved in the situation. The challenge for the police in SBC incidents is that people who are highly motivated to commit SBC are as dangerous, or even more dangerous, than other subjects in deadly force situations. SBC situations also often have the added challenge of involving subjects with serious mental health issues. In these incidents de-escalation skills (see Chapter 5) may be useful in bringing potentially lethal events to nonlethal endings.

FORCE LESS LIKELY TO BE LETHAL

In between bodily force and deadly force exist some less lethal options for inducing compliance among resisting or threatening subjects. Most common among these options are oleoresin capsicum (OC) spray and Tasers. As discussed below, these weapons can be deadly, but they are less likely to be so and for that reason they are broadly described as less lethal weapons.
RESEARCH SPOTLIGHT

The Frequency and Characteristics of Suicide by Cop Incidents

In spite of the difficulties in accurately estimating the frequency of SBC, several studies have attempted to do so. Perhaps one of the best studies on the issue examined cases from ninety police departments in which a police officer discharged a weapon (firearm or less lethal weapon) at a subject. Suicidal ideation (intent) was determined based on the subject’s communication during the incident as well as post-incident investigation of the subject’s previous behaviors and mental health history. During eight years a total of 707 cases were included in the sample; 41% involved the police killing a subject. Approximately 36% of the 707 incidents (254) were classified by the researchers as SBC (attempted or completed). In 5% of the total cases, the subject completed or attempted suicide on his own during the incident. Of the 254 incidents determined to be SBC:

- The mean age of the subjects was thirty-five, with a range of sixteen to seventy-six years.
- 95% of subjects were male; 29% were homeless.
- 62% of subjects had confirmed or probable mental health issues; 21% had a known and reported prior psychiatric hospitalization.
- 21% were described by police officers as psychotic at the time of the event.
- 80% of subjects were armed with a weapon during the incident; 19% falsely behaved as though they possessed a weapon or they possessed a simulated weapon (e.g., a toy gun).
- In 32% of incidents a police officer or other person (not including the subject) was injured or killed as a result of the subject’s actions.
- In 61% of the incidents, the subject provided suicidal communication to the officers or others who were present.
- Comparing the SBC subjects with subjects involved in similar use of force incidents, SBC subjects tended to be older, were more likely to possess a knife, were less likely to flee the police, and were more likely to be psychotic at the time of the incident. SBC incidents were more likely to involve injuries or deaths to police officers or other citizens because of the actions of the subject. There were no differences in type of calls through which the police became involved with SBC subjects compared to non-SBC subjects.
- Other research has found the typical SBC subject to be a young, white, male adult experiencing a romantic relationship conflict; who has a significant mental health and criminal history; and who often is intoxicated at the time of the offense.


Oleoresin Capsicum (OC) Spray

Oleoresin capsicum (OC) spray, otherwise known as pepper spray, was introduced to law enforcement in the 1980s. Today, approximately 94% of police departments authorize officers to use OC spray. Oleoresin capsicum is an inflammatory agent naturally found in cayenne peppers. Ideally, when a person is sprayed with OC spray, the effects are immediate: The respiratory tract becomes inflamed, the subject experiences a burning sensation and swelling around the eyes, and the subject’s eyes close involuntarily. OC spray has the potential to render a resistive suspect passive and compliant so the officer may be able to take the suspect into custody without the need for additional force. However, although the subject may be in extreme discomfort, he or she may still be able to resist. OC spray is used in approximately 10% of all use of force incidents, although variation likely exists among police departments.

Once introduced, OC spray immediately demonstrated advantages over other forms of force. In particular, the effects of OC spray, while generally immediate and dramatic,
TECHNOLOGY ON THE JOB

Police Robots

Robots are no longer just a science fiction trope. In particular, robots are an important tool for the military; TALON robots are used to identify and detonate improvised explosive devices (IEDs), and drones are used to conduct surveillance. Drones with smart bombs have also been used to kill terrorists in Iraq, Afghanistan, and Syria. Like many other technologies that were created by and for the military, several types of robots have been adapted for use by law enforcement. For example, in 2016 the police used a robot to deliver an explosive device to a barricaded sniper who had killed five officers at a demonstration in Dallas, Texas. Police Chief David Brown told reporters, “We saw no other option but to use our bomb robot and place a device on its extension for it to detonate where the suspect was.” The police had used robots many times before this, usually to defuse bombs, obtain visual data from closed or dangerous settings, and deliver tear gas. In 2015 the San Jose Police Department used a robot to deliver a phone and pizza to an armed, suicidal man on a freeway. But the Dallas delivery of a bomb via a robot to the location of a subject for the purpose of killing him was a first.

The use of robots for dangerous missions has clear advantages but also raises questions and concerns. Where will the trend toward the greater deployment of such technology end? Could the use of robots for police work become routine—for instance, could robots be used to handle high-risk traffic stops? If robots are a means by which force is delivered, might the use of force become “easier” and thus perhaps overused? Although the days of RoboCop are probably not near, it would appear they are certainly closer on the horizon.

PHOTOS 11.5 and 11.6 Robots today are used to handle certain hazardous tasks, such as diffusing bombs. In the near future robots will likely perform additional police tasks, although perhaps not to the extent portrayed in the popular 1987 science fiction film RoboCop.

are more temporary than other forms of chemical gasses used previously by police, and OC spray is less likely to cause serious or lasting injury than bodily force, batons, and flashlights. OC spray can also be used effectively on multiple subjects simultaneously. However, OC spray also has numerous disadvantages. These include the following:

- When using the spray, innocent bystanders (including other police officers) can be affected.
- Officers have to be in relatively close proximity to the resisting subject they seek to spray.
• OC spray must be aimed at a subject’s face for it to be effective (i.e., the target is limited).

• OC spray can be affected by environmental conditions, such as wind.

• People who are impaired by alcohol or drugs, mentally ill, emotionally disturbed, or highly motivated to resist or escape may not be affected by exposure.43

• Most research concludes that OC spray is not as effective in incapacitating subjects as Tasers.44

Perhaps as a result of this, research shows OC spray is more likely to be used along with some other type of force (e.g., bodily force) than by itself.45

• Safety concerns have been raised with regard to OC spray because in rare instances people have died after being exposed to it. However, research has shown the deaths involving OC spray were actually the result of positional asphyxia or preexisting health conditions, or they were drug-related.46

**Tasers**

**Taser** (short for the Thomas A. Swift Electric Rifle) is the brand name of the most popular electronic stun device on the market. These devices are also known as conducted energy devices (CEDs), electronic control devices (ECDs), or electronic control weapons (ECWs). This technology was first introduced in police departments in the 1990s; today 81% of departments have CEDs such as Tasers. All police departments that serve populations of one million or more have CEDs, although not all officers in these departments may actually carry or be authorized to use them.47

Tasers can be used in either probe mode or drive-stun mode. A Taser resembles a gun. In **probe mode**, nitrogen cartridges are discharged to fire two probes into the body of a subject. As long as both probes attach to the body, an electrical current then runs from the Taser through the wires into the body. The electrical current overrides the central nervous system, causing involuntary muscle contractions and incapacitation of the resisting subject.48 In **drive-stun mode** the weapon itself is placed in contact with the subject’s body and the electrical current is delivered directly. A Taser in drive-stun mode is a pain compliance weapon; it causes localized pain that can allow officers to overcome the resistance of the subject. However, the weapon is not necessarily incapacitating and in fact may lead to additional subject resistance. In many police departments, the use of a Taser in drive-stun mode is discouraged or even prohibited except in extreme circumstances.

In probe mode the Taser has several potential advantages over other less lethal alternatives, such as OC spray, including the following:

• Tasers can be used from greater distances and allow officers to keep more space between themselves and combative or assaultive subjects. As a result, Taser incidents seldom involve injuries to officers.

**PHOTO 11.7** OC spray leads to extreme discomfort mostly in the eyes and, if inhaled, the nose, mouth, and sinuses. Although OC spray can incapacitate a resisting subject and its effects are reversible, some concerns have been expressed over its use.
• Tasers provide for a relatively quick recovery time for the subject.
• Tasers are effective at inducing suspect compliance. Research indicates a significantly higher level of effectiveness with Tasers compared to OC spray.
• Because in probe mode Tasers do not rely on pain to induce compliance, ideally they are more effective than OC spray on persons who have a higher tolerance for pain. This can include people under the influence of drugs or alcohol or who have a mental illness.
• Tasers have the unique advantage of being able to be used during a foot chase; about 7% of the time a Taser was used during 2015, the incident involved a subject who was running from the police (compared to 1% of the time OC spray was used).

In spite of their potential advantages, serious questions exist about the safety and potential overuse of Tasers. There are concerns Tasers are used in a disparate fashion against members of minority groups. A related worry is that Tasers are rated too low in continuaums of force and consequently are being used against passive (versus active) resisters. Finally, there are concerns about the use of Tasers (and OC spray, for that matter) on the elderly, children, pregnant women, and persons with medical conditions that put them at greater risk of experiencing dangerous medical side effects.

With regard to the potential overuse of Tasers, much depends on the department being studied. Research has shown Taser use accounts for 10% to 50% of all use of force incidents. And concerning disparate use, most studies examining the issue have not found racial disparities in the use of Tasers on subjects compared to other forms of force; Tasers are equally likely to be used on white, Hispanic, and black subjects.

As previously noted, it is very uncommon for officers to be injured when force is limited to Taser use alone. If Tasers work effectively, however, they will cause injuries to subjects, if only because of the probes that stick into the person. While the probes seldom cause more than minor physical injuries, it is unknown if there are lasting physical or emotional consequences of Taser injuries. There is also the potential for injuries to subjects as they become incapacitated and fall to the ground, although these types of injuries are surprisingly rare. The most serious issue is that Tasers have been linked to in-custody deaths. Between January 2015 and November 2015 in the United States, forty-eight people died in incidents in which police used Tasers. However, to put this statistic in perspective, it is estimated Tasers are used on citizens more than 900 times per day. The reasons for Taser-related deaths are varied; most of the individuals who died soon after a Taser incident suffered from hypertensive heart disease, coronary heart disease, drug intoxication (especially methamphetamine or PCP), cocaine toxicity, or excited delirium (Exhibit 11.3).

Overall, more than half of the citizens who died after Taser use suffered from...
mental illness or were under the influence of drugs, which may reflect the sample upon which Tasers are most commonly used. A National Institute of Justice study that examined Taser-related deaths concluded, “The risk of death in a CED-related use of force incident is less than 0.25%, and it is reasonable to conclude that CEDs do not cause or contribute to death in the large majority of those cases.”

Patterns in Police Use of Force: Causes and Control

It is well established that a small percentage of officers account for a relatively large proportion of force incidents in any given police department. For example, one study found 58 out of 1,084 (5.4%) patrol officers accounted for 40% of all use of force incidents in the department under examination. That same study found 71% of all officers in the department were not involved in any use of force incidents over the course of the year. According to the Christopher Commission report of the Los Angeles Police Department, 5% of the officers accounted for 20% of use of force reports. This is a potentially useful research finding because it suggests if a department wishes to address the use of force issue, it is necessary to focus on the behavior of a small group of officers.

Exhibit 11.3

Excited Delirium

According to an article in the FBI Law Enforcement Bulletin titled “Excited Delirium and the Dual Response: Preventing In-Custody Deaths,”

Excited delirium syndrome (ExDS) is a serious and potentially deadly medical condition involving psychotic behavior, elevated temperature, and an extreme fight-or-flight response by the nervous system. Failure to recognize the symptoms and involve emergency medical services (EMS) to provide appropriate medical treatment may lead to death. Fatality rates of up to 10% in ExDS cases have been reported. In addition to the significant mortality associated with unrecognized ExDS, a substantial risk for police liability and litigation exists. These patients often die within 1 hour of police involvement. One study showed 75% of deaths from ExDS occurred at the scene or during transport.

ExDS subjects typically are males around the age of 30, and most have a history of psychostimulant use or mental illness. Law enforcement agents or EMS personnel often are called to the scene because of public disturbances, agitation, or bizarre behaviors. Subjects are usually violent and combative with hallucinations, paranoia, or fear. Additionally, subjects may demonstrate profound levels of strength, resist painful stimuli or physical restraint, and seem impervious to self-inflicted injuries. This information becomes particularly important to law enforcement personnel who may use techniques intended to gain control and custody of subjects through physical means, chemical agents, or ECDs. During initial assessment patients often are noted to have elevated body temperatures, fast heart rates, rapid breathing, elevated blood pressures, and sweaty skin.

An early intervention system (EIS) is a data management system designed to record and monitor certain behaviors of officers with the objective of identifying potentially problematic patterns of behaviors while they can still be corrected. The ultimate goal is to prevent more serious behaviors. These systems are also discussed in Chapter 12.

According to Albuquerque police chief Ray Schultz,

Our early intervention system is triggered by several things in addition to use of force incidents, including missed court dates, citizen complaints, vehicle accidents involving the officer, lawsuits or torts against the officer, or notices of intent to sue. We used to flag someone if they had 5 uses of force, but based on the data we examined, we lowered the threshold to three for force incidents. By doing that, the numbers of officers identified by the early intervention system went up significantly for the first six months. After that period, the number of hits has come back down, because the officers know the system is closely monitoring behavior. Our department’s response to a first trigger (three problems within a rolling 12-month period) is a face-to-face informal meeting with the officer’s commander. We don’t have them talk with their sergeant or lieutenant, because we think those supervisors can be a little too close to the situation. We thought it better to have the commander conduct the review. For the second hit, which could be one more incident within the same rolling 12-month period, the response is now a formal face-to-face meeting with the commander. If there is a third hit, the response is a formal face-to-face with the department psychologist. The fourth hit gets the officer a face-to-face with the psychologist and an assessment. A fifth hit within a rolling 12-month calendar is a transfer that I make within the department. The union was strongly opposed when we started talking about moving people around. But everybody that I’ve had to move has come back and said, “Thank you, that was the best thing you could have done for me.” Sometimes the change in environment is enough to bring about change in an officer’s behavior.71

OFFICER CHARACTERISTICS AND USE OF FORCE

The fact that a small group of officers accounts for a relatively large proportion of use of force incidents raises an important question: How do officers who frequently use force differ from officers who do not? Studies examining background or demographic characteristics of officers and their relationship to use of force have produced many inconsistent findings. Most (but not all) suggest that officer gender does not influence the frequency with which officers use force.72 Similarly, studies also suggest officer race does not influence the likelihood of using force.73 Research does show, however, that younger officers are more likely to use force than older ones,74 and less experienced officers are more likely to use force than more experienced ones.75 It would be useful to know if there is a relationship between officer characteristics and the specific type of force used, but few studies have examined this issue. For example, perhaps female officers are less likely to use bodily force but more likely to use less lethal weapons. Research regarding the impact of officer characteristics has also been limited because much of it has failed to consider the job assignments and arrest activity of the officers under study—important variables that might attenuate the relationships between individual characteristics and police use of force.
OFFICER ASSIGNMENT, ARRESTS, AND USE OF FORCE

One might reasonably expect location/type of patrol assignment to be related to use of force. For example, high-crime areas may foster conditions in which use of force is more frequently necessary. Also, like officer assignment to a high-crime area, an officer’s assignment to a high-crime time could affect the likelihood of involvement in force incidents. Serious crime and arrests are more likely to occur during the late evening and early morning hours. As such, an officer’s shift (particularly one that covers the hours of 9:00 p.m. to 3:00 a.m.) may be related to the frequency with which the officer uses force.

If there is one pattern that is most clear with regard to police use of force, it is that most instances of force occur during the course of arrests. Not surprisingly, then, research has found arrest activity is the strongest predictor of use of force. Officers who make more arrests are significantly more likely to be involved in more force incidents. However, some officers make a lot of arrests and are not involved in a lot of force incidents. Also, the time ordering of the arrest-force relationship is not entirely clear. Some officers may make more arrests simply to justify the use of force.

POLICE CULTURE

The police culture is another important factor that needs to be considered when understanding and controlling police use of force. As discussed earlier in this book, one of the primary values of the traditional police culture is “toughness.” Tough cops are seen as good cops, and this may have direct implications for the tendency of officers to use force. Professor Dennis Rosenbaum from the University of Illinois at Chicago explains:

By the time officers leave their academy training, they’re already more prone to want to use force to resolve any kind of situation rather than talk to people. They’re less likely to want to engage in active listening and more machismo about how to interact with people. They haven’t even hit the road yet. So I think it is part of the police culture that is being instilled at our training academies and something to think about.

In addition, one might expect police departments oriented more toward law enforcement would have higher rates of use of force than departments oriented more toward service. The values espoused by departmental leaders and supervisors could potentially affect officers’ tendencies toward using force. However, little research has examined these issues.

THE CONTROL OF POLICE USE OF FORCE

Use of force is a discretionary decision usually made very quickly based on information perceived by the officer. These decisions are often examined intensely after the fact, and sometimes they have negative consequences for the officer involved, the police department, the citizens affected, and the community in general. However, it is important not to lose sight of the obvious: Police use of force is sometimes necessary. The goal is only to use force when it is the best option. As discussed in detail in Chapter 8, numerous studies have shown organizational policies and rules can substantially reduce the frequency of use of force incidents. The use of de-escalation techniques (Chapter 5) is another way of reducing the frequency of force, as is monitoring officer behavior through early intervention systems. To the extent feasible, the careful assignment of certain officers to
certain shifts and patrol areas is another technique worthy of consideration. In particular, when young male officers are assigned to high-crime areas during high-crime shifts, it creates situations in which force may be more likely to be used. The Police Executive Research Forum (PERF) provides additional suggestions in effectively managing police use of force:

- Dispatch a supervisor and multiple officers to potentially high-risk calls, such as 911 calls in which the caller reports a person with a firearm who appears to be under the influence of drugs. Having a supervisor at the scene, preferably within fifteen minutes, can help avoid a tendency to think that action must always be taken immediately to resolve the situation. Once police have arrived at the scene, “slowing down” the response can sometimes reduce the likelihood that force will be used. For example, by asking questions instead of issuing orders, responding officers may better understand the nature of the crisis and be able to defuse it without force. And having multiple officers present can result in greater safety if police use hands-on tactics to take a person into custody.

- Consider establishing a crisis intervention team (CIT) in which the police partner with local mental health officials and other experts to design comprehensive plans for managing and responding to persons with mental illness or other issues that can result in erratic behavior.

- Crisis intervention teams also can reduce “revolving door” issues by identifying persons who are “chronic customers” and intervening with those persons to ensure they have the medication and other services they need to avoid repeatedly going into crisis.

- Collect, track, and analyze use of force data to identify trends and patterns. Early intervention systems can help to identify possible issues with individual officers as well as groups of officers, by precinct, shift, or specialized unit.

- In dealing with a military veteran who is barricaded, resisting arrest, or in crisis, consider using a police officer who is also a military veteran and who may be better able to establish a personal connection with the subject.

- Hold officers accountable for adhering to policy and training when dealing with persons with mental illness or other conditions that can result in erratic behavior.

- Recognize the threat that mentally ill persons and others can pose to officers, and understand the officers’ perspectives about the need to protect themselves.

- Teach officers to understand the “objective reasonableness” standard for use of force articulated by the Supreme Court in *Graham v. Connor*, and train them to be able to clearly and accurately articulate their reasons for any use of force, in writing, following an encounter.

- Consider training officers to understand that not every situation requires a police action. In other words, if an officer can walk away from a situation and no negative outcome results, in some cases that can be a more effective response than thinking that an arrest or other intervention must always be made.

- In addition to de-escalating tensions during encounters with persons with mental illness or other conditions, police should aim to de-escalate tensions within the community following a use of force incident.82

Police use of force is a complicated and controversial issue. Much still needs to be learned about its causes and how it can best be controlled.
MAIN POINTS

• The right to use force can be thought of as a powerful tool of the police. With the ability to use force, the police can intervene in situations in which order needs to be maintained and offenders need to be arrested. However, it is also the use of force that makes the police inherently controversial.

• The continuum of force principle holds that police can and should only use as much force as necessary to overcome the resistance offered by the subject. The use of force is a stepwise progression in which the officer uses the next more severe form of force only if the previous form of force did not induce subject compliance.

• Much variation in continua of force can be found across police departments, and all continua have limitations as a guide for police decision making. The twenty-one-foot rule is a guideline indicating a subject within a twenty-one-foot boundary of an officer can pose a significant threat to that officer; this is particularly true for a subject who possesses a knife. This “rule” also has many limitations as a useful guide for police decision making.

• When force is used beyond what is prescribed in the continuum of force, it is deemed unjustified, unnecessary, or excessive, or sometimes it is referred to simply as police brutality. However, because use of force situations are often complex and continua do not specify the exact actions officers should take in each situation, the determination of what is actually “unnecessary” or “excessive” is often a matter of judgment.

• Bodily force can take many different forms and is the most common type of physical force used by the police. Of all types of force, bodily force is most likely to result in injuries to officers and subjects.

• Deadly force typically refers to an officer’s use of a firearm to shoot a subject, although other forms of force could potentially cause fatal injuries to a subject. Officers may use deadly force in defense of their own lives or the lives of others, although this determination is subjective and may depend on many factors.

• Suicide by cop (SBC) is a method of suicide that occurs when a subject engages in threatening behavior in an attempt to be killed by law enforcement. SBC situations are potentially very dangerous for police officers and other people involved in the situation.

• De-escalation skills can be used by officers to resolve situations peacefully without force being used by the subject or the officer.

• Oleoresin capsicum (OC) spray and Tasers are examples of weapons that are less likely to be lethal when used. Both have unique advantages and disadvantages, and both have also been criticized for overuse and safety concerns.

• Excited delirium syndrome is a serious and potentially deadly medical condition involving psychotic behavior, an elevated temperature, and an extreme fight-or-flight response by the nervous system.

• It is well established that a small percentage of officers account for a relatively large proportion of force incidents in any given police department. Officers who make more arrests are significantly more likely to be involved in more force incidents.

• An early intervention system (EIS) is designed to record and monitor certain behaviors of officers with the objective of identifying potentially problematic patterns of behaviors while they can still be corrected. The ultimate goal of such a system is to prevent more serious behaviors among officers.
IMPORTANT TERMS

Bodily force 248
Brutality 251
Continuum of force 247
Control talk 248
Deadly force 245
Drive-stun mode 259
Early intervention system (EIS) 262
Excited delirium 260
Impact weapons 248
Less lethal weapons 257
Oleoresin capsicum (OC) spray 257
Positional asphyxia 252
Probe mode 259
Reasonable force 247
Subject resistance 248
Suicide by cop (SBC) 255
Taser 259
Threat assessment 248
Twenty-one-foot rule 250
Unnecessary force 251

QUESTIONS FOR DISCUSSION AND REVIEW

1. What is a continuum of force and what are its major limitations? Given these limitations, is a continuum of force of any value? Explain.

2. What is the difference between unnecessary force and brutality? How can one be differentiated from the other? Why is this distinction potentially important?

3. What is bodily force? What are the advantages and disadvantages of using bodily force?

4. What is positional asphyxia? What is excited delirium? Under what conditions are they likely to occur?

5. What were the rulings in the U.S. Supreme Court cases of Graham v. Conner (1989) and Tennessee v. Garner (1985)? How did these cases affect police use of force?

6. Why do you think there is not a national reporting mechanism on police use of deadly force?

7. What is suicide by cop (SBC)? Why are these situations especially problematic for police officers?

8. What are the two most common weapons that are less likely to be lethal to subjects? How do they work? What are the advantages and disadvantages of each?

9. Research shows that a small proportion of officers in a police department account for a relatively large proportion of use of force incidents. Why?

10. According to the Police Executive Research Forum (PERF), how can police use of force best be managed?

FACT OR FICTION ANSWERS

1. Fiction
2. Fiction
3. Fiction
4. Fact
5. Fiction
6. Fiction
7. Fact
8. Fact
9. Fact
10. Fact
SAGE edge offers a robust online environment featuring an impressive array of free tools and resources for review, study, and further exploration, keeping both instructors and students on the cutting edge of teaching and learning.
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- Measuring the Use of Force May Help New York Police to Limit It
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- Police Use of Force
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