AN EVALUATION STUDY OF THREE ILLINOIS POLICE DEPARTMENTS USE OF FORCE TRAINING PROGRAMS

An Abstract of a Thesis

Presented to the

Department of Law Enforcement and Justice Administration

Western Illinois University

In Fulfillment

of the Requirement for the Degree of Master of Arts

By

Jason Baldowsky

April 2006

THESIS ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to evaluate the use of force training programs currently in use by three Illinois police departments. Harvard, Fox Lake, and Round Lake Beach were the municipal police department that participated in this survey in an effort to evaluate the quality of their use of force training programs. Manpower and budget constraints made training difficult and these departments were looking for a way to provide the most realistic, practical training under these constraints.

To evaluate the use of force training programs this research first needed to discover what the dynamics of a use of force encounter were. The level of force used most often, the suspect resistance level encountered most often, and the conditions of a shoot/ no shoot encounter, were the focus in this section of the study. These findings were then compared to the training offered in an effort to evaluate how practical the training is.

Most force used by the police officers in this study was relatively low, with contact control indicated as the level used most. The same was true of suspect resistance level, as verbal non-compliance was the most common level encountered. Shoot/ no shoot encounters were reported as mostly occurring at a close range with subjects often moving. When frequency distributions were examined the years of police experience more than any other variable, had the most impact on a use of force encounter. Officers with over five years of police experience used lower levels of force, encountered lower levels of suspect resistance, but were morel likely to be involved in a shoot/ no shoot situation.

The level of force where officers received most of their training was in the use of deadly force. Additionally, the majority of firearms training occurred at close range but with no movement by either the officers or targets. Because of the small number of respondents in this study (50), no significant relationships could be definitively proven regarding the use of force, and use of force training.

APPROVAL PAGE

This thesis by Jason R. Baldowsky is accepted in its present form by the Department of Law Enforcement and Justice Administration of Western Illinois University as satisfying the thesis requirement for the degree Master of Arts.

[redacted]

Chairperson, Examining Committee

[redacted]

Member, Examining Committee

[redacted]

Member, Examining Committee

May 8, 2006

Date

AN EVALUATION STUDY OF THREE ILLINOIS POLICE DEPARTMENTS USE OF FORCE TRAINING PROGRAMS

A Thesis

Presented to the

Department of Law Enforcement and Justice Administration

Western Illinois University

In Fulfillment

of the Requirement for the Degree of Master of Arts

By

Jason Baldowsky

April 2006

AKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Grateful acknowledgement is made for the valuable suggestions and help given by the chairman of my examining committee, Dr. Michael H. Hazlett, and other members of my committee, Professor Terry Mors and Professor Dennis Bowman.

Additionally the researcher would wish to thank the members of the Harvard, Fox Lake, and Round Lake Beach Police Departments for participating in this study.

Table of Contents

Chapter One

Introduction

The decision to use force is one of the most heavily criticized decisions an officer can make. The decision to use force has a much higher probability for civil litigation than other duties a police officer will perform (Bayley & Garofalo, 1989). Yet departments typically provide very little training in this area for their officers. Budget constraints and manpower shortages are common reasons for not conducting training. At the police academy a police recruit typically receives forty hours each in the areas of firearms training and arrest and control tactics (Bayley & Garofalo, 1989). Administrators who believe that the training obtained at the academy is sufficient for the duration of one's career are misguided for several reasons. First, the academy merely teaches officers basic skills while laying a foundation so officers can develop more advanced skills later. Second, firearms and defensive tactics are learned behaviors, and if regular practice does not occur, the skills diminish over time (Siddle, 1995, p.12).

The purpose of this research was to evaluate the use of force training programs in use by the Harvard, Illinois, Fox Lake, Illinois and Round Lake Beach, Illinois Police Departments. In this era of community policing, gaining the public trust is an essential component of a community-policing program. Citizen complaints and law suits for excessive use of force by the police can severely damage that trust. The public and the court system expect and demand that the police use force in a responsible manner. However, the very nature of police work requires that police officers use force to control a situation. The

challenge for police administrators becomes finding a way to ensure their officers are using force consistent with department policy and state law.

Research regarding the use of force training programs of Harvard, Fox Lake, and Round Lake Beach Police Departments was needed as no comprehensive assessment had ever been done before. These departments have been experiencing a rapid population growth, and as a result have seen their call volumes increase. The increase in call volumes has led to an increase in the number of use of force encounters. Although different police jurisdictions, both departments' training programs have similar goals.

The first goal is to enhance the officer's knowledge in officer safety skills. The training the officer undergoes provides the officer with skills and knowledge of how to safely conduct high-risk activities such as arrests, traffic stops, or domestic disputes. This knowledge is important as it assists the officer in being able to better articulate their actions when questioned (Rose and Warren, 2001, 3).

The second goal of training is to reduce the number of injuries officers sustain during use of force encounters. Training will improve the officer's ability to perform arrest and control tactics, which will reduce the chances the officer, is injured during the encounter (Siddle, 1995, p.12). According to studies conducted by the Department of Justice an officer is injured in forty-eight percent of all use of force encounters (Anderson et al., 1999). Given the rising costs in health care this should be an item of concern for police administrators responsible for managing a budget. When an officer is off active duty due to injury, the manpower shortage that results can become expensive for that municipality.

The third goal is to teach the officer when to use a specific level of force. This is an important goal to achieve, as the police are expected to use a reasonable amount of force necessary to control a subject (ILCS). This knowledge gives officers the ability to better articulate their actions, which will better protect themselves and the municipality should a citizen complain or a lawsuit arise.

To achieve these goals the training must include realistic, challenging scenarios. A variety of training methods need to be utilized to prepare officers for use of force encounters. These methods include, but are not limited to, hands-on training, written training, and audio/visual training. This research examined the training methods used by the Harvard, Fox Lake, and Round Lake Beach Police Departments to determine if their program goals are being achieved.

Frequency of training is equally as important as the training method utilized. Use of force encounters are high stress, high risk situations, with a high potential for injury. Stress affects the human body's ability to perform certain physical tasks in a variety of ways. Tasks such as shooting or wrestling become more difficult in this environment. This diminished performance reduces the possibility that an encounter will end quickly, which greatly increases the possibility that the officer or suspect will be injured (Siddle, 1995, p. 85). Training reduces the effects stress has on the body provided certain methods are used. This research examined literature regarding the effects of combat stress, the relevance of training, and what training methods are best suited for reducing combat stress. This literature assisted the researcher when evaluating the training programs studied.

This evaluation research tested hypotheses related to the use of force training programs of the Harvard, Fox Lake, and Round Lake Beach Police Departments. The research measured the police officer's street experiences using force and compared that to the officers training experiences. Areas such as the level of force most commonly used, and the areas most commonly trained are of particular interest to the researcher. It is proposed that the officers of the Harvard, Fox Lake, and Round lake Beach Police Departments receive disproportionate training in the use of force. Specifically, officers are trained at higher force levels than they actually use on the streets.

In the final section of the study, secondary data was obtained from a survey utilized by all three departments. The researcher examined the data from the survey to determine the statistical differences between the officer's street experiences and their training experiences. The sample consisted of all sworn officers on the Harvard, Fox Lake, and Round Lake Beach Police Departments. It was proposed that this evaluation provided a proper assessment of the training needs of the officers. Once the training needs or weaknesses had been identified, changes could be made to better prepare the officers for future use of force encounters.

This study attempted to find relationships between a officers gender, education level, years of police experience, and rank compared to the level of force used, the level of suspect resistance encountered, and whether or not an officer had been involved in a shoot/ no shoot situation. Due to a low sample population no significant relationships could be found in these areas. However

this study did identify differences in the use of force training provided and actual street experiences of the officer using force. In summary, most officers involved in shoot/ no shoot situations reported they encounters occurred at close range with the suspect and/or themselves moving. However when compared to the firearms training it was found officers still train using their firearms on stationary targets. Why this is considered an important issue will be discussed more in depth in following chapters.

To better evaluate the issue of police use of force and use of force training it is recommended that a much larger sample population be studied. In this way future research can obtain data as to the significance gender, education level, years of police experience, or rank may have on a use of force encounter. If significant relationships can be found in future research that will greatly assist police departments in upgrading their use of force training programs to better prepare their officers for actual use of force encounters.

CHAPTER 2

Literature Review

This research will address several topics, which are relevant to the training programs in use by the Harvard, Fox Lake, and Round Lake Beach Police Departments. These departments divide their training programs into two parts, firearms training, and arrest and control training. These training programs have been implemented as a means to achieve three departmental objectives. The first objective is to reinforce officer safety by providing the officer with practical skills to use during a use of force encounter (Gerretsen, E. 2004, p. 20). The second objective is to teach the officer how to responsibly use force (Gerretsen, 2004, p. 20). The third objective is to educate the officer as to when a specific level of force is justified (Gerretsen, 2004, p.20). These objectives were achieved by providing realistic training scenarios that challenge the officer's decision-making ability. This research examined three departments training programs in an effort to determine if their respective objectives are being met. In particular the researcher examined the officers' street experiences regarding the use of force, and compare them to the training offered. This evaluation research sought to discover if the three departments training programs were in fact providing practical training for their officers. Some variables that were examined are the frequency of force used, the most frequent level of force used. This level of force will be compared to the amount of training time spent on the various force levels. Reviewing existing studies and literature regarding police use of force, and use of force training was necessary to assist the researcher in properly evaluating this phenomenon.

There are four studies conducted by the United States Department of Justice (D.O.J) that examined the use of force by police in making arrests. Although arrests are not the only situation in which the police may use force, arrest data was chosen as these situations are better documented than other police activities. These in-depth studies focused on several areas such as the situations force is used most frequently, the most frequent level of force used, and the use of deadly force.

The first study by the D.O.J. examined the use of force by the Phoenix, Arizona Police Department during arrests. Data was collected for the study by surveying Phoenix police officers, and interviewing suspects who had been arrested. In summary the study discovered the following: the use of force was a rare occurrence, and the level of force used was typically low (Buchanan, Gardner, Hebrun, and Shade, 1996). Overall of the 1,585 arrests studied, force was used in twenty percent (317) of those arrests. The level of force used was typically low such as grabbing or wrestling with a subject. Finally it was the suspects actions not their age, gender or race, that determined if the police used force to arrest a subject (Buchanan et al., 1996).

The second study was larger in scale in that it randomly sampled citizens throughout the United States in an effort to collect data on police use of force. The findings in this particular study were similar to the Phoenix, Arizona study. Overall the use of force by the police accounted for the lowest percentage of police-citizen contacts, around one percent of all contacts (Greenfield, Kamish, and Smith, 1998). When the levels of force were examined, the levels police used were low in terms of severity (Greenfield et al., 1998). Grabbing or wrestling with a subject was the most common level of force used and this accounted for seventy-seven percent of all use of force

encounters (Greenfield et al., 1998). These findings are significant for police administrators and trainers because the majority of police use of force training focuses on more severe levels of force such as the use of firearms.

The third study focused on six police jurisdictions, and measured the amount of force the police used on citizens. Data was collected from a survey of the officers from Charlotte-Mecklenburg, North Carolina Police Department, Colorado Springs, Colorado Police Department, Dallas, Texas Police Department, St. Petersburg, Florida Police Department, San Diego, California Police Department, and the San Diego County, California Sheriff's Department (Adams et al., 1999). One of the first areas examined were the types of situations where police resorted to force most frequently. Making an arrest was the activity that had the highest potential for police use of force. Of the 7,512 arrests studied, force was used in 1,418 arrests, which are almost twenty percent (Adams et al., 1999). Like the previous studies, the most common level of force used remained low, typically wrestling or grabbing a suspect. This occurred in seventy-seven percent of arrests (1,092) where force was used (1418) (Adams et al., 1999). These studies findings provide consistent data regarding police use of force that trainers should be aware of when designing their programs.

The fourth D.O.J. study examined the nationwide use of deadly force by the police from 1976 to 1998. A total of 8,578 police shootings were examined and the data showed several consistencies to the afore-mentioned use of force studies (Brown, Greenfield, and Langan, 1998). First the situations where police used deadly force most frequently were those in which they were affecting an arrest. Second, deadly force was used only after the suspect committed a hostile action towards the police, such an act

might be shooting at an officer. Third, the majority of those suspects killed by the police were under the influence of alcohol or drugs (Brown et al., 1998). Less than one percent of use of force incidents results in the use of deadly force (Brown et al., 1998). Yet from a training perspective these results are important as they serve to illustrate how unpredictable police work can be.

USE OF FORCE TRAINING

Trainers need to take these findings into consideration when devising training scenarios. This way training sessions can be both challenging and realistic for the officers, which will improve their use of force decision-making. Trainers can use a variety of methods to create challenging training scenarios, and an examination of use of force training is needed to further illustrate this point.

To fully understand the importance of use of force training, a brief examination on the evolution of use of force training is needed. Police use of force training in the United States can be traced back to the late 19th century. Theodore Roosevelt, then Commissioner of the New York City Police Department, implemented a firearms training program for officers of that department (Brands, 1997, p.274). The purpose of this program was to improve the officers' marksmanship abilities, and give the officers the knowledge of when to use their firearms. It was not until the 1930s that police training in the use of force began to become standardized across the nation.

By the 1930s major metropolitan cities such as Chicago, New York and Los Angeles began to incorporate a training academy to provide basic law enforcement education to new officers (http://www.isp.il.us). Firearms training, arrest and control tactics were made part of the curriculum at this time and very little changed until the

1980s. Once an officer graduated from the academy they typically did not receive training in the use of force again. After the Supreme Court ruling in *Tennessee v. Garner* (1985), the use of force by the police came under close public scrutiny (Rose and Warren, 2001, p. 9.2). Departments nationwide began to conduct regular training in the use of their firearms, yet training on lower levels of force was not seen as necessary. The Harvard, Fox Lake, and Round Lake Beach Police Departments today conduct quarterly firearms training, and quarterly training regarding arrest and control tactics. To measure if this training is sufficient, an understanding of the dynamics of a use of force encounter is needed to better understand the importance of use of force training.

An encounter in which an officer has to use force to control a subject can be an emotionally charged experience. Feelings of anger or fear may be present in either party. This can make the encounter highly volatile and unpredictable. As such, the stress level is extremely high. As the heart rate and adrenaline levels increase, changes occur in the human body's ability to perform physical tasks.

According to Bruce Siddle (1995) there are three basic types of physical skills, which a human being can perform, gross motor skills, fine motor skills, and complex motor skills (p. 101). Gross motor skills are very simple movements utilizing the large muscles of the body. An example of a gross motor skill would be tackling someone. A fine motor skill requires some degree of hand eye coordination and a fair amount of manual dexterity. Examples of fine motor skills are most joint locking techniques. A complex motor skill requires a high degree of hand eye coordination and a high degree of manual dexterity. An example of a complex motor skill would be precision shooting. When the stress levels increase the ability to perform complex motor skills diminishes

immediately (Siddle, 1995, p. 35). When the heart rate increases to 150 beats per minute, fine motor skill performance diminishes, leaving the officer with the ability to perform only gross motor skills (Siddle, 1995, p.35). This is important to understand because the effects of stress combined with the diminished memory from lack of training, can produce an inadequately prepared officer. An inadequately prepared officer is more likely to be overcome by stress and react inappropriately. Regular training greatly improves an officers decision-making skills under this type of stress.

Police officers are trained to use force as a reaction to a suspect's behavior. For example, if a subject tries to pull away from an officer during handcuffing, officers are trained to execute a control hold to gain compliance. Without regular training officers are slower to react as they will have difficulty remembering what techniques to use. This confusion can turn into fear, causing the officer to lash out in desperation (Siddle, 1995, p. 65). This act of desperation could have adverse effects for the officer and the department. For example the officer may use a baton to subdue a subject who was only verbally noncompliant. The officer's actions could possibly be subject to civil or criminal proceedings. To understand how regular training affects reaction time, a closer look at how the body reacts to stimuli is needed.

According to Siddle (1995), human beings react to a stimulus in a five-step process. The first step is perceiving or identifying the stimulus. The second step is analyzing the stimulus to determine whether or not the stimulus is a threat. The third step evaluates the threat level and this carries over to the fourth step, the strategy phase. During the strategy phase the brain searches to find a way to neutralize the threat. This stage more so than any other is adversely affected by lack of training as past experiences

and past training is recalled. Poor training or a lack of training interrupt this phase and affect the fifth step, the initiation of motor action (p.69). This why an overreaction may occur during a use of force encounter as the officer is unable to recall a strategy to implement, so fear takes over and an inappropriate response may occur. Regular training provides the officer with a strategy, which has several benefits for the officer and the agency.

First regular training reduces stress for the officer. Training improves the ability to recognize and respond to threatening behavior in a controlled, efficient manner (Nowicki, 2003, p.40). Second, regular training makes an officer more confident. Confident officers are more willing to accept challenges and less likely to complain when assigned to menial tasks (Nowicki, 2003, p.40). With a reduction in stress and an increase in confidence departments will see an overall increase in morale. Regular training increases morale among subordinates because the employees feel the organization cares about their safety (Nowicki, 2003, p.40). Clearly regular training has many physical and psychological benefits for a police department. However an examination of the legal obligations regarding training is needed to better understand the importance of training.

There are three federal cases that law enforcement managers and trainers need to be aware of regarding use of force training. These cases are significant because they hold the law enforcement agency accountable for an officer's action. *Ohio vs. Harris (1989)* established that law enforcement personnel must receive training to perform their various duties, especially if those duties occur frequently (Rose and Warren, 2001, p.2.2). Use of force encounters are frequent, therefore training is needed on that subject matter. This

case makes it the responsibility of law enforcement managers to see to it that their subordinates are receiving training. Under *Ohio vs. Harris,* supervisors can also be required to pay punitive damages if the court finds there was a failure to train. Because of this case supervisors have a duty to train their subordinates, and ensure that the training follows department policy. Two other cases of significance are *Grahm vs. Connor (1989)* and *Valdez vs Abney (1986).*

These cases set the criteria under which an officer will be judged during a civil suit. It is important that law enforcement managers understand these cases so an effective program can be created. *Grahm vs. Connor (1989)* established the standard of objective reasonableness. Courts use this standard to rule if the officer was justified in their decision to use force. Factors the court used to reach this standard are the officers' experience, training, and equipment (Rose and Warren, 2001, p. 2.5). The court then determined if another officer with the same experience level would have acted the same way. Here again the court focused on training to determine justification. *Valdez vs. Abney (1986)* switched the burden of proof on civil suits from the plaintiff to the law enforcement agency. It is now the responsibility of the officer or law enforcement agency to prove that any force used was not excessive (Rose and Warren, 2001, 2.6). This case established seven vicarious liability factors for law enforcement agencies. If the court finds the department was in violation under any one factor, the department can be help liable. The seven factors are: hiring an unqualified employee, retaining an unqualified employee, negligent assignment of an unqualified employee, the employee using equipment they are not qualified to use, failure to train an employee, inadequate supervision, and a supervisor's failure to modify policy (Rose and Warren, 2001, p. 2.6).

This case forces law enforcement to create both policy and training programs, and adapt them as needed. Just as in the previous two cases federal law holds the law enforcement agency responsible for the subordinate's actions. Legally, there can be no excuse for not establishing a regular use of force training program. Failing to train is negligent supervision and can subject a law enforcement agency, and their responsible parties, to paying out large punitive damages. Another legal issue law enforcement managers need to know regarding case law is that not only can the plaintiff sue; the officer can sue for failing to train as well.

The case of *Owens vs. Hass (1979)* gives public safety employees the right to sue the department if injured, and it is determined that training could have prevented the injury (Rose and Warren, 2000, p. 2.8). Here again the courts hold law enforcement managers responsible for the training of their subordinates. The *Owens (1979)* case is one law enforcement managers need to pay particular attention to. According to the Federal Bureau of Investigations' Uniform Crime Report for 2001, 58,066 law enforcement officers were assaulted, with 16,494 sustaining injuries. Also in that same year 56 officers were killed in the line of duty (http://www.fbi.gov). These numbers were higher than they have been in recent years, and should be a warning sign for law enforcement managers. When an officer is involved in an encounter where force has to be used, there is a potential for injury. Since the officers themselves have the right to sue, it only makes sense to establish a regular training program. If a department has an established training program, and it is ruled the officer acted in violation of policy, then the agency is protected in the event of a law suit from either the plaintiff or the officer

(Rose and Warren, 2001, p. 2.8). It may be a sound management practice to establish a use of force training program.

Another issue supervisors need to be aware of is the department's responsibility to train versus budget restrictions. Departments, which do not conduct training due to restricted budgets, are not protected from liability. In *McClelland vs. Facteuau (1979)*, the court ruled that budgetary constraints are not a valid excuse for not training (Rose and Warren, 2001, p. 2.8). Every law enforcement agency whether from a small or large agency needs to be aware of this ruling. Law enforcement managers need to make the proper elected officials understand the importance of investing in training while approving a budget. The courts have no sympathy for departments that claim an inability to train due to strained budgets. The courts expect law enforcement managers to be creative and find a way to conduct regular training.

Managers and trainers also need to be aware of their departments' responsibility during firearms training. An officer involved shooting is almost guaranteed to result in civil litigation. Administrators responsible for training should be aware of the issues presented in *Zuchel v. Denver (1985)*. That federal case ruled that the traditional method of firearms training is ineffective. The court held that shooting at stationary targets does not adequately prepare an officer and therefore the department can be ordered to pay damages, even if the shooting was ruled justifiable. The *Zuchel(1985)* case ruled that range training should be supplemented with shoot no shoot scenarios, shooting on the move, low light shooting, and role playing during force on force scenarios (Olson, 1998, p.9). This way the officers are exposed to situations they will most likely encounter on the street. The courts feel that only by providing this higher level of training can an

officer make the correct decisions when facing a deadly force encounter. Before a training program can be established one last legal issue needs to be addressed. Departments need to create and implement a practical use of force policy before a training program can be implemented.

The purpose of a policy is to serve as a functional guide for line officers when decisions need to be made. A use of force policy should reinforce the department's expectations, goals, and objectives as to how a use of force encounter should be handled (Kinniard, 2003, p.58). This way officers will use force in a consistent manner, making it easier for supervisors to identify excessive use of force incidents. A sound policy should have two parts. The first is a written description as to when and under what circumstances an officer will use force. The second is an adoption of a use of force continuum (Kinniard, 2003, p. 58). The first part is relatively simple to create, as state statutes define an officer's right to use force. A department simply has to adopt the state statute as policy. By adopting the state statute the department's practices remain consistent with the law, which helps reduce civil liability (Boyle, 1993, p.5). Adopting the state statute alone is not sufficient as the statute does not tell specifically what type of force may be use to affect an arrest. The adoption of a use of force continuum will help make the policy stronger.

According to Professor Brian A. Kinniard (2003), a police use of force expert from Fort Hays State University, the use of force continuum is a strategic guide for police officers. The continuum consists of five levels of suspect behavior, and offers examples as to the corresponding level of force by the police officer. The cooperative subject is the first level. At this level verbal commands from the officer are sufficient to control the

subject. The next level is the passive resistor. Here the subject may be verbally non-complaint, but not exhibiting any physical resistance to the officer. The officer would be justified in using pepper spray or a control hold at this level Kinniard, 2003, p. 69). The third level is the active resistor. At this level the subject is physically resisting any attempts to be controlled by pulling away, trying to push free, running away and so on. An appropriate response for the officer would be to apply a control hold or deliver stunning strikes. At the fourth level the subject is actively assaulting the officer by punching, grabbing for the officers weapon, or kicking with the intent to harm the officer. Officers faced with subjects at this level would respond be defending themselves with an impact weapon, or less lethal weapons (Kinniard, 2003, p.69). Finally at the fifth level the subject commits a deadly assault. At this level the officer is faced with death or great bodily harm, so they will resort to their firearms to stop the individual (Kinniard, 2003, p. 69). A critical component of the use of force continuum is that the officer should not be required by policy to visit every level of the continuum in order to be equal with the subject. For example if an officer is faced with a subject who is trying to shoot them, the officer should not have to try verbal commands first then move up. Instead the officer should be able to move up and down the continuum as needed in order to quickly match the suspect's threat level (Kinniard, 2003, p.69). The adoption of a use of force continuum will make decision making easier for the officer as he or she will understand what the department expects during a use of force encounter. The challenge for administrators and trainers however, is to ensure that the training program mirrors the policy.

After a policy has been adopted there are several tactical considerations, which need to be addressed before training can begin. Instructor qualifications, current use of force data, and training methods need to be examined to produce the most realistic program.

A program is only as successful as the instructors who are in charge of it. It is imperative that only the most qualified individuals assume the responsibility of a use of force instructor. Being an instructor is challenging work as trainers will have to deal with budget constraints, manpower shortages, and personality conflicts. As noted earlier, departments are legally bound to provide training despite budget constraints, so a qualified instructor needs to posses several characteristics.

First, knowledge of the subject matter is critical. With knowledge comes credibility, which makes it easier to motivate others to train (Lombardo, Schroeder, and Strollo, 2000, p. 214). Instructors with prior experience in the martial arts, or firearms proficiency would make ideal candidates. However to protect the agency from civil liability, all instructors should be certified in conjunction with their respective state's training standards. This ensures the training program is consistent with the state standards, and that consistency helps to provide protection from civil litigation (Boyle, 1993, p.4). A second characteristic of a good instructor is creativity. Instructors will need to be find ways to overcome budget and manpower constraints. Also training must be realistic and practical. Close-minded, regimented thinking will not work; these instructors need to be open minded and willing to experiment (Lombardo et al., 2000). Being creative allows an instructor to devise creative training scenarios that will better prepare the officers for future use of force encounters. The third characteristic of a good

instructor is dedication. The instructor has to be a person who understands why use of force training is important, and readily accepts the challenges of a trainer Lombardo et al., 2000). There will be set backs that hamper training sessions, such as officers on sick leave, vacation, or those officers who simply do not want to be trained. These setbacks can be frustrating, but the instructor must have the fortitude to find a way to satisfy the departments training needs.

Law enforcement agencies have a difficult task trying to implement realistic training programs. Lack of available manpower, increasing call loads, and shrinking budgets are some problems that make training difficult. To adequately address their department's needs, administrators and trainers need to examine the current data on use of force encounters. By examining national data trainers can identify what type of force is most frequent. This way trainers can better streamline their programs so officers can receive training for situations they will most likely encounter.

Regarding less lethal use of force such as handcuffing, control holds and so on. The most common type of force used is relatively low on the use of force continuum. The use of pepper spray is the most frequent tactic employed to control resistive behavior (Travis, 1996). Additionally, officers encounter the most suspect resistance during the handcuffing procedure (Travis, 1996). Trainers should dedicate a greater portion of training in the various methods to control a subject during handcuffing. Instruction on proper handcuffing, frisking, and control holds, takedowns, and pepper spray should be covered in this area of instruction. Although the level of resistance may be low at this point (a suspect trying to pull away for example), if the suspect is not controlled quickly, then the suspect will likely become increasingly more violent (Travis, November 1996).

Training officers to use their impact weapons, strikes, and other counter measures is important, but the majority of training needs to address handling this lower level of resistance. This way the officers' training is more practical and therefore more valuable.

Trainers should also research the data on officer-involved shootings, and adjust their firearms training accordingly. Most law enforcement training involves standing still at a distance of twenty-five yards, and firing at a stationary target down range (Suarez, 1996, p.24). While this is important to develop the basic fundamentals needed for precision shooting, it does not adequately prepare an officer for a deadly force encounter. Most officer-involved shootings, nearly eighty percent, occur at a distance of less than seven yards (Suarez, 1996, p.24). Over fifty percent of these shootings actually occur at a distance of less than five feet (Suarez, 1996, p.24). Yet academies and police departments conduct little, if any training at this range. The techniques that work at twenty-five yards simply will not work at extremely close range. A close quarters shooting is a fast, violent encounter. The techniques at twenty-five yards require time to effectively acquire the sights and fire, time an officer simply does not have when attacked within five feet. Additionally, most shootings occur in low light conditions, and with moving targets (Suarez, 1996, p.24). Again, law enforcement agencies conduct very little training under these conditions. If firearms instructors wish to adequately prepare officers for a deadly force encounter, then they need to have a training program that reflects reality. Once an instructor has identified the training needs of the department, there are several training methods, which should be used.

There are three training methods, that when used together, can effectively meet the training needs of a law enforcement agency. Written training, video training, and

hands on training will provide the officer with the practical knowledge they need to be successful during a use of force encounter. This knowledge will help police officers to better articulate their actions when questioned by department officials, defense attorneys and so on.

Written training has several advantages for the trainer. First written training is convenient. Police officers can read the information at their own pace, which increases the chances for memory retention (Nowicki, 2003, p. 30). Second, scheduling is not an issue as the instructor does not need to have contact with the trainee to deliver the information. Simply placing a training bulletin in an officer's departmental mailbox is sufficient. It is recommended that the officer sign documentation indicating they have received and understand the material(Nowicki, 2003, p.30). Examples of topics for written training bulletins would be officer safety updates, identifying assualtive body language, and proper use of force report writing.

Video training like written training has several of the same advantages. Scheduling is not an issue as the police officer views the video at their own pace. An advantage video training has over written training is that it utilizes more than one of the body's senses. When viewing a video the viewer picks up the information both visually and audibly. Since more than one of the senses is involved, a greater percentage of the information is retained (Nowicki, 2003, p. 30). There are many videos dealing with use of force issues that would make an excellent addition to a department's training program. Topics such as advanced shooting techniques, self-defense against edged weapons, and verbal de-escalation techniques are just a few topics that can be covered during training.

Hands on training is the most important aspect of use of force training. Shooting, handcuffing, or using an impact weapon are physical skills. In order for police officers to be proficient in these skills they will need hands on repititions. Repetitions are based upon the principle of interval reinforcement. Through interval reinforcement a trainee executes a set number of repetitions for a particular skill to help develop muscle memory. For example, if six repetitions of a skill are executed, the trainee will still retain ninety percent of that information after thirty days (Nowicki, 2003, p. 30). To meet the real life challenges an officer will face, two types of hands on training will need to be conducted. Static and dynamic training are essential for developing skill and improving decision making under stress.

Static training is a controlled method of skill development. There is very little stress in the training environment, and the trainee is exposed to little or no resistance. Static training is ideal for developing sound fundamentals such as a proper way to execute a control hold, or shoot accurately (Danaher &Faulkner, 1997, p.9). When developing drills for static training instructors should understand how stress affects the body. In this way they can implement techniques, which will have a greater chance for success under stress.

As noted earlier, gross motor skills have a higher success rate under stress than fine or complex motor skills. Most control holds are complex motor skills, and typically will fail under real life conditions (Danaher et al., 1997). However, the situations under which an officer will apply a control hold are low on the use of force continuum. Regular training in the use of control holds reduces the stress for the officer, increases their confidence, and increases the chances for success. Additionally, instructors should take a

careful look at the defensive tactics programs to see how many techniques there actually are. Teaching too many techniques can lead to information overload, making it difficult for the student to retain the information (Danaher et al., 1997). Reducing the program to a few basic techniques that are easily adaptable to a variety of situations, makes memory retention and skill development much more effective.

Firearms training instructors should have officers utilize an Isosceles Stance and/or a one handed style, as compared to the Weaver Stance (Olson, 1998, p.8). The Weaver Stance involves holding the officer's strong hand straight out towards the target, while the weak hand is pulling back creating counter pressure to balance the firearm. The feet are positioned so the officer is bladed away from the target, making the officer a smaller target (Olson, 1998, p.8). This movement is a complex motor skill and under the stress of deadly force encounter, has a higher failure rate. The Isosceles Stance involves fully extending the arms from the body, and keeping both feet pointed towards the target. This movement is a gross motor skill and more natural under stress, giving this technique a better chance of succeeding under stress (Olson, 1998, p.8). The one handed style helps effectively prepare the officer for shooting situations within the five-foot range. The one handed style involves keeping the firearm tucked close to the officer's body while keeping the other hand free to block, strike, or push away from the threat (Suarez, 1996, p.103). Whether it is defensive tactics or firearms training, the repititions during static training are critical for officer safety. Instructors need to ensure the officer's basics are solid. This way during dynamic training the officer will flourish.

Dynamic training when combined with static training greatly increases the officer's chances for success. Dynamic training places police officers under stress and

forces them to make critical decisions (Olson, 1998, p.6). All the skills learned in static, written and video training can be applied during dynamic training. Officers will experience a variety of resistance both verbally and physically during dynamic training. This will force the officer to use various strategies to control the situation. The officer might have to try verbal skills to deescalate the situation, or execute a control hold, or resort to deadly force. This level of training challenges the police officers' ability to evaluate threats, and teaches the officer to properly escalate or deescalate the levels of force (Williams, 1999, p.3). Dynamic training should focus on role-playing situations that mirror an environment an officer might encounter. This way the training is practical and more useful for the officers. An important point to consider during dynamic training is that instructors must be sure not to create impossible, no win situations. Trainees need positive training experiences in order to feel secure in their ability to carry out their duties during a use of force encounter. Without this confidence, officers may be reluctant to use force when necessary. Dynamic training is difficult to schedule but must be utilized to adequately prepare police officers for use of force encounters.

Currently the Harvard, Fox Lake, and Round Lake Beach Police Department provide in-service training in the use of force. The training is divided into two areas; firearms training and defensive tactics. The following will be a summary of the training programs currently used by these departments.

The Harvard Police Department currently has one instructor for firearms training and one for defensive tactics training. Due to budget constraints, training in these areas are only conducted during an officers' regularly assigned shift. Firearms training are conducted four times a year (Mrozak, 1993, p.30). The training primarily consists of

static drills designed to improve the officer's accuracy (Mrozak, 1993, p.30). This research will focus on the experiences of Harvard Police officers during shooting situations, and compare that to the current firearms training offered. An examination will be conducted to determine if the training reflects what the police officers experience.

The defensive tactics program is based on Bruce Siddle's Pressure Point Control Tactics program (P.P.C.T.). This program is based on the principle that stress affects a person's motor skills, thereby making specific techniques better suited for use of force encounters (Siddle, 1989, p.15). Tactics classified as gross motor skills are preferred as Siddle's research has shown gross motor skills are easier to perform under combat stress conditions (Siddle, 1989, p.25).The training program is divided into four levels: contact control, pain compliance, active assault, and impact weapons (Mrozak, 1993, p.30). This division occurs so officers receive the maximum number of repetitions in one area at a time. This is done so the officer is not overwhelmed with information, which can decrease memory retention (Siddle, 1995, p. 65). Training occurs on a monthly basis with one level taught each month. The training sessions are designed to be thirty to forty-five minutes in length with the officers receiving one training session a month (Mrozak, 1993, p.30). The training sessions are dependent on available manpower, and call volume. A more in depth explanation of the defensive tactics program will occur later in this chapter.

The Fox Lake Police Department's training programs are similar in structure to that of the Harvard Police Department. Budgetary constraints limit all training to an officer's regularly assigned shift. There are currently two firearms instructors and they are responsible for training twenty-five officers. Training occurs once a month and each

session lasts one hour (Gerretsen, 2004, p.20). The training primarily consists of static drills designed to improve an officer's accuracy (Gerretsen, 2004, p.20). This research will focus on the firearms training offered, and compare that to the police officers experiences in shooting situations. The purpose for this will be to evaluate how practical the training is for the officers.

The Fox Lake Police Department has two instructors for their defensive tactics program, and the program is based on Bruce Siddle's Pressure Point Control Tactics System (P.P.C.T.). Training sessions occur during an officer's regularly assigned shift, and each session lasts one hour (Gerretsen, 2004, p.30). The training program is divided into four levels: contact control, pain compliance, active assault, and impact weapons (Gerretsen, 2004, p.20). This division is necessary so the police officers are not overloaded with information, which could hamper memory retention. It is intended that the officers receive one hour of training each month in defensive tactics. The training sessions are highly dependent on available manpower, and call volume.

As stated earlier, both defensive tactics programs are divided into four levels. In each level a wide variety of techniques are taught to the officers, so the division is also necessary to keep the sessions within the allotted time. For example in a session involving the use of contact control, police officers are taught how to handcuff a subject, search them, and control resistance during handcuffing (Siddle, 1989, p.4-31). A session in the use of pain compliance would teach officers when to use pepper spray, and how to apply control holds on a resisting subject (Siddle, 1989, p5-23). The session on countering active assault would focus on self-defense techniques. This level teaches officers how to defend themselves against punches, kicks, and weapon retention skills

(Siddle, 1989, 7-35). Finally the session on impact weapons includes how to use a baton, what the proper target areas are, and under what circumstances the weapon may be used (Siddle, 1989, 9-29). The drills are primarily static in nature and designed to improve the fundamental skills of the officer. This research will focus on the defensive tactics training and compare that to the police officers street experiences. The purpose will be to evaluate how well both departments training programs reflect what the officers actually experience.

The Round Lake Beach Police Department conducts firearms training on a quarterly basis (at least four times a year), and the training consists mostly of officers engaging stationary targets. Accurate fire is the primary goal of the training sessions. The Round Lake Beach Police Department does not currently use a defensive tactics program as that is still under development at the time of this study (M. Scott, personal communication, May 17, 2005).

Based upon this literature there are questions regarding the application of these training methods to the actual reality of street use of force or control. Given the limitations on training, as well as liability issues faced by officers and supervisors, it is important to judge the perceived effectiveness of such training.

CHAPTER THREE

Methodology

This research focused on data obtained from a cross sectional-exploratory design survey offered to police officers from the Harvard (IL), Fox Lake (IL), and Round Lake Beach (IL) Police Departments. A survey was distributed to all sworn officers from these departments. The focus of the survey was officers who were currently employed by these departments, and their use of force experiences, to evaluate the in-service training programs offered to these officers. The training supervisors from each department submited copies of the survey to the researcher for data collection. The questionnaire addressed areas necessary for the researcher to conduct an evaluation study of both departments training programs. Categories such as the frequency force are used, the level of force used most frequently, the level of force trained at most frequently, were some of the areas evaluated. The population for this study consisted of all sworn officers from both Harvard, Fox Lake, and Round Lake Beach Police Departments, a total of 75 sworn officers.

Operational definitions

There is a great deal of terminology surrounding police use of force training, which must first be defined and operational zed. To see how many of these terms were used in the study see Appendix B and Appendix C.

Use of force A physical act used by the police officer to control a non-complaint suspect.

Compliant subject	A subject who cooperates with a police officers commands.
Non-complaint subject	A person who refuses to obey verbal commands by an officer and or commits a physical act in an effort to resist the performance of that officer's duties.
Training	Any documented education an officer receives in the use of force.
Verbal commands	Stated orders by an officer to a citizen to perform a task such as exiting a vehicle.
Contact control	A method of force that controls a non-complaint subject by means of physical contact that is not designed to cause injury. This can be done by a firm grip or the application of pepper spray (O.C. Spray).
Pain compliance control	An unarmed method of force that involves temporarily placing a non-complaint suspect into a hold that produces pain until the suspect complies with verbal commands. This is done through the use of control holds or joint locks.

Joint locks	Physically manipulating a person's joints in such a way that pressure is exerted on the ligament, tendons, or muscles, which causes pain and/or injury to that joint.
Hard empty hand control	An unarmed method of force that involves punching, kneeing, or choking a non-complaint subject to gain control.
Impact weapons	A method of force that utilizes a blunt object such as an expandable baton, PR-24, knight stick, to strike a non-complaint subject in an effort to gain control of that subject.
Deadly force	A method of force that will cause death or great bodily harm to a non-complaint subject.
Passive resistance	A non-complaint subject who resists arrest by not complying with verbal commands and or physical control efforts. Subject does not attempt to defeat the officer's control efforts, rather just remains physically rigid or becomes dead weight.

Defensive resistance A non-complaint subject who attempts to defeat an officer's effort to arrest that subject by pushing, pulling away, or running away.

Active resistance A non-complaint subject who physically attacks the officer by punching, kicking, etc.. in an effort to defeat any attempts to be arrested.

Deadly assault A non-complaint subject whose physical assault on the officer is likely to cause death or great bodily harm.

O.C. spray Oleoresin capsicum spray, or pepper spray. A non-flammable spray designed to irritate the eyes and sinuses in an effort to temporarily incapacitate a subject.

Shoot/ No Shoot Situation A situation where a suspect's actions rise to the level of deadly force and the officer must decide whether or not to use deadly force or a lower level of force.

Use of Force Continuum A reference guide for officers that describes what level of force is appropriate for a suspect's actions.

Statistically Significant A test result that has a numerical value which indicates a relationship between variables.

Years of Police Experience The length of time the officer has worked as a police officer measured in years.

Officer's Rank The position or title the officer holds on their department.

Officer's Education Level The highest level of formal education the officer has attained.

Level of Force Trained at Most Often The level of force the officer has received the most training in compared to all the levels of force an officer may use in performing their duties.

Proposition and Accompanying Hypothesis

It is proposed that differences in the use of force, and the experience regarding use of force will vary by the characteristics of the officer. In order to test this proposition the following hypotheses were examined using data collected from the surveys conducted by the Harvard, Fox Lake, and Round Lake beach Police Departments.

Ho 1 There is no significant observed versus expected difference between gender and the level of force they use most frequently in Harvard, Fox Lake, and Round Lake Beach Police Departments in 2005.

H0 2 There is no significant observed versus expected difference between an officer's years of experience and the level of force they use most frequently in Harvard, Fox Lake, and Round Lake Beach

Police Departments in 2005.

H0 3 There is no significant observed versus expected difference between an officer's rank and the level of force they use most frequently in Harvard, Fox Lake, and Round Beach Police Departments in 2005.

H04 There is no significant observed versus expected difference between an officer's education level and the level of force they use most frequently in Harvard, Fox Lake and Round Lake Beach Police Departments in 2005.

H05 There is no significant observed versus expected difference between an officer's gender and the type of resistance most frequently encountered in Harvard, Fox Lake, and Round Lake Beach Police Departments in 2005.

H06 There is no significant observed versus expected difference between an officer's years of experience and the type of resistance most frequently encountered in Harvard, Fox Lake and Round Lake Beach Police Departments in 2005.

H07 There is no significant observed versus expected difference between an officer's rank and the type of resistance most frequently encountered in Harvard, Fox Lake, and Round Lake Beach Police Departments in 2005.

H08 There is no significant observed versus expected difference between an officer's education level and the type of resistance most frequently encountered in Harvard, Fox Lake, and Round Lake Beach Police Departments in 2005.

H09 There is no significant observed versus expected difference between an officer's gender and whether they have or have not been in a shoot no shoot situation in Harvard, Fox Lake, and Round Lake Beach Police Departments in 2005.

H010 There is no significant observed versus expected difference between an officers education level and whether they have or have not been in a shoot no shoot situation in Harvard, Fox Lake, and Round Lake Beach Police Departments in 2005.

H011 There is no significant observed versus expected difference between an officer's education level and whether they have or have not been in a shoot no shoot situation in Harvard, Fox Lake, and Round Lake Beach Police Departments in 2005.

H012 There is no significant observed versus expected difference between an officer's rank and whether they have or have not been in a shoot no shoot situation in Harvard, Fox Lake, and Round Lake Beach Police Departments in 2005.

H013 There is no significant observed versus expected difference between the level of force used most frequently, and the level of force trained at most frequently in Harvard, Fox Lake, and Round Lake Beach Police Departments in 2005.

H014 There is no significant observed versus expected difference between the conditions officers experience during shoot no shoot situations and the

conditions they experience during firearms training in Harvard, Fox Lake, and Round Lake Beach Police Departments in 2005.

H015 There is no significant observed versus expected difference between the conditions officers experience using force and the conditions they experience during defensive tactics training in Harvard, Fox Lake, and Round Lake Beach Police Departments in 2005.

The data used in this study was derived by a survey, which collected primary experience and perception data on officer use of force and use of force training. The data was collected to assist in evaluating the street experiences of the officers, and the training experiences of the officers. These sources were used due to their availability, low cost, and being less time consuming. There are a number of advantages in using survey data collected from officers in the three departments considered. First the survey will be based on the officer's perceptions and or memory of use of force experiences. This may not be an accurate reflection of what the officers are actually experiencing. Second, there may be interpretation problems regarding the questions on the survey. Fox Lake, Round lake Beach, and Harvard Police Departments use different terminology in their training and policies to describe suspect resistance levels, and officer use of force levels. The survey utilized will need to use terminology that is familiar to officers on either department. Third, not every officer may respond to this survey. Fourth the possibility of the Hawthorne Effect exists. This could lead to errorless or biased results during calculation. Fifth officers participating in this survey may provide socially acceptable answers.

The data from this survey was collected by sampling the entire population of the Harvard, Fox Lake, and Round Lake Beach Police Departments. Combined this will be a total of seventy-four sworn officers. This survey asked questions regarding the officer's street experiences using force, and their use of force training experiences. The data then was compared to determine if the training experiences of the officers is a realistic reflection of their street experiences. The findings are intended to be used to evaluate the current training programs to gain a better understanding of what the training needs are for the officers.

Units of Analysis

The units of analysis for this research were the sworn police officers of the Harvard, Fox Lake, and Round Lake Beach Police Departments. The officer's street and training experiences were examined and calculated. The results of this survey were stored in a secure facility by the researcher, and only manually retrieved and reviewed by the researcher. The time frame of the survey responses was between May 15, 2005 to June 15, 2005.

Levels of Measurement

For the purpose of this study, the following variable codebook was derived from the survey instrument of the officers sampled.

Variable	Label of Variable	Unit of Measure
Gender	Gender of the Officer. 1= Female 2= Male	Nominal

Experience Level	Years of Police Experience	Interval Ratio
	1= 0 to 4	
	2= 5 to 9	
	3= 10-14	
	4= 15-19	
	5= 20-29	
	6= 30 or more	
Education Level	Officer's Education Level	Nominal
	1= H.S. Diploma/G.E.D.	
	2= Associate Degree	
	3= Bachelors Degree	
	4= Graduate Degree	
	5= Doctorate	
	6= Other Degree/Certificate	
Rank	Officer's Rank on the Department	Nominal
	1= Patrolman/Detective	
	2= Sergeant/ Commander	
	3= Lieutenant/ Deputy Chief	
	4= Chief	

Force Used	Level of Force Used by the Officer	Interval Ratio
	1= Verbal Commands	
	2= Contact Control	
	3= Pain Compliance Control	
	4= Hard Empty Hand Control	
	5= Impact Weapons	
	6= Deadly Force	
Resistance Level	Level of Resistance by Suspect	Interval Ratio
	1= Complaint Suspect	
	2= Passive Resistance	
	3= Defensive Resistance	
	4= Active Resistance	
	5= Deadly Assault	
Training Level	Use of Force Training Levels	Interval Ratio
	1= Verbal Commands	
	2= Contact Control	
	3= Pain Compliance Control	
	4= Hard Empty Hand Control	
	5= Impact Weapons	
	6= Deadly Force	

Shoot no Shoot Conditions 1 Distance From Suspect Interval Ratio

1= Close Distance (0-21 ft)

2= Mid Distance (22 ft –45 ft)

3= Long Distance (46 ft and beyond)

Shoot no Shoot Conditions 2 Officer/ Suspect Actions Interval Ratio

1= Officer and/or suspect both moving no cover used

2= Officer behind cover, suspect is exposed

3= Officer is exposed, suspect is behind cover used

4= Officer and suspect are stationary, no cover used

5= Other situation

Range Training 1 Distance From Target Interval Ratio

1= Close Distance (0-21 ft)

2= Mid Distance (22-45 ft)

3= Long Distance (46 ft and beyond)

Range Training 2 Officer/ Target Actions Interval Ratio

1= Officer and/or target are moving, no cover used

2= Officer behind cover, target is exposed

3= Officer is exposed engages target that is behind cover

4= Officer and target are stationary, no cover used

Use of Force Officer/ Suspect Actions Interval Ratio

1– Officer initiates encounter

2= Suspect initiates encounter

3= Other situation

Officer Perceptions 1	Realism of Defensive Tactics Program	Interval Ratio
	1= yes	
	2= no	
	3= not sure	
Officer Perceptions 2	Realism of Range Training	Interval Ratio
	1= yes	
	2= no	
	3= not sure	
Use of Force Policy 1	Officer Knowledge of Policy	Interval Ratio
	1= yes	
	2= no	
	3= not sure	
Use of Force Policy 2	Policy Covered During Training	Interval Ratio
	1= yes	
	2= no	
	3= not sure	
Use of Force Policy 3	Policy/Training Program Consistency	Interval Ratio
	1= yes	
	2= no	
	3= not sure	

Data gathered for this research was examined using descriptive statistics. Descriptive statistics focus on relationships between variables in a data set including the use of frequency tables on all variables. The Chi Square Independent Samples Procedure was used to compare actual street use of frequency, with use of force training frequency. These tests measured the significant relationships between the street experiences and the training provided, as well as officers' demographics. Rejection of a null hypothesis was done only after the chance of sampling error playing any part in such differences was reduced to less than five chances out of 100 ($p<.05$). Magnitude was measured using the Cramer's V statistic. In cases of small frequency counts in contingency tables, the Fischer Exact Test of Statistical Significance was used in addition to the Chi Square Test to compensate for inflation of the Chi Squared as to such low frequency counts.

Limitations

There were several limitations to this research. First, the results of the data were applicable to the population studied and not generalizable to other police agencies. Second, there may be interpretation issues regarding the questionnaire. The survey was based on the officers' perceptions so the accuracy of the data could be questioned due to memory loss, or compounding of events. Third, the Hawthorne Effect may result as officers recognize they are a topic of interest and may provide socially acceptable answers because of this. Finally not every officer may wish to participate in this survey given the topic. Care must be taken to conduct the survey so that the officers remain anonymous and

confidential to improve the reliability of the results. In an attempt to overcome these limitations a cover letter defined the suspect resistance levels, and the corresponding officer force levels.

Chapter 4

Data Analysis

The following is a summary of the study totals. Fifty of the 78 total officers responded to the survey for a response percentage of sixty-four percent. The 50 participants consisted of 41 patrolman, 8 sergeants, and 1 lieutenant. Forty-six of the respondents were male and 4 were female. The 50 respondents years of police experience broke down as follows. Sixteen had between 0 to 4 years police experience. Eleven had between 5 to 9 years experience. Seven had between 10 to 14 years experience. Seven had between 15 to 19 years experience. Seven had between 20 to 24 years of police experience, and 2 respondents indicated they had between 25 and 29 years of experience. The education levels of the respondents were equally as varied as the years of police experience.

The 50 respondents education levels were as follows. One reported having a General Equivalency Degree. Sixteen respondents reported having a high school education. Fifteen respondents reported having an associate's degree. Sixteen respondents reported having a bachelor's degree. One respondent reported having a graduate degree, and another respondent indicated their education level as an other degree. Due to low cell frequencies, the categories of education level, years of police experience, and rank were collapsed in an effort to better determine significance rates. The first area examined in the study was the level of force the respondents listed as using most often.

Level of Force Used Most Often

On the survey used for this study, the officers had an option of five different levels of force to choose from, when asked which level of force they use the most. The lowest level of force was contact control and the highest level was deadly force. The use of verbal commands was not considered for this study, as a subject who complies with an officers' verbal commands is considered cooperative. This study focused on police use of force as it applied to a suspect's resistance level, therefore the use of verbal commands was not relevant to this study. The level of force the respondents indicated was used most was the use of contact control. Thirty-nine of the 50 respondents (78%), reported using contact control most often when countering suspect resistance. Eleven of 50 respondents (22 %) reported using pain compliance most often when countering suspect resistance. None of the respondents indicated using hard empty hand control, impact weapons, or deadly force as their most frequent level of force used. See table 1 for results.

Table 1 Level of Force Used Most Often By Police

LevelUsed

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Contact Control	39	78.0	78.0	78.0
	Pain Complaince	11	22.0	22.0	100.0
	Total	50	100.0	100.0	

To further evaluate this phenomenon several other variables were examined. The purpose of this was to determine if an officer's use of force differs based on gender, education level, years experience, or rank.

Gender and the Level of Force Used Most

Regarding gender and the use of force the breakdown was as follows. Three of 4 female officers (75%) reported using contact control most often. Thirty-six of 46 male officers (78%) indicated using contact control most often. Pain compliance was reported as being used by 1 female (25% of females) and 10 males (22 % of male officers). See table 2 for further.

Table 2

Level Of Force Used Most Often by Officers Compared Across Officers Gender in Harvard (IL), Fox Lake (IL), and Round Lake Beach Police Departments in 2005

LevelUsed * sex Crosstabulation

			sex		
			1 male	1 female	Total
LevelUsed	Contact Control	Count	36	3	39
		% within sex	78.3%	75.0%	78.0%
	Pain Complaince	Count	10	1	11
		% within sex	21.7%	25.0%	22.0%
Total		Count	46	4	50
		% within sex	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Yates Corrected Chi Square = 0.2286 Degrees of Freedom = 1
Critical Value = 3.8415 Fischer Exact Probability = .64285

In Table 2 the differences between gender and the level of force the officers used most often was compared. Based upon the observed versus expected differences, no significant difference was found. The null hypothesis was accepted. The Chi Square of 0.2286 was significantly lower than the minimum critical value difference-to-error of 3.8415. Gender does not help predict the level of force a police officer will use. The Fischers Exact Probability of Sampling Error was 64.285% meaning that chances of accidental differences across gender was high and that no real differences could be found. Due to low cell frequencies, care should be taken in interpreting these findings, so no true prediction of the level of force used most often can be made.

Education Level and the Level of Force Used Most

Regarding the officers' education level and the level of force used most the two categories for education level were used when the cells were collapsed. These categories were officers with no college education and those with a college education. Thirteen of 18 (72.2%) officers with a general equivalency degree or high school diploma reported using contact control most often. Five of 18 (27.8%) officers with a G.E.D. or high school diploma reported using pain compliance most often. Twenty-six of 32 (81.2%) officers with a college education reported using contact control as the level of force they use most often. Six of 32 (18.8%) officers, with a college education report using pain compliance as the level of force used most often. See table 3 for further

Table 3

Level of Force Used Most Often Compared Across Officer Education Level in Harvard (IL), Fox Lake (IL), and Round Lake Beach (IL) Police Departments in 2005

LevelUsed * education Crosstabulation

			education		
			G.E.D./ High School	College and above	Total
LevelUsed	Contact Control	Count	15	24	39
		% within education	75.0%	80.0%	78.0%
	Pain Complaince	Count	5	6	11
		% within education	25.0%	20.0%	22.0%
Total		Count	20	30	50
		% within education	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Yates Corrected Chi Square = 0.1465 Degrees of Freedom= 1 Critical Value= 3.8415

In Table 3 the differences between an officers education level and the level of force the officers used most often was compared. Based upon the observed versus expected differences, no significant difference was found. The null hypothesis was accepted. The Chi Square of 0.1465 was significantly lower than the minimum critical

value difference-to-error of 3.8415. An officer's education level does not help predict the level of force a police officer will use. Due to low cell frequencies, care should be taken in interpreting these findings, so no true prediction of the level of force used most often can be made.

Years of Police Experience and the Level Of Force Used Most

When an officers years of experience were compared to the level of force reported as used most often, two categories were used to examine an officer's years of police experience. These were officers with less than five years police experience, and officers with five or more years of police experience. The breakdown was as follows:

Eleven of 16 (68.8%) officers with less than five years of police experience reported using contact control as the level of force used most often. Five of 16 (31.2%) officers with less than five years of police experience reported using pain compliance as the level of force used most often. Twenty-eight of 34 (82.4%) officers with five or more years of police experience reported using contact control as the level of force used most often. Six of 34 (17.6%) officers with five or more years of police experience reported using pain compliance as the level of force used most often. See table 4 for further.

Table 4

Levels of Force Used Most Often by An Officer Compared Across years of Officer Experience in Harvard (IL), Fox Lake (IL), and Round Lake Beach (IL) Police Departments in 2005

LevelUsed * YrsExp Crosstabulation

			YrsExp		
			0-4 yrs	5 yrs or more	Total
LevelUsed	Contact Control	Count	11	28	39
		% within YrsExp	68.8%	82.4%	78.0%
	Pain Complaince	Count	5	6	11
		% within YrsExp	31.3%	17.6%	22.0%
Total		Count	16	34	50
		% within YrsExp	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Yates Corrected Chi Square= 0.514 Degrees of Freedom= 1
Critical Value = 3.8415

In Table 4 the differences between an officers years of police experience and the level of force the officers used most often was compared. Based upon the observed versus expected differences, no significant difference was found. The null hypothesis was accepted. The Chi Square of 0.514 was significantly lower than the minimum critical value difference-to-error of 3.8415. Years of police experience do not help predict the level of force a police officer will use. Due to low cell frequencies, care should be taken in interpreting these findings, most likely any differences in the table are caused by sampling error so no true prediction of the level of force used most often can be made.

Officers Rank and the Level of Force Used Most

When an officer's rank was compared to the level of force used most often, two categories were used to interpret officer rank. Rank was divided into two classes. Patrolman and those sergeants and above. The breakdown was as follows:

Thirty-one of 41 patrolman (75.6%) report using contact control most. Ten of 41 patrolman (24.4%) report using pain compliance most. Eight of 9 sergeants and above (88.9 %) report using contact control most often. One of 9 sergeants and above (11.1%), reports using pain compliance most often. See table 5 for further.

Table 5

Level of Force Used Most Often by Rank of the Officer's in Harvard (IL), Fox Lake (IL), and Round Lake Beach (IL) Police Departments in 2005

LevelUsed * Rank Crosstabulation

			Rank		
			Patrolman	*Sergeant and above*	*Total*
LevelUsed	Contact Control	Count	31	8	39
		% within Rank	75.6%	88.9%	78.0%
	Pain Complaince	Count	10	1	11
		% within Rank	24.4%	11.1%	22.0%
Total		Count	41	9	50
		% within Rank	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Yates Corrected Chi Square= 0.1819 Degrees of Freedom= 1
Critical Value = 3.8415 Fischer's Exact Probability = .35469

In Table 5 the differences between an officers rank and the level of force the officers used most often was compared. Based upon the observed versus expected differences, no significant difference was found. The null hypothesis was accepted. The Chi Square of 0.1819 was significantly lower than the minimum critical value difference-to-error of 3.8415. An officer's rank does not help predict the level of force a police officer will use. The Fischers Exact Probability of Sampling Error was 35.469%, meaning that chances of accidental differences across an officer's rank was high and that no real differences could be found. Due to low cell frequencies, care should be taken in interpreting these findings, so no true prediction of the level of force used most often can be made.

Suspect Resistance Level

The second area examined in this study was the suspect resistance level the responding officers encounter most. On the survey used for this study, officers were asked to select from four levels of suspect resistance. Verbal non-compliance, defensive resistance, unarmed active assault, and deadly assault were the levels offered. None of the officers surveyed indicated unarmed active assault or deadly assault as the level of suspect resistance encountered most often. The level of suspect resistance officers indicated they encountered most was verbal non-compliance. Thirty-three of 50 officers (67%) indicated encountering verbal non-compliance most often. While 17 of 50 officers (34 %) indicated defensive resistance as the level of resistance encountered most. See Table 6 for further.

Table 6

Comparison of Suspect Resistance Level Encountered Most Often by Officers of the Harvard (IL), Fox Lake (IL), and Round Lake Beach (IL) Police Departments in 2005

Resistance

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Verbal Noncomplaince	33	66.0	66.0	66.0
	Defensive Resistance	17	34.0	34.0	100.0
	Total	50	100.0	100.0	

To further evaluate this phenomenon several variable were examined in relation to suspect resistance levels. The purpose of this was to determine if an officer's gender, education level, year's experience, or rank have any bearing on the level of suspect resistance they encounter.

Gender and Suspect Resistance Level

The first category examined was gender as it relates to suspect resistance level. The breakdown was as follows:

Two of 4 female officers (50%) reported that verbal non-compliance was the level of suspect resistance they encounter most often. Two of 4 female officers (50%) reported that defensive resistance is the level of suspect resistance they encounter most. Thirty-one of 46 male officers (67.4%) indicated verbal non-compliance as the level of suspect resistance they encounter most. Fifteen of 46 male officer (32.6%) indicated experiencing defensive resistance more often. See table 7 for further.

Table 7

Comparison of Suspect Resistance Across Gender Category of Officer in Harvard (IL), Fox Lake (IL), and Round Lake Beach (IL) Police Departments in 2005

Resistance * sex Crosstabulation

			sex		
			1 male	1 female	Total
Resistance	Verbal Noncomplaince	Count	31	2	33
		% within sex	67.4%	50.0%	66.0%
	Defensive Resistance	Count	15	2	17
		% within sex	32.6%	50.0%	34.0%
Total		Count	46	4	50
		% within sex	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Yates Corrected Chi Square= 0.0237 Degrees of Freedom= 1
Critical Value = 3.8415 Fischer's Exact Probability= 0.41957

Table 7 compared an officer's gender to the level of suspect resistance encountered by the officer's. Based upon the observed versus expected differences, no significant difference was found. The null hypothesis is accepted. The Chi Square of 0.0237 was lower than the minimum critical value difference-to-error of 3.841. An officers gender does not help predict the level of suspect resistance an officer will encounter. The Fischers Exact Probability of Sampling Error of 41.957 %, meaning that

accidental differences across gender were high and that no real differences could be found. Due to low cell frequencies care should be taken in interpreting these findings, so no true prediction of an officer's gender on the level of suspect resistance encountered can be made.

Officer's Education Level and Suspect Resistance Level

When comparing education level as it relates to suspect resistance level, two categories were used to interpret an officer's education level. These categories were officers with a general equivalency degree (G.E.D) or high school diploma, and officers with a college education. The breakdown was as follows:

Fifteen of 18 (83.3%) officers with a G.E.D or high school diploma reported experiencing verbal non-compliance as the level of suspect resistance they encounter most often. Three of 18 (16.7%) officers with a G.E.D. or high school diploma reported experiencing defensive resistance as the level of suspect resistance encountered most often. Eighteen of 32 (56.2%) of officers with a college education reported experiencing verbal non-compliance as the level of suspect resistance encountered most often. Fourteen of 32 (43.8%) officers with a college education reported experiencing defensive resistance as the level of suspected resistance encountered most often. See table 8 for further.

Table 8

Comparison of Suspect Resistance Across Education Level of Officers of the Harvard (IL), Fox Lake (IL), and Round Lake Beach (IL) Police Departments in 2005

Resistance * education Crosstabulation

			education		
			G.E.D./ High School	College and above	Total
Resistance	Verbal Noncomplaince	Count	16	17	33
		% within education	80.0%	56.7%	66.0%
	Defensive Resistance	Count	4	13	17
		% within education	20.0%	43.3%	34.0%
Total		Count	20	30	50
		% within education	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Yates Corrected Chi Square= 2.65538 Degrees of Freedom= 1
Critical Value = 3.8415 Fischer's Exact Test= 0.049

Table 8 compared an officer's education level to the level of suspect resistance encountered by the officers. Based upon the observed versus expected differences, a significant difference was found. The null hypothesis is rejected. The Chi Square of 2.65538 was lower than the minimum critical value difference-to-error of 3.8415. An officers education level does help predict the level of suspect resistance an officer will encounter. Based upon Cramer's the amount of joint change in these categories is estimated at 0.2304509. The Fischers Exact Probability of Sampling Error was 4.9 %, meaning the chances of accidental differences across education level were low.

Years of Police Experience and Suspect Resistance Level

When comparing years of police experience against levels of suspect resistance, two categories were used to interpret an officers years of police experience. These categories were officers with 0 to 9 years of police experience, and officers with 10 or more years of police experience. The breakdown was as follows:

Seventeen of 26 officers (65.4%) with 0 to 9 years of police experience reported experiencing verbal non-compliance as the level of suspect resistance encountered most often. Nine of 26 officers (34.6 %) with 0 to 9 years of police experience reported experiencing defensive resistance as the level of suspect resistance encountered most often. Sixteen of 24 officers (66.7 %) with 10 or more years of police experience reported experiencing verbal non-compliance as the level of suspect resistance encountered most often. Eight of 24 officers (33.3%) with 10 or more years of police experience reported experiencing defensive resistance as the level of suspect resistance encountered most often. See table 9 for further collapsed test on levels of suspect resistance and officer's years of police experience.

Table 9

Suspect Resistance encountered Most Often By Level of Officer Experience in Harvard (IL), Fox Lake (IL), and Round Lake Beach (IL) Police Departments in 2005

Resistance * YrsExp Crosstabulation

			YrsExp		
			0 to 9 yrs	5 yrs or more	Total
Resistance	Verbal Noncomplaince	Count	17	16	33
		% within YrsExp	65.4%	66.7%	66.0%
	Defensive Resistance	Count	9	8	17
		% within YrsExp	34.6%	33.3%	34.0%
Total		Count	26	24	50
		% within YrsExp	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Yates Corrected Chi Square= 0.04127 Degrees of Freedom= 1
Critical Value = 3.8415

Table 9 compared an officer's years of police experience to the level of suspect resistance encountered by the officers. Based upon the observed versus expected differences, no significant difference was found. The null hypothesis is accepted. The Chi Square of 0.04127 was lower than the minimum critical value difference-to-error of

3.8415. An officer's education level does not help predict the level of suspect resistance an officer will encounter. Due to low cell frequencies care should be taken in interpreting these findings, so no true prediction of years of police experience on the level of suspect resistance encountered can be made.

Rank and Suspect Resistance Level

When comparing an officer's rank to the level of suspect resistance level two categories were used to interpret an officer's rank. The categories were broken down as patrolman or sergeants and above. The statistical breakdown was as follows:

Twenty-nine of 42 patrolman (68.3%) reported verbal non-compliance as the suspect resistance level most often encountered. Thirteen of 42 patrolman (31.7%) reported defensive resistance as the level of suspect resistance most often encountered.

Five of 9 sergeants and above (55.6%) reported experiencing verbal non-compliance as the level of suspect resistance encountered most often. Four of 9 sergeants and above (44.4%) reported experiencing defensive resistance as the level of suspect resistance most often encountered. See table 10 for a collapsed breakdown of encountered resistance by the rank of the officer.

Table 10

Comparison of Suspect Resistance Level Encountered Most by Rank of the Officer in Harvard (IL), Fox Lake (IL), and Round Lake Beach (IL) Police Departments in 2005

Resistance * Rank Crosstabulation

			Rank		
			Patrolman	Sergeant and above	Total
Resistance	Verbal Noncomplaince	Count	28	5	33
		% within Rank	68.3%	55.6%	66.0%
	Defensive Resistance	Count	13	4	17
		% within Rank	31.7%	44.4%	34.0%
Total		Count	41	9	50
		% within Rank	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Yates Corrected Chi Square= 0.1169 Degrees of Freedom= 1
Critical Value = 3.8415 Fischer's Exact Probability= 0.35789

Table 10 compared an officer's rank to the level of suspect resistance encountered by the officers. Based upon the observed versus expected differences, no significant difference was found. The null hypothesis is accepted. The Chi Square of 0.04127 was lower than the minimum critical value difference-to-error of 3.8415. An officers rank does not help predict the level of suspect resistance an officer will encounter. Due to low cell frequencies care should be taken in interpreting these findings, so no true prediction of rank on the level of suspect resistance encountered can be made.

Shoot/ No Shoot Situations

The third area examined in the study dealt with shoot/ no shoot situations. Distance from the suspect, the availability and use of cover, and whether the suspect or officer was moving were the circumstances of interest in this study. Of the 50 respondents to the survey, 32 of 50 (66%) indicated they have been in a shoot/ no shoot situation as a police officers. Fifteen of 32 respondents (30 %) indicated they had not been in a shoot/ no shoot situation, and 2 of 50 respondents (4%) were not sure if they

had been in a shoot/no shoot situation. When the data in this section was collapsed the two officers who indicated they were not sure are now categorized as missing data. See table 11 for further.

Table 11

Percentage of Officers Involved in a Shoot/ No Shoot Situation For Officers of the Harvard (IL), Fox Lake (IL), and Round Lake Beach (IL) Police Departments in 2005

Shoot/No shoot

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	yes	33	66.0	68.8	68.8
	no	15	30.0	31.3	100.0
	Total	48	96.0	100.0	
Missing	System	2	4.0		
Total		50	100.0		

As done with the previous areas, several variables were examined to study the shoot/no shoot phenomenon further. The purpose of this was to determine if an officer's gender, education level, years of police experience, or rank will influence whether or not an officer will be involved in a shoot/ no shoot situation.

Gender and Shoot/ No Shoot Situations

When comparing gender to shoot/ no shoot situations the breakdown was as follows:

One of 4 female officers (25%) indicated that they have been involved in a shoot/ no shoot situation. Three of 4 female officers (75%) indicated that they have not been involved in a shoot/ no shoot situation. Thirty-two of 44 male officers (72.7%) indicated that they have been involved in a shoot/ no shoot situation. Twelve of 44 male officers (27.3%) indicated they have not been involved in a shoot/ no shoot situation. See table 12 for further.

Table 12

Comparison of Shoot/ No Shoot Situations Across Gender of the Officer in Harvard (IL), Fox Lake (IL), and Round Lake Beach (IL) Police Departments in 2005

Shoot/No shoot * sex Crosstabulation

			sex		
			1 male	1 female	Total
Shoot/No shoot	yes	Count	32	1	33
		% within sex	72.7%	25.0%	68.8%
	no	Count	12	3	15
		% within sex	27.3%	75.0%	31.3%
Total		Count	44	4	48
		% within sex	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Yates Corrected Chi Square= 1.983 Degrees of Freedom= 1
Critical Value = 3.8415 Fischer's Exact Probability = 0.08418

Table 12 compared an officer's gender to whether or not they had been involved in a shoot/ no shoot situation. Based upon observed versus expected differences, no significant difference was found. The null hypothesis is accepted. The Chi Square of 1.983 was lower than the critical value difference-to-error of 3.8415. An officers' gender does not help predict whether or not they will be involved in a shoot/ no shoot situation. The Fischers Exact Probability of Sampling Error was 8.418 %, meaning that chances of accidental differences across gender is significant, therefore no real differences could be found. Due to low cell frequencies care should be taken in interpreting these findings, so no true prediction of gender and shoot/ no shoot situations can be made.

Education Level and Shoot/No Shoot Situations

When education level is compared to shoot/ no shoot situations the collapsed data breakdown was as follows:

Ten of 17 officers (58.8%) with a general equivalency degree (G.E.D) or high school diploma reported that they had been involved in a shoot/ no shoot situation. Seven

of 17 officers (41.2%) with a G.E.D. or high school diploma reported that they had not been involved in a shoot/ no shoot situation. Twenty-three of 31 officers (74.2%) with a college education reported that they had been involved in a shoot/ no shoot situation. Eight of 31 officers (25.8%) with a college education reported that they had not been involved in a shoot/ no shoot situation. See table 13 for collapsed table of officer involved in a shoot/ not shoot situation as compared by education level.

Table 13

Comparison of Officers Involved in Shoot/ No Shoot Situation by Officer Education Level in Harvard (IL), Fox Lake (IL), and Round Lake Beach (IL) Police Departments in 2005

Shoot/No shoot * sex Crosstabulation

			sex		
			1 male	1 female	Total
Shoot/No shoot	yes	Count	32	1	33
		% within sex	72.7%	25.0%	68.8%
	no	Count	12	3	15
		% within sex	27.3%	75.0%	31.3%
Total		Count	44	4	48
		% within sex	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Yates Corrected Chi Square= 0.5978 Degrees of Freedom= 1
Critical Value = 3.8415

Table 13 compared an officer's education level to whether or not they had been involved in a shoot/ no shoot situation. Based upon observed versus expected differences, no significant difference was found. The null hypothesis is accepted. The Chi Square of 0.5978 was lower than the critical value difference-to-error of 3.8415. An officers gender does not help predict whether or not they will be involved in a shoot/ no shoot situation. Due to low cell frequencies care should be taken in interpreting these

findings, so no true prediction of education level and shoot/ no shoot situations can be made.

Years of Police Experience and Shoot/ No Shoot Situations

When years of police experience were compared to whether or not an officer was involved in a shoot/ no shoot situation the collapsed data breakdown was as follows:

Fifteen of 25 officers (60.0%) having between 0 to 9 years of police experience indicated that they had been involved in a shoot/ no shoot situation. Ten of 25 officers (40.0%) having between 0 to 9 years of police experience indicated that they had not been involved in a shoot/ no shoot situation. Eighteen of 23 officers (78.3%) having between 10 or more years of police experience indicated they had been involved in a shoot/ no shoot situation. Five of 23 officers (21.7%) having between 10 or more years of police experience indicated they had not been involved in a shoot/ no shoot situation. See table 14 for collapsed information on shoot/ no shoot involvement compared across years of police experience.

Table 14

Comparison of Officers Involved in Shoot/ No Shoot Situations by Officers Years of Police Experience in Harvard (IL), Fox Lake (IL), and Round Lake Beach Police Departments in 2005

Shoot/No shoot * YrsExp Crosstabulation

			YrsExp		
			0 to 9 yrs	5 yrs or more	Total
Shoot/No shoot	yes	Count	14	19	33
		% within YrsExp	56.0%	82.6%	68.8%
	no	Count	11	4	15
		% within YrsExp	44.0%	17.4%	31.3%
Total		Count	25	23	48
		% within YrsExp	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Yates Corrected Chi Square= 1.1065 Degrees of Freedom= 1
Critical Value = 3.8415

Table 14 compared an officer's years of police experience to whether or not they had been involved in a shoot/ no shoot situation. Based upon observed versus expected differences, no significant difference was found. The null hypothesis is accepted. The Chi Square of 1.1065 was lower than the critical value difference-to-error of 3.8415. An officers years of police experience does not help predict whether or not they will be involved in a shoot/ no shoot situation. Due to low cell frequencies care should be taken in interpreting these findings, so no true prediction of education level and shoot/ no shoot situations can be made.

Rank and Shoot/ No Shoot Situations

When rank was compared to whether or not an officer was involved in a shoot/ no shoot situation the collapsed data breakdown was as follows:

Twenty-six of 40 patrolman (65%) indicated that they had been involved in a shoot/ no shoot situation. Fourteen of 40 patrolman (35%) indicated that they had not

been involved in a shoot/ no shoot situation. Seven of 8 sergeants and above (87.5%) indicated that they had been involved in a shoot/ no shoot situation. One of 8 sergeants and above (12.5%) indicated that they had not been involved in a shoot/ no shoot situation. See Table 15 for collapsed information of officer involvement in a shoot/ no shoot situation compared across an officers rank.

Table 15

Comparison Of Officers Involved in Shoot/ No Shoot Situation by Officers Rank in Harvard (IL), Fox Lake (IL), and Round Lake Beach (IL) Police Departments in 2005

Shoot/No shoot * Rank Crosstabulation

			Rank		
			Patrolman	Sergeant and above	Total
Shoot/No shoot	yes	Count	26	7	33
		% within Rank	65.0%	87.5%	68.8%
	no	Count	14	1	15
		% within Rank	35.0%	12.5%	31.3%
Total		Count	40	8	48
		% within Rank	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Yates Corrected Chi Square= 0.69818 Degrees of Freedom= 1
Critical Value = 3.8415 Fischer's Exact Probability = 0.2066

Table 15 compared an officer's rank to whether or not they had been involved in a shoot/ no shoot situation. Based upon observed versus expected differences, no significant difference was found. The null hypothesis is accepted. The Chi Square of 0.69818 was lower than the critical value difference-to-error of 3.8415. An officers rank does not help predict whether or not they will be involved in a shoot/ no shoot situation. The Fischer Exact Probability of Sampling Error was 20.66%, meaning that chances of accidental differences across rank was high and no real differences could be found. Due to low cell frequencies care should be taken in interpreting these findings, so no true prediction of rank and shoot/ no shoot situations can be made.

Dynamics of Shoot/ No Shoot Situations

In examining the phenomenon of shoot/ no shoot situations, this study also focused on the conditions under which they occur. The study focused on the distance from the suspect, whether the officer or suspect was moving, the availability or use of cover. Data obtained from this section will be used to evaluate current range training practices, in an attempt to gauge how practical the training is for the officers. The breakdown was as follows:

Distance From the Suspect

When distance was examined, three ranges were available on the survey for the officer to choose from. Close distance was any encounter occurring between 0 to 21 feet approximately. Mid distance was any encounter occurring between 22 feet to 45 feet approximately. Long distance was any encounter occurring beyond 46 feet. Of those officers that indicated they had been involved in a shoot/ no shoot situation, 35 of 36 officers (97.2%) indicated the encounter occurred at a close distance. Only one officer (2.8%) indicated that a shoot/ no shoot encounter occurred at long range.

When examining the condition under which the encounter occurred the results were as follows: Twenty of 35 officers (57.1%) indicated that the encounter occurred at close range, with either the suspect or officer moving. Ten of 35 officers (28.6%) indicated the encounter occurred at close range, but both the officer and subject were not moving. Three of 35 officers (8.6%) indicated the encounter occurred at close range, the suspect utilized cover, but the officer did not. Two of 35 officers (3%) indicated that the encounter occurred at close range, the officer utilized cover, and the suspect did not. One

of 36 officers (2.8%) indicated that the encounter occurred at long range, the officer utilized cover, and the suspect did not. See table 16 for further.

Table 16

Dynamics of a Shoot/ No Shoot Situation Encountered by Officers of the Harvard (IL), Fox Lake (IL), and Round Lake Beach (IL) Police Departments in 2005

Suspect/ Officer Actions * Distance from Suspect Crosstabulation

			Distance from Suspect		
			Close Distance	Long Distance	Total
Suspect/ Officer Actions	Moving targets	Count	20		20
		% within Suspect/ Officer Actions	100.0%		100.0%
		% within Distance from Suspect	57.1%		55.6%
	Officer uses cover	Count	2	1	3
		% within Suspect/ Officer Actions	66.7%	33.3%	100.0%
		% within Distance from Suspect	5.7%	100.0%	8.3%
	Suspect uses cover	Count	3		3
		% within Suspect/ Officer Actions	100.0%		100.0%
		% within Distance from Suspect	8.6%		8.3%
	Stationary	Count	10		10
		% within Suspect/ Officer Actions	100.0%		100.0%
		% within Distance from Suspect	28.6%		27.8%
Total		Count	35	1	36
		% within Suspect/ Officer Actions	97.2%	2.8%	100.0%
		% within Distance from Suspect	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Use Of Force Training Issues

The fourth area examined in this study dealt with the use of force training background of the officers. Areas of interest in this study were the levels of force the officers had received most training on, the methods of training used, the methods of range

training used, and questions pertaining to the respective use of force policies of the departments.

The Level of Force Trained at Most

In the survey, the officers could choose from six levels of force to indicate which level they had received the most training in. Verbal commands, contact control, pain compliance, hard empty hand control, impact weapons, and deadly force were the options to choose from. The breakdown was as follows:

Thirty of 49 officers (61%) indicated most of their use of force training has dealt with the use of deadly force. Seven of 49 officers (8%) indicated most of their use of force training has dealt with the use of contact control. Four of 49 officers () indicated most of their use of force training has dealt with the use of pain compliance. Three of 49 officers (6%) indicated most of their training has dealt with the use of impact weapons. Three of 49 officers (6%) indicated most of their training has dealt with the use of verbal commands. Two of 49 officers (4%) indicated most of their training has dealt with the use of hard empty hand techniques. See table 17 for further.

Table 17

Levels of Force Officers of the Harvard (IL), Fox Lake (IL), and Round Lake Beach (IL) Police Departments Have Been Trained at in 2005

LevelTrained

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	.00	1	2.0	2.0	2.0
	Verbal Commands	3	6.0	6.0	8.0
	Contact Control	7	14.0	14.0	22.0
	Pain Complaince	4	8.0	8.0	30.0
	Hard Empty Hand Control	2	4.0	4.0	34.0
	Impact Weapons	3	6.0	6.0	40.0
	Deadly Force	30	60.0	60.0	100.0
	Total	50	100.0	100.0	

Firearms Training

When examining the officers' responses to their firearms training experiences the breakdown was as follows: Thirty-two of 50 officers (70%) indicate that their firearms' training occurs at a close distance from the target. Fifteen of 50 officers (30%) indicated that their firearms' training occurs at mid range from the target. When comparing the distance to the conditions of the training (whether or not the officer is moving for example), the breakdown was as follows:

Eight of 50 officers (16%) indicated that their firearms' training primarily occurs at a close distance with either the target or officer moving. Two of 50 officers (4%) indicated that their firearms training consists of engaging a target at close distance while utilizing cover. One of 50 officers (2%) indicated that their firearms training primarily consists of engaging a target at mid range but the target is behind cover.

One of 50 officers (2%) indicated that their firearms training primarily consists of engaging a target at mid range, and either the target of officer is moving. Two of 50

officers (4%) indicated that their firearms training primarily consists of engaging a target at mid range but the officer utilizes cover. Twelve of 50 offices (24%) indicated that their firearms training consists of engaging a target at mid range and both they and the target are stationary. In table 18 two categories appear. These are FT1 and FT2. The researcher used these as labels when coding the data from the survey used. These labels were used for the questions pertaining to firearms training. FT1 was a question asking at which distances firearms training occurs. FT2 was a question asking what the conditions of the training where. For example, did the officers engage moving or stationary targets. See table 18 for a complete breakdown of the firearms training used by the departments that participated in this study. .

Table 18

Firearms Training Dynamics For Officers of the Harvard (IL), Fox Lake (IL), and Round Lake Beach (IL) Police Departments in 2005

FT1 * FT2 Crosstabulation

			FT2				
			Moving Targets	Officer uses cover	Target behind cover	stationary target	Total
FT1	Close Distance	Count	8	2	1	24	35
		% within FT1	22.9%	5.7%	2.9%	68.6%	100.0%
		% within FT2	88.9%	50.0%	100.0%	66.7%	70.0%
		% of Total	16.0%	4.0%	2.0%	48.0%	70.0%
	Mid Distance	Count	1	2		11	14
		% within FT1	7.1%	14.3%		78.6%	100.0%
		% within FT2	11.1%	50.0%		30.6%	28.0%
		% of Total	2.0%	4.0%		22.0%	28.0%
	Long Distance	Count				1	1
		% within FT1				100.0%	100.0%
		% within FT2				2.8%	2.0%
		% of Total				2.0%	2.0%
Total		Count	9	4	1	36	50
		% within FT1	18.0%	8.0%	2.0%	72.0%	100.0%
		% within FT2	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
		% of Total	18.0%	8.0%	2.0%	72.0%	100.0%

Table 18 indicates that most firearms training occurs at close range, but the officers primarily engage stationary targets. When examining the data collected shoot/ no shoot situations (see Table 16) it is apparent that the firearms training offered by these departments is not a realistic reflection of what the officers experience during actual shoot/ no shoot situations.

Officer Perceptions of the Departments Training Programs

In this section, the officers' perceptions of their respective departments training programs were examined. Topics of interest in this area included the perceived realism of the training programs, the perceived training methods, whether officers know their departments' use of force policy , and whether the policy is consistent with the training

programs offered. Data obtained from this section of the study will be used to evaluate the use of force training programs in question. This data will be useful in identifying problem areas in the respective programs. Changes can be made based on this data that will help to improve the overall quality of the training programs.

When examining the issue of whether or not the officers thought their defensive tactics program was realistic the breakdown was as follows:

Twenty-six of 50 officers (52%) thought the program was not a realistic reflection of what they experience on the street. Fourteen of 50 officers (28%) indicated they thought their departments defensive tactics program was a realistic reflection of what they experience on the street. Ten of 50 officers (20%) were not sure if their departments defensive tactics program was a realistic reflection of what they experience on the street. See Table 19 for further.

Table 19

Breakdown of the Opinions of the Defensive Tactics Program Realism offered by The Harvard (IL), Fox Lake (IL), and Round Lake Beach (IL) Police Departments in 2005

DT3

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	yes	14	28.0	28.0	28.0
	no	27	54.0	54.0	82.0
	not sure	9	18.0	18.0	100.0
	Total	50	100.0	100.0	

When asked whether the firearms training they receive was realistic the officers responded as follows:

Twenty-six of 50 officers (52%) thought their firearms training were not realistic. Fifteen of 50 officers (30%) were not sure. Nine of 50 officers (18%) thought their

firearms training was a realistic reflection of what they have experienced in shoot/ no shoot situations. See Table 20 for further.

Table 20

Do officers of the Harvard (IL), Fox Lake (IL), and Round Lake Beach (IL) Police Departments in 2005 Feel Their Departments' Firearms Training is Realistic?

FT3

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	yes	10	20.0	20.0	20.0
	no	25	50.0	50.0	70.0
	not sure	15	30.0	30.0	100.0
	Total	50	100.0	100.0	

When asked if officers knew their departments' use of force policy, officers responded as follows:

Forty-seven of 50 officers (94%) knew their departments' use of force policy. One of 50 officers (2%) did not know their departments' use of force policy. Two of 50 officers (4%) were not sure if they knew their departments' use of force policy. See table 21 for further.

Table 21

Do officers of the Harvard (IL), Fox Lake (IL), and Round Lake Beach (IL) Police Departments Know Their Departments Use of Force Policy?

Policy1

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	yes	47	94.0	94.0	94.0
	no	1	2.0	2.0	96.0
	not sure	2	4.0	4.0	100.0
	Total	50	100.0	100.0	

When asked if policy requirements were covered during training, officers responded as follows:

Twenty-three of 50 officers (46%) said policy requirements were covered during training. Fifteen of 50 officers (30%) were not sure if policy requirements were covered during training. Twelve of 50 officers (24%) said policy requirements were covered during training. See table 22 for further.

Table 22

Are Policy Requirements Covered During Training for Officers of the Harvard (IL), Fox Lake (IL), and Round Lake Beach (IL) Police Departments in 2005?

Policy2

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	yes	23	46.0	46.0	46.0
	no	12	24.0	24.0	70.0
	not sure	15	30.0	30.0	100.0
	Total	50	100.0	100.0	

When asked if the training programs were consistent with their departments' use of force policy, the officers responded as follows:

Twenty-two of 50 officers (44%) said the training was not consistent with the department policy. twenty of 50 officers (40%) said the training was consistent with department policy. Eight of 50 officers (16%) said they were not sure if the training program was consistent with the departments' use of force policy. See Table 23 for further.

Table 23

Is the Training Program Consistent with the Department Policies of the Harvard (IL), Fox Lake (IL), and Round Lake Beach (IL) Police Departments in 2005?

Policy3

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	yes	22	44.0	44.0	44.0
	no	20	40.0	40.0	84.0
	not sure	8	16.0	16.0	100.0
	Total	50	100.0	100.0	

Dynamics of a Use of Force Encounter

This section-sought insight into what was the most common circumstance leading to the use of force. Forty-nine of 50 officers (98%) indicated that their use of force was a response to suspect's actions, but after the officer attempted to arrest or control the subject. One of 50 officers (2%) indicated that their use of force is a response to a suspect committing a crime. See Table 24 for further.

Table 24

Dynamics of a Use of Force Encounter According to Officers of the Harvard (IL), Fox Lake (IL), and Round Lake Beach (IL) Police Departments in 2005

Force Used

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Officer Initiates	49	98.0	98.0	98.0
	Other situation	1	2.0	2.0	100.0
	Total	50	100.0	100.0	

This finding should not be interpreted as officers being eager to use force on a subject but rather acting properly. This study found that verbal non-compliance was the most common type of suspect resistance. Therefore it is reasonable to assume that if

verbalization fails some type of physical contact must then be initiated in order to take a subject into custody. This finding should be interpreted as officers reacting to a suspect's action (or lack thereof), which is consistent with the literature discussed in Chapter 2. Future training programs should emphasize that initiating the use of force encounter is highly probable and it is the researchers opinion that use of force training programs should stress responsible initiation of the encounter. This could include how to de-escalate the level of force used when the subject complies, how to escalate the encounter to counter higher suspect resistance levels, and the use of verbal commands to better control the situation

This study focused on several issues pertaining to the use of force and use of force training. While this study was unable to prove a relationship between gender, officer education level, years of police experience, and the use of force, there were some issues which police trainers and administrators should take notice of. In particular the firearms training provided does not reflect what officers have reported as occurring during actual shoot/ no shoot situations. Officers who participated in this study indicated that the defensive tactics training offered by the departments did not reflect what they experience in the field. When examining the level of force that officers receive most of their training in, the use of deadly force was trained at most. When examining the level of force use most it was found to be the use of contact control. While it is important to train officers in the use of deadly force, time should also be set aside to train at the lower levels as well to better prepare officers for actual use of force encounters. The following chapter will further discuss these and other issues in more detail.

Chapter 5

Summary and Conclusions

This research attempted to show several patterns regarding the use of force and use of force training. Due to the small number of respondents (50), The data collected did not indicate any significant relationship between certain variables and the use of force. Though the various cross tabulations performed in Chapter 4 did not reveal any significant relationships, examining the frequency distributions did indicate patterns for further discussion.

This study compared the following variables, the officers gender, education level, years of police experience, and rank to the following three categories. The level of force the police use most, and whether or not an officer had been involved in a shoot/ no shoot situation were all compared to the above listed variables. Of these variables, the years of police experience had the most consistent results when examining the frequency distributions.

The Level of Force Used Most by the Police

The level of force reported as used most was the use of contact control. Which 78 percent of the officers in this study indicated was the level they use most when controlling a subject. When examining years of police experience, a marked difference occurred after five years of police experience. Sixty-eight point eight (68.8%) percent of officers with 0 to 4 years of police experience reported using contact control. This was approximately twelve percent lower than the officers with more than five years of police experience. Due to the low number of respondents this finding can only be a point of interest that at most requires further study. Increasing the number of respondents in

future research may provide a more definitive result regarding any relation ship between years of police and the level of force used most often.

Shoot/ No Shoot Situations

Sixty-six percent of officers who responded to this study's survey indicated they had been in a shoot/ no shoot situation. Years of police experience showed a pattern of greater occurrence as the years of police service increased. Sixty percent (60%) of the officers with 0 to 9 years of police experience indicated they had been involved in a shoot/ no shoot situation. After nine years of police experience, the number of officers involved in shoot/ no shoot situations increased. Seventy-eight point three percent (78.3%) of officers with more than ten years of police experience reported they had been involved in a shoot/ no shoot situation. Though no significant relationship could be found, it is the researcher's opinion that trainers and administrators take note of these frequency distributions. These findings do suggest the probability of being involved in a shoot/ no shoot situation increases the longer one remains a police officer. A committed effort should be made to continue in-service firearms training for police officers. This way officers will be better prepared to handle a high-risk incident that very likely may occur the longer a person remains a police officer. However this is speculation at this point until further research using a larger sample population can be done.

Police Use of Force Training

When asked if their department's defensive tactics and firearms training were realistic, the majority of the respondents indicated their departments programs were not realistic. When examining the levels of force the officers used most, and comparing that to the levels trained at, it is clear why the officers feel this way. Deadly force was the

level of force officers indicated they received most of their training in. While contact control was indicated as the level they used most. Again police trainers and administrators should take note of these findings when devising a use of force training program. The need to invest in both defensive tactics and firearms training is apparent. It is the researcher's opinion that this dual training is needed to ensure officers act properly when engaged in use of force encounters.

Regarding the department's use of force policy, the overwhelming number of respondents indicated they knew their department's policy (94%). Yet when asked if policy requirements were covered during training, or the training consistent department policy, that number was much lower (44 to 46 %). This difference, in the researcher's opinion, indicates the training programs used are not sending a clear message to the officers regarding their responsibilities in using force. This mixed message may effect officer decision making during use of force encounters. Care should be taken that similar terminology is used during training sessions that appears in the department policy. Future research should focus on this problem to determine how much, if at all, a department's use of force policy affects an officer's decision making.

When firearms training conditions were compared to shoot/ no shoot conditions, a difference was discovered. Shoot/ no shoot situations in this study were found to occur at close distances, with movement by the suspect or officer. Firearms' training was found to occur at close distance, but with stationary conditions. To provide more realistic firearms training, it is recommended these departments add motion to better simulate real life events.

In conclusion, this study identified several issues regarding police use of force and use of force training. Examining the use of force encounters and training backgrounds of officers from the Harvard, Fox Lake, and Round Lake Beach Police Departments has brought about the need for future research. By examining a larger sample population a more efficient evaluation of how well training prepares an officer to handle a use of force encounter can made.

References

Bayley, D., & Garofalo, J. (1989). The management of violence by patrol officers. Criminology, (2), 215-135.

Brands, H.W. (1997). TR The last romantic. New York: Basic Books.

Boyle, D. (1993). Police violence addressing the issue. The F.B.I. Law Enforcement Bulletin, 62 (2), 1-8.

Danaher, L. & Faulkner, S. (1997). Controlling subjects: realistic training versus magic bullets. The F.B.I. Law Enforcement Bulletin, 66 (2), 1-13.

Greenfield, L., Kaminski, R., Langan, P. & Smith, S. (1998 January 6) Police use of force. U.S. Department of Justice. Retrieved June 17, 2003 from the World Wide Web:http://www.infotrac.com.

Federal Bureau of Investigation. (2002 May 15). Summary of law Officers killed and assaulted for 2001. Uniformed Crime Reports for 2001. Retrieved February 8, 2003 from the World Wide Web: http://www.infotrac.com.

Illinois State Police. (2005 March 13). History of the Illinois State Police Academy. Illinois State Police. Retrieved March 13, 2005 from the World Wide Web: http://www.isp.il.us.

References Continued

Kinniard, B. (2003). Use of force. New York: Loose Leaf Publications, Inc.

Lombardo, F., Schroeder, D., & Strollo, J. (2000). Management and supervision of law enforcement personnel. New York: Gould.

Nowicki, E. (2003). Stretching your training dollars. Law & Order, 51 (11), 30-32.

Nowicki, E. (2003). Ten things every chief should know about training. Law &Order, 51 (10), 40-42.

Olson, D. (1998). Improving deadly force decision-making. The F.B.I. Law Enforcement Bulletin, 67 (2), 1-16.

Remsberg, C. (1986). The Tactical Edge. Illinois: Calibre Press.

Rose, D., &Warren, R. (2001). Police use of force case law. Kansas: Varro Press.

Siddle, B. (1995). Sharpening the warrior's edge. Illinois: PPCT Research Publications.

Siddle, B. (1989). PPCT defensive tactics instructor manual. Illinois: PPCT Management Systems, Inc.

Suarez, G. (1996). The tactical pistol. Colorado: Paladin Press.

References Continued

Travis, J. (1996 November 1). Understanding use of force by and against the police. U.S. Department of Justice. Retrieved June 17, 2003 from the World Wide Web: http://www.infotrac.com.

Williams, G. (1999). Reluctance to use deadly force. The F.B.I. Law Enforcement Bulletin, 68 (10), 1-8.

Appendix A

Participating Officers,

Thank you for participating in this survey. The purpose of this survey is to gather use of force data that will be used to evaluate your department's use of force training programs. This department's goal is to provide the most practical training possible, and to accomplish this; the current program must be studied and evaluated. Therefore your participation is necessary your input will directly affect the study. Your answers **WILL** remain **Anonymous** and **Confidential,** so please answer honestly. The privacy of your individual responses is assured.

While an officer's presence and verbal commands are an essential element of modern use of force continuums, this study will not focus on these elements. Verbal commands that control a subject's actions shall not be considered an act of force, as the subject cooperated with the officer's commands. For this study the use of force shall be considered any physical act used to control a subject who did not cooperate with verbal commands. Some of the terminology used in this survey may differ from your departments', so attached is a list of definitions that use may reference as you complete the survey. Any questions or concerns please feel free to contact the training supervisor. Thank you for your time.

Appendix B

Use of Force Definitions

Non-complaint subject- A person who refuses to obey verbal commands by an officer and/or commits a physical act in an effort to resist the performance of that officer's duties.

Contact control- A method of force that controls a non-compliant subject by means of physical contact that is not designed to cause injury. This is typically done by using a firm grip or pepper spray (O.C. spray).

Pain compliance control- An unarmed method of force that involves temporarily placing a non-complaint subject in pain in an effort to control their actions. This is typically done by utilizing control holds.

Hard empty hand control- An unarmed method of force that involves punching, kicking, or otherwise striking a non-complaint subject to control their actions.

Impact weapons- A method of force that utilizes a blunt object such as a baton to control a non-complaint suspect's actions.

Deadly force- A method of force that will cause death or great bodily harm to a non-complaint subject.

Passive resistance- A non-complaint subject who resists arrest by remaining rigid, becomes dead weight, or does not respond to verbal commands.

Defensive resistance- A non-complaint subject who resists arrest by pulling, pushing or running away.

Active resistance- A non-complaint subject who physically attacks the officer by punching, kicking, etc..

Deadly assault- A non-complaint subject whose actions cause the officer to believe they are in danger of receiving great bodily harm or death.

Shoot/ no shoot situation- An incident where the circumstances are such that an officer must decide if deadly force should or should not be used.

Appendix C

POLICE USE OF FORCE TRAINING EVALUATION SURVEY

Thank you for participating in this survey. The information obtained in this survey is for research purposes only and anymous in nature. Information gathered from this survey will be used to improve the quality of this department's use of force in-service training program, so please answer honestly.

1. What level of force do you typically use the most?
   a. contact control (i.e. o.c. spray or a firm grip)
   b. pain compliance (i.e., control holds, joint locks)
   c. hard empty hand control (i.e.,strikes, choke holds)
   d. impact weapons (i.e.,batons, knight sticks, flash lights)
   e. deadly force
2. What level of force does a suspect use towards you use the most?
   a. verbal noncompliance (no physical response to orders)
   b. defensive resistance (i.e., running away, pulling away)
   c. unarmed active assault (i.e., punching, kicking, grabbing)
   d. deadly assault (i.e., knife, firearm)
3. Have you ever been in a shoot/ no shoot scenario as a police officer?
   a. yes b. no c. not sure
4. What conditions most closely resemble those situations?
   a. Close distance to the suspect (approximately 0-21 feet)
   b. Mid distance to the suspect (approximately 22 ft to 45 feet)
   c. Long distance to the suspect (approximately 46 ft and beyond)

5. In those shoot/ no shoot situations, which condition was most prevalent?

   a. Engaging suspect while one or both parties are in motion and exposed

   b. Engaging suspect while officer is behind cover and suspect is exposed

   c. Engaging suspect while officer is exposed and suspect is behind cover

   d. Engaging suspect while both officer and suspect are stationary and exposed

   e. other situation (please specify)_____

6. What level of force have you received the most training in?

   a. use of verbal commands

   b. use of contact control

   c. use of pain compliance

   d. use of hard empty hand control

   e. use of impact weapons

   f. use of deadly force

7. Does the defensive tactics-training program include techniques performed as controlled repetitions (minimum resistance by partner)?

   a. yes b. no c. not sure

8. Does the defensive tactics-training program include force on force scenarios (training partner provides a high level of resistance)?

   a. yes b. no c. not sure

9. During firearms training which distance does the majority of training occur at?

   a. Close distance (approximately 0-21 ft) b. Mid range (approximately 22 ft to 45 ft)

   c. Long range (approximately 46 ft and beyond)

10. During firearms training what conditions are most prevalent?

    a. Engaging target while officer and/or target in motion and exposed

    b. Engaging target from behind cover while target is exposed

    c. Engaging target that is behind cover while officer is exposed

    d. Engaging target while both parties are exposed and stationary

11. In those situations where force was used, which condition was most prevalent?

    a. officer initiating the encounter by attempting to arrest or control the subject, and the subject resists those efforts.

    b. officer defending himself or herself from a suspect's actions.

    c. other situation (please specify)_____

12. Do you feel the departments defensive tactics training reflects what you experience as a police officer?

    a. yes b. no c. not sure

13. Do you feel the department's firearms training reflects what you have experienced during shoot/ no shoot circumstances as a police officer?

    a. yes b. no c. not sure

14. Do you know the department's use of force policy?

    a. yes b. no c. not sure

15. Are policy requirements covered during use of force training?

    a. yes b. no c. not sure

16. Do you feel the department's use of force training program is consistent with the

department's use of force policy?

a. yes b. no c. not sure

17. Please indicate any other comments you would like to make regarding use of force, or policies, practices or training .

---

18. What is your gender?

a. male b. female

19. What is the highest education level achieved?

a. General equivalency degree (G.E.D.) b. high school diploma c. associate degree

d. bachelors' degree e. graduate degree f. doctoral degree

h. other degree

20. What is your present rank on your department?

a. patrolman/ detective b. sergeant/commander c. lieutenant/ deputy chief d. chief

21. How many years of police experience do you have (including all agencies you may have worked for)?

a. 0 to 4 yrs b. 5 to 9 yrs c. 10 to 14 yrs e. 15 to 19 yrs f. 20 to 24 yrs

g. 25 to 29 yrs h. 30 or more yrs

Thank you for your participation in this survey. Remember your responses are confidential.