

2015

Critical Factors in Police Use-of-Force Decisions

Orville Nickel
Walden University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.waldenu.edu/dissertations>

 Part of the [Criminology Commons](#), [Criminology and Criminal Justice Commons](#), [Public Policy Commons](#), and the [Women's Studies Commons](#)

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Walden Dissertations and Doctoral Studies Collection at ScholarWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in Walden Dissertations and Doctoral Studies by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact ScholarWorks@waldenu.edu.

Walden University

College of Social and Behavioral Sciences

This is to certify that the doctoral dissertation by

Orville Nickel

has been found to be complete and satisfactory in all respects,
and that any and all revisions required by
the review committee have been made.

Review Committee

Dr. Barbara Benoliel, Committee Chairperson, Human Services Faculty

Dr. Tina Jaeckle, Committee Member, Human Services Faculty

Dr. Dorothy Scotten, University Reviewer, Human Services Faculty

Chief Academic Officer

Eric Riedel, Ph.D.

Walden University

2015

Abstract

Critical Factors in Police Use-of-Force Decisions

by:

Orville Audray Nickel

MBA, Queen's University, 2001

BA, Simon Fraser University, 1992

Dissertation Submitted in Partial Fulfillment

Of the Requirements for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Human Services

Walden University

June 2015

Abstract

This study investigated law enforcement officers' perceptions of the legal, normative, and practical considerations that are implicit in their decisions when faced with using physical force. Law enforcement officers observe and protect fundamental human rights. A significant problem, however, is that physical force is sometimes misused, impacting public confidence in police services. The study was framed by Durkheim's conflict theory and Beirle's concepts of police corporate culture and social control. It used a grounded theory method and predeveloped case scenarios presented to 2 male focus groups of 7 and 6 participants respectively, and 2 female focus groups of 5 and 7 participants, who were police officers in Canada, to explore for gender differences in response strategies, decisions to use force, and arguments for their decisions, following the model set forth by Waddington (2009). Additionally, data were also collected through 12 individual semistructured interviews. Open, axial, and selective manual coding was used in the data analysis. The data collection and analysis for this study resulted in the development of, the *paradigm of safety*, a theory that reflects how female officers' use-of-force decisions differ from the decisions of their male colleagues. These decision factors, when incorporated into their response strategies, reflect the timing and need for using force. This study promotes positive social change by providing information that will inform police policies and training practices. This information will enable police administrators and legislators to enhance workplace safety for their officers that are more consistent with democratic rights and freedoms for citizens by reducing use-of-force in conflict circumstances.

Critical Factors in Police Use of Force Decisions

by:

Orville Audray Nickel

MBA, Queen's University, 2001

BA, Simon Fraser University, 1992

Dissertation Submitted in Partial Fulfillment

Of the Requirements for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Human Services

Walden University

June 2015

Dedication

I dedicate this writing to my wife Maria, for her unconditional love and support during the long road to graduation. I also dedicate this work to our children, Scott and his wife Candace, James and his wife Erin, our granddaughters Olivia and Kaitlyn and a third grandchild, yet to be born. You each have been my inspiration. My wife Maria, spent many hours entertaining herself while I poured through volumes of journal articles and text books. She read my papers and provided me with valuable feedback when my creativeness was suffering. She made phone calls to add to the study participant list and was able to bring some very bright minds forward as participants for this study. Maria, your dedication and your support for me is so very much appreciated.

Our son Scott, a law enforcement professional, and his brother James who now carry on the tradition of keeping our country safe have engaged in many conversations on topics of use of force and public safety. Just knowing that both of you are on duty causes us to sleep better at night.

It is with heavy heart but I must dedicate some of this work to three dear people in my life my parents, Abram and Agnes Nickel, with whom I shared my childhood years and my brother John with whom I grew up and all of who meant the world to me and now are missed.

Acknowledgement

I would like to acknowledge the professors who were my mentors throughout my studies at Walden University, thank you. Dr. Paul Katsampes started me off on the road for my doctoral studies. Dr. Barbara Benoliel who took over from Dr. Katsampes and who then became my committee chair during my dissertation period was extremely helpful in maintaining focus and expanding my thinking at times when my thoughts seemed somewhat repetitive and circular in their pathways. Thank you also to Dr. Tina Jaeckle (Committee Methods Professor) and Dr. Dorothy Scotten (URR) for your reviews of the drafts and all the kind comments and helpful suggestions for improving the quality of the document.

Thank you to two very gracious and professional police chiefs, Chief Clive Weighill, Saskatoon Police Services and Chief Neil Dubord, PhD., Metro Vancouver Transit Police, who both signed Letters of Cooperation giving me full access to the officers under their commands. Thank you to the staff members, Lisa Olson, Kevin Good-Murphy and Lance Talbot at each of these two agencies who organized the participant pools. Thank you also to Dr. Peter German, Deputy Commissioner, Corrections Canada Western Region who helped in searching for study participants and to Dr. P.A.J. Waddington, Wolverhampton University, U.K. for your advice on the study processes and your support for my study topic.

Table of Contents

List of Tables	vii
Chapter 1: Introduction to the Study	1
Introduction	1
Background of the Study	2
Problem Statement.....	4
Purpose of the Study.....	5
Research Questions.....	6
A Conflict Theory Contribution - Violence in Society and Policing	6
Conceptual Framework.....	8
Significance of the Study.....	15
Assumptions and Limitations	16
Delimitations of the Study.....	19
Conclusion	19
Chapter 2: Literature Review	21
Introduction	21
Defining and Conceptualizing the Study Problem	23
Democratic Principles and Use of Force Applications.....	28
A Discussion of Legal Principles and Use of Force.....	29
Public Perspectives on Police Use of Force	39
Organizational Structure and Interests	41
Occupational Stress in Policing - a Dichotomous Potential	47

Gender-based Harassment	49
Police Subculture and Use of Force	55
Police Officers’ Perspectives and Use of Force Decisions.....	60
Officers’ Perceptions and Use of Force Decisions	63
Situational Factors and Perception Components	67
Police Use of Force Decisions based on Gender: Is there a Difference?	71
Conclusion	74
Chapter 3: Research Method	76
Introduction	76
Research Design and Approach.....	76
Data Collection Method – Settings and Sampling.....	79
Focus Group Interviews.....	81
In-Depth Individual Interviews	83
Sampling Method and Design	84
Data Collection and Analysis	86
Ethical Concerns and Informed Consent	87
Privacy	91
Anonymity and Confidentiality	92
Protection of Rights and Welfare of Participants	93
Role of the Researcher.....	94
Researcher Bias	95
Dissemination of Findings.....	97

Conclusion	98
Chapter 4: Results.....	100
Introduction	100
The Study Problem	100
Research Study Questions	102
Results of Study Questions Analysis.....	102
RQ1. What are the different ways in which police officers explain the application of physical force as a strategy for maintaining social order?	102
Scenario Phase 2.....	103
Scenario Phase 3.....	103
Scenario Phase 4.....	103
Scenario Phase 5.....	103
Focus Group Comments	104
Male Participants Strategies	104
Female Participants Strategies.....	105
Discussions About Phase 3.....	106
Individual Interviews Discussion	107
RQ2. What are the different ways in which police officers are critical of the application of physical force?.....	108
Gender Physiology and Force Strategies.....	108
Female Focus Group Discussions and Relationship Building.....	108
Public Safety as Critical Decision Factor	110

RQ3. What criteria do police officers identify in situations justifying or not justifying the use of force as a police practice in maintaining social order?	110
Subjective/Objective Legal Test Discussion	111
RQ4. What are the points of consensus among police officers on these matters generally, or do they display a significant variety of different viewpoints?	112
Decision Differences Criteria	113
RQ5. What are the perspectives wherein the police officers’ viewpoints differ about use of force?.....	114
Participant Demographics.....	116
Data Collection	119
Data Analysis - Grounded Theory Coding.....	122
Specific Codes, Categories, Themes and Quotes	124
Focus Group Scenario Discussions	135
Focus Group Findings	140
Semistructured Individual Interviews Summary	144
Semistructured Interviews Findings	146
Discrepancies in Interviews and Discussions Summary	147
Evidence of Quality and Trustworthiness	148
Summary.....	152
Chapter 5 - Summary, Conclusion and Recommendations	155

Introduction	155
Grounded Theory Findings.....	156
Interpretation of Findings	160
Democratic, Constitutional and Political Concerns.....	160
Organization’s Structure and Interests	164
Officer Disposition – Public, Officer and/or Subject Safety	170
Gender, Control, Perception, Uncertainty and Trust.....	173
Relationship of Findings to Conceptual Framework.....	180
Theory Generated From the Data	183
Summary of Conclusions.....	188
Implication for Social Change.....	190
Recommendations	193
Recommendation for Action	193
Recommendation for Further Study	196
Reflections about the Research Experience.....	198
Conclusion	201
References	205
Appendix “A” – Progressive Study Scenario and Application Method (Focus Group Interviews).....	218
Appendix “B” – In-depth Individual Interviews	222
Appendix “C” – Letter of Cooperation.....	225
Appendix “D” - Consent Form.....	227

Appendix “E” - Confidentiality Agreement	231
Appendix “F” - Coding.....	232
Appendix “G” - Invitation to Participate.....	234
Appendix H: Table of Cases and Legal References	235

List of Tables

Table 1. - Demographics of Participants by Gender ...	P.117
Table 2. - Participants' Regional Locations	...P.118
Table 3. – Coding	...P.124
Table 4. – Applied Themes and Codes	...P.133
Table 5. – Force Options Table	...P.135
Table 6. – Gender Decision Differences	...P.142

Chapter 1: Introduction to the Study

Introduction

The study starts with a discussion of the purpose of the police in Canada who use force to protect citizens against incidents of victimization. Some citizens may fear that this force will be abused in ways that are oppressive, undermine their freedoms, and deny basic human and civil rights (Kuhns & Knutsson, (2010). When state applications of force and civil rights conflict in principle, police services suffer as a result. Why some police officers use force in circumstances where it appears that no force was necessary, inappropriate and/or unreasonable often varies, leaving citizens confused. This study examined several factors that contribute to the decisions by police officers to use physical force. It used conflict theory as its theoretical foundation and engaged with issues of traditional organizational culture, political concerns, officer disposition, and the influence of gender in use of force decision factors. Although, there is substantial contemporary research on police use of force, there is also a gap in the research analyzing the decision differences of police officers that use force. In this study I specifically considered police officers' responses and investigated gender differences.

This study was conducted in Canada, a country that owes its origins and police institution to British colonialism. While Canada has recently evolved into an independent democracy by virtue of the British Parliament's Canada Act of 1982, the Canadian policing systems reflect the military-like processes consistent with colonial occupation. This aspect of Canadian culture is somewhat reflected in the symbols that identify its national police

force, the Royal Canadian Mounted Police. References to royalty are significantly emblematic of Canadian culture and speak to the historical influence of British systems of government within Canada's governmental systems, legal processes, education and architecture that each contribute to Canadian culture.

Background of the Study

The association between the observance and protection of fundamental human rights and the application of physical force by police has created a need for the research on police officers' use of force. This is especially true in the present day where the multicultural composition within local societies is increasing and the globalization of economics and justice issues are prevalent (Waddington et al., 2009). This ongoing process of change made it especially important in this study to understand the cultural basis for different points of view about what is accepted as a legitimate state intrusion into the human rights and democratic freedoms of their citizens. Public debate emanates from incidents where it appears that the police were too willing to use force.

The use of force and violence has been a topic of public and political interest, scrutiny, challenge and controversy throughout the history of modern policing (Stenning et al., 2009). Decisions to employ physical force are made by individual police officers within situational circumstances wherein they choose to apply physically coercive measures, potentially including deadly force, and based on legal, normative and/or political perspectives (Stenning et al., 2009). Normative perspectives implicate issues of police culture involving their values, attitudes and beliefs that guide officers in their daily routine and produce the patterns that are observed in actual police practice, including the officers'

willingness to use force (Waddington et al., 2009). In cases of differing perspectives, discussion includes identifying the excessiveness of the issues and the standards by which the level of excessiveness was assessed.

The very nature of police work creates some unique characteristics in terms of the way the work was done and the services delivered. Police officers work in an environment wherein the resolutions to public complaints were uniquely varied and the work of policing presented a high degree of ambiguity. Male and female officers dealt with the stress of a policing environment in different ways (Garcia, 2003; Kakar, 2002). When given the opportunity to lead, women generally do things differently from the men, which does not mean that they are less successful in their accomplishments, but only that they do things differently (Waddington et al., 2009). However, the essence of policing has been defined by male standards of performance that effectively set the goals and methods of achievements. According to Waddington et al., (2009), policewomen are equally as successful in accomplishing the aims of law enforcement. Currently literature on this topic does not, however, show how policewomen talk differently about the using force.

Waddington et al., (2009) found that female police officers generally used the powers of arrest available to them by statute less frequently than male police officers, and still provided a similar service level (Garcia, 2003). However, extant literature does not show what the policewomen do differently that results in a diminished level of use of force while attending complaints of equal difficulty and perceived danger than their male colleagues. The importance of the study was to address a gap in the literature by

identifying how policewomen describe using force differently from their male counterparts.

Problem Statement

The application of physical force during an arrest or in pursuit of a suspect is a decision specific to the profession of policing. The ease of abusing physical force is problematic because its potential to impact public confidence in police services. If the ultimate goal in society is to reduce violence, including violence perpetrated by police officers, then the programs to affect this type of behavior needed to be very specific to what police officers do in their work and their training. How police officers talked about force or are critical of the use of force reflects how they responded to confrontational situations (Waddington et al., 2009). There are also several factors that the officers consider and that impact the nature of their responses. Officers are impacted by legal, normative and practical considerations that I investigated and which formed part of the discussions within focus groups as well as in the individual interviews. How officers explained the various force considerations provided me with important information as to how they react in practical circumstances in the field.

The use of physical force is an area of the police role that makes citizens uneasy largely because it is so easy to misuse. A police service that causes injury to a citizen can result in significant public grief or criticism about the service (Waddington et al., 2009). This study analyzed police officers' reasons for using force, an important venture that would impact the approach to use of force in the future (Klukkert et al., 2009). The responses from policewomen participating in this study were anticipated to be less focused

on use of force than their male colleagues and this research concurred. Policewomen do their work differently than policemen and with less physical force, but are equally as effective (Waddington et al., 2009).

My research responds to a gap in the literature on specific decision factors that both men and women specifically respond to under confrontational conditions. The research is very specific in stating that policewomen respond differently to work circumstances relative to their male colleagues. This study determined that those differences were significant, meaning that through additional research, changes to police recruitment, training, and organization policy on issues of force applications should change to reflect this new information.

Purpose of the Study

The primary purpose of this qualitative study was to examine data and create a theory that modeled gender differences in police decisions about use of force. The study explored and discussed the decisions involved in police use of force behavior based on varying factors. It examined factors that contributed to the use of force decisions by police officers, including the role of gender. The concerns I had was that current decision factors based on principles of law or political considerations, organizational interests and culture, and traditional conflict management practices, did not reflect gender-based response preferences. Strategies that avoided the use of force were consistent with legal principles and public expectations. I also explored decision factors applied by police officers in situational circumstances that were confrontational. I analyzed these decisions for possible differences based on all factors including gender to determine the contributing factors

relative to the differences in arriving at use of force decisions as well as decisions not to use force. The results enhanced my understanding about decision factors in police use of force that will empower organizational leaders and researchers in the field to promote constructive changes in use of force strategies and their implementation.

Research Questions

Two primary research questions guided this study:

RQ1. What are the different ways in which police officers explain the application of physical force as a strategy for maintaining social order?

RQ2. What are the different ways in which police officers are critical of the application of physical force?

Three secondary research questions were used to help answer the primary research questions:

RQ3. What criteria do police officers identify in situations justifying or not justifying the use of force as a police practice in maintaining social order?

RQ4. What are the points of consensus among police officers on these matters generally, or do they display a significant variety of different viewpoints?

RQ5. What are the perspectives wherein the police officers' viewpoints differ about the use of force?

A Conflict Theory Contribution - Violence in Society and Policing

The research questions in this study were predicated on government intervention in social order events. In this context conflict theory emphasizes the role of coercion and

power in establishing social order (Durkheim, 1938). Maintaining social order is a key factor for the state and the use of coercive measures apparently is necessary to make social order work effectively (Durkheim, 1938). Conflict theory discusses both the ideas of the relationship between government and citizen as well as between citizens themselves. The theory asserts that society is fragmented into groups that compete for social and economic resources. Additional to Conflict Theory, Durkheim, (1897), also introduced the concept of anomie to describe social fragmentation in the context of normlessness. The term anomie describes a condition of deregulation that Durkheim observed as occurring in society, in which the rules on how people ought to behave with each other were breaking down causing people to not know what to expect from one another. Anomie, simply defined, is a state where expectations on behaviors are confused, unclear, or not present. This term arose from Durkheim's preoccupation with the effects of social change during the times when working conditions changed from feudalism to industrialization. Unguided or unregulated change produced conflict and subsequently violence. The conflict that was created required the state to intervene with activities related to social order and order maintenance responses that involved police action such as law enforcement action, crowd control, looting and vandalism events (Durkheim, 1897).

Further, Durkheim (1897) referred to social order maintained by domination of power concentrated in the hands of those with the greatest political, economic, and social resources as a violence-producing component. This relationship is an important aspect of Durkheim's conception of conflict management. For the purposes of this study, the police were considered as an arm of government that manages social order and order maintenance

conditions, and which becomes the delivery system of order services that government anticipates. Therefore, conflict in society according to Durkheim (1897), was anticipated, requiring controls that allow the civil systems to function. Conflict theory helped to explain the sources of societal disorder. Government's role was to establish a means of maintaining social order like policing services that by their very nature implied violence in structure and operation.

In my study, the research questions provided a basis of inquiry for determining how police officers determine when physical force was to be applied and how much force was to be used. Generally, police officers talked about decisions to use force based on a number of factors that examine the legal, normative and practical components that align with the Durkheim (1897) conflict theory. The components of the conceptual framework of this paper will be discussed in more detail next.

Conceptual Framework

This study was built around a number of concepts that form the framework within which police use of force ideas thrive. Conflict theory was key and emphasized the role of coercion and power in producing social order (Durkheim, 1938). Conflict theory emphasized the coercive role of the state in maintaining social order as a significant mandate that allowed for public safety initiatives to thrive. Within this context, the police agencies deliver coercive power under law and order initiatives used by governments to maintain that social order. These social control initiatives have caused police agencies to develop a corporate culture characterized by aggression and assertiveness (Bierie 2012).

The resulting paramilitary organizational structure expresses command and control features and has assumed a physically coercive approach (Kuhns & Knutsson 2012).

However, social feminism theory indicates that policewomen do the same job and within the same risk parameters as their male counterparts however they were doing it differently (Bierie, 2012; Garcia 2003; Kakar, 2002). Policewomen use their powers of arrest less frequently than their male counterparts, and are less reliant on physical control measures (Waddington et al. 2009). Policewomen also rely more on mediation, negotiation, and conflict management strategies. Therefore, conflict theory and social feminism theory are in disagreement about government needs in social control and the practical components of conflict management and negotiation. The difference in traditional police practices characterized by gender was a key focus of this study.

Alpert and Dunham (2004), indicated an increasing contemporary distaste for the use of physical force to direct and control others. One of the goals of this study was to help reduce violence in police and citizen encounters. The study was designed to discuss and explore contributing factors to the application of physical force during police and citizen encounters, thereby increasing our understanding about those events.

Scholnick (2011), argued that it is in the interest of public safety and/or the public good, that the police should be effective in preserving public order and preventing crime. However, Scholnick also argued that it is equally good that police powers be controlled and confined so as not to interfere arbitrarily with personal freedoms; this results in compromises between efficient and effective policing and basic human rights. The idea that guided my research was that when police officers acted officiously and used physical

force during citizen encounters, the appropriateness of their behavior came into question relative to public safety and the justifiability of physical force is brought into question (Waddington et al., 2009; Scholnick, 2011). It was therefore in the interest of policing agencies that a manner of reducing violence during arrests be explored and modeled.

This study was partly modeled on an international study of policing by Waddington et al. (2009). This earlier study reviewed how police officers talked about police use of force and how they arrived at decisions to use force; participant responses in focus group discussions indicated that the personal values and attitudes were important outcomes. My dissertation study was structured similarly and also used focus group discussions as one method of gathering the data. Waddington et al. (2009), focused on police officer attitudes and values from a more general police officer perspective while looking for causal factors that potentially identified use of force decisions. My study had a similar focus but emphasized exploring potential gender-based differences in the responses of the police participants, and how these decision differences impacted use of force decisions during police and citizen encounters.

It was the differences in the participants' responses in the focus group discussions that were important to this study. The developing theory addressed the idea that not all conflict should result in use of force applications. If policewomen talk about the study scenario presented in the focus group discussions implying they would use less force than their male counterparts, the potential impact for changes to traditional police conflict management strategies and policies will likely change. The rationale is that the female approach to use of force is less injury causing, a positive approach in policing.

Waddington et al. (2009), indicated that what was striking in the various jurisdictions in the International Studies wherein the cultures were so diverse, the police officers talked about the use of force in similar ways. Waddington, et al. (2009), further indicated that in these studies, the scenarios depicted a routine encounter for the police officers yet the perceived extent of the dangers or risks within the situational circumstances varied enormously. The officers in these focus group interviews demonstrated an imperative to maintain control of the situation, a factor that commonly appears in police strategies. Like perception, the ideas about control can be defined variously. That is, one officer might think of control in terms of physical means, while another might negotiate a confrontational circumstance to an agreed upon set of behavior based outcomes.

Waddington et al. (2009) found that the focus group interviews conducted in the International Studies most significantly revealed how officers justified, evaluated and explained police conduct. These focus group participants openly acknowledged the extent to which their aggressive nature might encourage officers to breach laws and department policies, and officers argued over competing courses of action based on the circumstances presented in the focus group scenarios (Waddington, et al., 2009). The results of the Waddington et al. (2009) International Study revealed that the countries' host culture somewhat impacted police officer responses to the focus group scenario within the study groups. Therefore, one could conceptualize that socialization of the study participants could have been one contributing factor to the data gathered in that study. Gender socialization differences appeared to be evident in my study results.

The International Study participants were primarily male participants. Gender was not considered in these studies. In my study, I exposed male focus group participants and female focus group participants to the same scenario for discussion and evaluation and then analyzed the discussions to determine the differences in responses if any. The literature review in Chapter 2 of this Proposal indicated that there probably would be noticeable differences.

It was in the context of determining whether the decisions to use force in police work vary based on the gender of the officers that this study was conducted. If policewomen are successful in de-escalating confrontational circumstances without the application of physical force, what does that say about the need for using physical force for purposes of gaining situational control in most if not all situations? Are there equally effective means of gaining situational control other than by physical force?

It is in the shadow of gender-based use of force decisions that this grounded theory study was conducted. Grounded theory allowed themes and patterns within the data to emerge from a systematic comparative analysis that was grounded in fieldwork so as to explain what has been and is observed (Charmaz, 2006; Patton, 2002). One of the challenges of a grounded method for generating theory was evident when researchers rely on existing theoretical ideals or notions that may influence the emergence of a new and substantive theory from the data analyzed (Creswell, 2007). Gender influenced theories were active in this study and explained in more detail in Chapter 2. It is within the context of the analyses of these theory influences that this study was conducted. The gap analysis

in this study looked at how these decision differences influenced the application of physical force when faced with difficult and confrontational circumstances.

What did the analysis of these data tell us about how policewomen think about use of force and how did they arrive at the decisions about using force or not to use force? The accounts of female officers about how to manage their status as policewomen in confrontational circumstances may demonstrate different attitudes in the way policewomen talk about use of force relative to their male counterparts. Those perceived differences, influenced this research.

Nature of the Study

The nature of this study was to construct a qualitative inquiry using a grounded theory approach that looked to generate theory from the analysis of data collected by way of focus group and structured individual in-depth interviews. The participants providing the data for my study were chosen from a pool of volunteers through convenience and purposeful sampling techniques with a distribution of gendered features, cultural differences, age group influences, and included considerations of length of police services of the participants. The utility of two sources of data in this study allowed for a breadth of discussion of the topic through focus group interviews and it allowed the researcher to explore the data in greater depth during structured interviews.

Grounded theory depends on research methods that take the researcher into the real world so that the data is empirically focused (Patton, 2002). The idea is to identify themes that accrue from the analysis of the data. Creswell (2009) and Patton (2002) went a little deeper than theme development and talked about grounded theory as a method of

discovering theory. It starts with the data gathered by the researcher and moves to theory development through a means of analysis.

In this study, the data collection procedures entailed focus group discussions and structured individual in-depth interviews. The responses from the focus groups were qualitatively analyzed to determine how the officers arrived at the decision to use force or not to use force. Gender specific responses are important in the analysis and therefore the participants in the focus groups and the structured interviews were separated during the discussions and interviews. The structured interviews added to the depth of the data about the participant's experiences. The interviews focused on actual police incidents and talked about the incidents responses, giving real life to the interview data.

My role as the researcher was to guide the focus group and individual interviews through a structured process. The discussions were prompted by scripted questions. I was careful to avoid making statements or asking questions that might be construed as directing the participants to take a particular position during the interviews.

In terms of the study quality and validation, the study was designed to mimic an International Study that looked at the issues of how police officers talked about using force in England, Netherlands, Germany, Australia, Venezuela and Brazil (Waddington et al., 2009). Furthermore, a dissertation study was conducted in New Jersey as a follow-up, testing for similar features as the International Study but looking at the responses from Urban, Suburban and Rural police officers (Barrett et al., 2009). These studies used focus groups as the data generator and used a progressive scenario to stimulate the focus group discussions. Part of the

validity and reliability tests in my study were to compare the findings of my study with the study results of these International Studies referred above.

The limitation of the study design was in the sampling method used. Random sampling would help to make the results more generalizable. I used a convenience sample of volunteers and thereby limited the generalizability of the study results. The strength of my study is in the depth of analysis of the data that provides the readers of the study results with richer information and a deeper understanding of the decision processes applied by the participants to the circumstances in the scenario.

Secondly, as a supplement to the focus group interviews I conducted individual interviews of 12 participants based on gender, 6 female and 6 male participants. These interviews were conducted through the use of a scripted questionnaire and each participant was asked the same question in the same way by the same interviewer to maintain consistency in all respects. The questionnaire was used to elicit responses that focus on use of force experiences, the situational factors surrounding the incidents and the contributing factors that initiated the use of force along with the care of the subject. The thoughts and perceptions of the participants who applied force or refrained from applying force were explored through the questionnaire and the reasons for their specific responses. This process provided the study with the in-depth information necessary to allow me to obtain a better understanding of the data.

Significance of the Study

The literature indicated that policewomen use the powers of arrest and use of force powers less frequently than their male counterparts (Garcia, 2003; Waddington, 2009, Bierie, 2012). My study gathered the responses from policewomen and policemen based on circumstances as

set out in a progressive scenario designed to encourage a discussion about the appropriate and reasonable measures to apprehend the subjects in the scenario. These focus group discussions were supplemented by structured individual in-depth interviews. The differences in the responses by gender were noticeable and were analyzed to determine the significance of any differences to police calls for service. The practical nature of this exercise was one that was designed to impact police performance through potentially mitigating use of force incidents, thereby promoting public confidence and safety.

The social change to be impacted by this study will be reflected in the importance of the study results to legislators, police administrators, policy writers, and police trainers in terms of impacting programs that address the practical day-to-day work engaged by the police. I anticipated that the success of the study would help to change the police response habits from situational control to situational safety within calls for service entailing confrontational circumstances.

Assumptions and Limitations

This study assumed that there are differences in the way that police officers do their work that included gender differences (Waddington, 2009; Garcia, 2003; Kakar, 2002). Researchers have noted that these differences could be due to different socialization practices for men and women in society (Bierie, 2012). The evidence of this, according to the literature reviewed in Chapter 2, is that policewomen use their powers of arrest less and are less likely to use physical force than policemen in similar circumstances (Waddington et al., 2009). The differences might reflect cultural or normative values that guide officer behavior irrespective of their training and experiences. This study also assumed that the study participants were

knowledgeable and or possessed experience in the area of modern policing and were prepared to respond to the structured questions and participate in the focus group discussions honestly and truthfully.

The internal validity of a study refers to credibility or the believability of the study results. Credibility in my study was significantly enhanced by participant integrity. The study participants in my study demonstrated an eagerness to participate and engaged me as the researcher about anticipated study results before we had engaged in either focus group discussions or completed an individual interview. Study questions were important in terms of focusing the researcher on the issues of interest or importance in the study.

The limitations of a study are determined by the breadth or focus of the study questions. This study was designed to determine whether there were differences in the gender-based critical decision factors when it came to the use of force applications in arrest circumstances. Although the discussions in Chapter 2 entail varying perspectives of police use of force, the final focus was on how the officers themselves assess their roles that centered on the application of physical force. This would be important information to know.

An additional threat to this study is the measurement tool used to determine male and female differences. The responses to the focus group discussions and structured interview questions are subjective and require a significant element of personal judgment. The situational factors of a circumstance may be judged differently by various officers, and thereby impacting the outcomes. The subjective elements associated to this study will be addressed by looking for patterns and themes in the behavior of the officers that represent the more common responses to situational circumstances.

Bierie (2012) indicated that vignette methodologies are not without limitations. They still are concerned with selection bias or difficulty in model specification or quantitatively the statistical tools applied. In qualitative methodologies selection bias relates to participant selection that will impact the data through their responses to the scenarios. In my study, I will also be conducting individual interviews that are also dependent to an extent on selection bias of interviewees an influence that reflects not only the biases of the participants but their selection can be a bias of the researcher if selection is not made through random methods. Although random selection is the best-known method of selecting a sample from a population, it then becomes a question of how the population to be represented is selected.

Random selection is not a characteristic of this study based on the qualitative nature of the research. Convenience sampling limits the sample's representativeness within the target population. This study was not designed to elicit representative data from the target population but it provided an opportunity to conduct a deeper analysis of the data collected that would empower police administrators in their organizational decisions and to guide future research on this topic that could better represent the target population through random sampling tactics, as one example, and thereby provide more generalizable analysis results.

Further to the limitations of this study is that, I as the researcher, am the main instrument for data collection, analysis and interpretation. Therefore, researcher biases and subjectivity are likely to play a role in these processes. An awareness of my personal biases is important for the validity of the entire study and I will address this within each of the phases of the study analysis. One idea about exercising neutrality within the study process is to check my own study procedures against some other similar studies that have been conducted and peer

reviewed. The International Study completed by Waddington et al. (2009) is a model or study structure used for building my study and the results from that study forms a base of comparison.

Delimitations of the Study

This study does not reflect observations of officers in the field engaged in various practical dilemmas that require them to make decisions about use of force. Those types of studies are known as Observational Studies and focus on different criteria as well as respond to possibly different study questions than in the grounded theory study method employed here. This study also did not include Case Studies wherein the researcher reviews various case files to determine officer responses to the varying situational conditions described in the files. Again, this would reflect a different study method and likely employ different study processes.

In the area of police perceptions of their analytical skills, which is important in police use of force considerations, there are additional physiological and neurobiological components that influence human behavior in the field. This study does not go into that level of analysis while commenting on police behavior in confrontational circumstance. However, these considerations would be excellent follow-up topics for study purposes.

Conclusion

As long as modern police forces have existed, their use of force and violence has been a potential topic of public and political interest, scrutiny, challenge and controversy (Stenning et al., 2009). The factors that influence police use of force are driven by the ideals of situational control of the physical surroundings including those persons immediately within that

environment. In my study, I explored the concepts related to situational safety as a primary consideration in police calls for service thereby contributing to the features of officer and subject safety.

Based on the evidence described in the Chapter 2 literature review, gender factors were explored during my study to determine the significance of gender influences on decisions to use force during an arrest. The differences in gender responses to calls for service are closely related to conflict management concepts that more closely resemble a community policing approach in responding to calls for service. I anticipated that if the data in my study demonstrates a difference in gender related responses to calls for police services that the analysis would motivate new research on this topic and motivate police administrators to revisit their policies and procedures in situational control management strategies.

Chapter 1 provides a brief outline of the study and explains some of its important features through the research questions and framework. Next, Chapter 2 describes the literature reviewed and pays a significant amount of attention to legal concepts, sociological ideals, and psychological components of police decisions. The literature review provided me with the informational background needed to form the study structure and enabled me to develop the necessary questions to conduct this type of research. Chapter 3 sets out the study that encompassed the theoretical traditions of inquiry, sampling, and population sampled, method of data collection, data management, methods of data analysis and issues of ethical consideration.

Chapter 2: Literature Review

Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to examine, analyze and synthesize the literature regarding police use of force decisions. The work that police officers engage in daily presents many opportunities for interactions with citizens, some of which have the potential to create an environment of conflict. This chapter offers a comprehensive review of the literature on the theoretical and conceptual factors that influence police use of force decisions during an arrest or during a demonstration of citizen violence. The examined literature suggested that there are gender-based differences in police work decisions. This chapter includes analyses and discussion of information in the existing literature on how these and other factors influence police decisions.

Police officers generally face problems in managing the varying and sometimes conflicting expectations of conduct in the course of their duties (Skolnick, 2011). Conflicts between democratic ideologies and the work of maintaining social order and control place a range of demands on the police officers as agents of law enforcement and public safety. Three key questions explored during this review were:

- What does it mean for a police officer to gain and maintain control?
- Does it have to be physical confinement that measures control or do psychological features count?
- Does gender play a role in the decisions for managing circumstances that threaten conflict?

In this Chapter, I discuss some of the current issues confronting police practitioners and researchers in the field, while also conducting a review of the conceptual frameworks and methods used by this study.

The chapter is organized around the different ideas about police use of force decisions mostly in mature democracies that demonstrate constitutional and legal frameworks that guide the relationships between government and citizens. The study is a grounded theory study and was designed to generate or discover a theory, as suggested by (Creswell, 2007).

The literature review for this study examined research on police officers' use of force to determine their conceptual ideals, evaluations and conclusions. The research process examined material available through the Walden University Library, the Simon Fraser University Library, the University of British Columbia Law Library, and through Google Scholar searches. Searches were also conducted using ProQuest Criminal Justice Data Base and EBSCO Host PsycINFO to identify peer reviewed journals articles. The primary search keywords and phrases used to identify relevant criminal justice literature were, *Police and Use of Force*, *Police and Violence*, *Police and Social Control*, *Community Policing* and such relevant terms. To identify literature on department organizational structure, I searched the terms, *police and organizational behaviour*, *police and management*, and *organizational structure*. Gender based articles were found by searching the terms, *police and culture*, *police and gender*, *police and sexual harassment*. I searched for literature on the psychology of police use of force centers on concepts of *perception* in the PsycINFO and PsycARTICLES areas of the EBSCO Host search engine. I also reviewed literature on perception in the policing field where using articles in the Criminal Justice Data Base. Amazon.com searches were helpful in finding

textbooks on the police use of force topic as well as in the qualitative research methods field.

The legal research for this literature review was conducted online using government databases relative to the substantive law and search engines such as CanLII.com and Justica.com. These searches used the specific search terms such as *police use of force* to identify articles whose references to other cases were investigated to broaden my own search. In Canadian Constitutional Law the term, *Charter of Rights and Freedoms*, refers to the constitutional document that governs the relationships between citizens and the state. In U.S. Constitutional Law, the 4th, 8th, and 14th Amendments to the U.S. Constitution speak to the issues about the rights and freedoms of its citizens.

Defining and Conceptualizing the Study Problem

Using democratic principles as the basis for decision-making, serves the public good through concepts of law and order; the arbitrary interference with personal freedoms through the application of police powers, however, impacts its effectiveness (Skolnick, 2011). Democratic principles express interests in, order and maintenance, through the application of the law, implying that the goal in modern societies is to reduce violence whether it is citizen behavior or the use of force by police officers (Klukkert et al., 2009). Although, the capacity to use force as an instrument for the achievement of state mandated goals is ultimately important to the police role, its application can be complex (Waddington et al., 2009). When used appropriately, police use of force is a functional and necessary aspect of living in a safe and healthy society (Kuhns & Knutsson, 2010). Citizens in most of the more mature democracies trust their police as a legitimate and a necessary part of their governmental institutions, the use

of physical force is one area of the police role that makes citizens uneasy, however, largely because it is so easy to misuse or abuse (Kuhns & Knutsson, 2010).

The complexities associated with clarifying what constitutes proper or appropriate force requires significant exploration of the issues. In this chapter I discuss ideas on use of force from democratic and legal perspectives, public safety demands, organizational influences, and the perspectives of those actually applying physical force, the police members themselves (Kuhns & Knutsson, 2010).

The purpose of this dissertation was to look beyond the ordinary police role and focus on the less than ordinary behavior that can develop during incidents when physical force is used in citizen contact with the police. A discussion about the critical factors pertaining to decisions to use force by police authorities is therefore important allowing police managers and ultimately criminal courts to assess the tipping points when negotiation or mediation fails and physical force is necessary in insuring safety factors are maintained. One dimension that stood out within this discussion in police services concerns the influence of gender. The importance of gender in this study demonstrated that there is a difference in the decisions of policewomen to use their powers of arrest relative to their male counterparts. In my literature search in preparation for this study, the literature indicated that, policewomen do the same work as policemen and they do it equally well or better in some circumstances (Garcia, 2003; Novak et al., 2011). Therefore, when arriving at the decision to initiate an arrest; what, are the decision factors that result in the use of force or the nonuse of force, and is there a range of decision points or are the decisions mostly focused on similar situational factors?

Police conduct is observed in many jurisdictions globally with similar interest and specific concerns about use of force. The Six Country Studies, a series of international studies conducted by Waddington et al., (2009), Stenning et al., (2009), Baker et al., (2009), Gabaldon et al., (2009), Birkbeck et al., (2009), and Machado et al., (2009), focused on police use of force in England, Netherlands, Germany, Australia, Venezuela, and Brazil. Although the scholars conducting the Six Countries Studies collaborated on the format of the studies, they were multiple studies that were conducted independently of each other, with an overview of all the studies done in an article by Waddington, et al., (2009). Additionally, Barrett (2009) conducted a dissertation study in New Jersey that followed the format of the Six Countries Studies focusing on the comparative differentiation of police use of force. The study was based on police officers' environmental influences like urban, sub-urban and rural duty assignments. In my study, the differentiating influences I focused on in use of force decisions were gender. While conflict theory (Durkheim, 1938), and social feminism theory (Kakar, 2002; Garcia, 2003; Bierie, 2012), informed my study, the conceptualization of the study was founded in the study conducted by Waddington et al., (2009) and their model of inquiry into using force. Although the societies in the above studies are different ethnically, socially, economically and politically, it was anticipated that the researched jurisdictions represented policing systems with different attitudes toward the levels of force applications (Waddington et al., 2009). As an example, the police in the two Latin American countries represented in the study had a reputation respecting the frequency of shooting people, whereas at the other extreme the police in England do not routinely carry firearms and seldom shoot anyone (Waddington et al., 2009). In spite of the differences in the frequency of police shootings in Brazil relative to Britain for

example, the police members expressed relatively similar decision-making concerns when confronted by the hypothetical circumstances in their focus groups. According to Waddington et al. (2009), the talk centered on concerns about the subjects ages, criminal backgrounds and history if known, the potential for weapons in the car or on their persons and how the law applies to what the subjects were doing. Stenning et al. (2009) indicated that although in some jurisdictions the police did not have the same range of weapons routinely available to them, they were still required to deal with the same circumstances and do so by simply applying other tactical considerations. Therefore the considerations about what force to apply in any given circumstances were partly dependent on the technical solutions available to the police officers involved in the circumstances. The differences in the officers' decisions in the International Studies were most evident when the more serious resistance was experienced like driving away from the police officers and instigating a police pursuit. Some of the decision differences may have been due to the differences in equipment such as guns in Latin America versus no guns in England. The officers cannot make a decision to use deadly force if they have no deadly force equipment, is the logic.

My study was conducted in Canada. The importance of the jurisdiction in which this study was conducted is that the host culture is considered to have an impact on how the police provide services (Waddington et al., 2009). Culture is at the heart of a nation (www.international.gc.ca). Canadian culture is influenced by two heritage traditions. Primarily Canada is defined by its British heritage from its colonial days, a parliamentary system of government and a common-law legal system. Secondly, there is a strong French influence

within the provinces of Quebec and New Brunswick that help to enrich the country's traditions that are also defined by language.

Waddington et al. (2009) indicated that findings in the International Studies revealed that local culture had an impact in the police responses relative to the study scenario presented. Although Canadian culture is rooted in European traditions, other influences may impact the results of my study if Waddington et al. (2009), comments are considered. For example, Canadian police officers take some guidance from United States police experiences. The U.S. Supreme Court decisions in *Graham v Connor* (1989) and *Tennessee v Garner* (1985) for example, are often referred to in Canadian police use of force training context. Additionally, Canada shares a common border with the United States and shares a common language making it easier for Canadians and Americans to share common features of culture across the border. The literature review in this chapter is largely based on non-Canadian research because the literature on the topic of this dissertation is scarce in Canada. Therefore my literature review is mostly based on writings that originated in U.S. based research. It is easy to see how the Canadian police experiences can become impacted by other influences. However, the Canadian culture demonstrates some differences that I explored in my research by reviewing, for example, Canada's democratic and legal principles relative to using force. The considerations in my research therefore addressed Canadian police responses in the context of the traditions in the Canadian culture. Canadian police services are focused in part on a community-policing model, which says something about the expectations in findings within the research for this dissertation (www.rcmp-grc.gc.ca/ccaps-spcca/capra). That is, community policing is centered on problem solving and conflict resolution approaches whereas the

enforcement model is perhaps more focused on a confrontational model. Waddington (2009) commented on culture specific findings in the International Studies, a feature that will be useful in analyzing the Canadian specific findings in my study.

Democratic Principles and Use of Force Applications

Democratic principles in governmental decision-making include all points of view with respect to the operations of government. Accordingly, citizens are discouraged in law and legal policies from the use of violence to settle differences. The concept is to achieve “peaceable behavior, certainly with procedure, but also with positive law” (Skolnick, 2011, p.8). The legitimacy of the police function in democracies is linked to the manner in which the police go about engaging in forceful tactics to accomplish their mandate. Kuhns & Knutsson, (2010), indicated that “police officers are expected to use individual judgment in applying force, while at the same time working within appropriate legal and organizational parameters” (p.6). When police misuse force, it challenges public trust and threatens the legitimacy of policing services. The police function can therefore be viewed as being engaged in a continuous balancing act wherein concepts like service, judgment, fairness, and justice are weighed against the use of force, abuse of authority and other concerns that might impact the ideals of legitimacy within a democracy (Kuhns & Knutsson, 2010).

Unlike health and education as examples, the police service does not rest upon a single concept of public good. It may be a positive good for the police to be strong and effective in preserving public order and preventing crime, but it must also be good for police powers to be controlled so as not to arbitrarily interfere with personal rights and freedoms (Skolnick, 2011).

In the United States the 4th, 8th and 14th Amendments to the Constitution speak to the treatment of citizens during and after arrest or while in custody. In Canada the Constitution Act (1982) refers to Section 7 through 12 of the Charter of Rights and Freedoms that constitutes Part 1 of the Act, setting out the use of force components that apply in the government and citizen relationship. Constitutional legislation in mature democracies will create the citizen rights and freedoms that override any other legislation that does not conform to the Constitution. Therefore, when the competent courts in any jurisdiction rule on any particular point of law, their primary focus will be on comparing the situational circumstances of the matter before them to Constitutional correctness.

A Discussion of Legal Principles and Use of Force

Laws and legal authority that govern arrests and, search and seizures of citizens, have their foundation in cultural legitimacy (Kuhns & Knutsson, 2010). Laws, in most if not all countries in the world establish the relationship between the government and its citizens. Democracies, more specifically, articulate fundamental principles or established precedents about the relationship between citizens and government. It protects citizens from unscrupulous government agents (Kuhns and Knutsson, 2010). I looked at case law in Canada and the U.S.A. to help with my discussion on the legal principles associated to police use of force. Case law as it evolves through decisions by the highest courts in the land often stand for decades before replacement decisions are created, as in the following examples;

In 1985, the Supreme Court of Canada held that, “police officers are authorized to use such force as is reasonable, proper and necessary to carry out their duties, providing that no wanton or unnecessary violence is imposed “ (Cluett v. The Queen, 1985, paragraph 10). In 1989, the U.S.

Supreme Court held in *Graham v Connor* that, determinations about the constitutional appropriateness of police use of force must be judged from the perspective of a reasonable officer on the scene (Klinger and Brunson, 2009). These two cases, although dated, have been used as primary references in police use of force cases and will help to focus the issues for purposes of this discussion.

Historically, in medieval England, the birthplace of the modern police specialists, the procedures involving arrest and detention resided in the common law powers derived from the rights and duties of ordinary citizens in relation to the maintenance of the “Kings Peace” (Holdsworth, 1973). In these early times, the ordinary citizen was duty bound to make arrests based on the common-law principles of that time (Holdsworth, 1973). Two principles evolved, one being that imprisonment is appropriate use of civil behavior and secondly, the principles of arrest and detention. Further, it would seem from this rule that, “in the middle ages the powers of officials to arrest suspected persons were not very much greater than those of private citizens” (Holdsworth, 1973, p.600). Therefore, in terms of English legal history, the powers of arrest lay with the private citizen as much as it did with any public official and implied with those powers included the right to use force.

In more modern terms, most particularly under Canadian and U.S. law on coercive powers, arrest is a legal process empowered by statute that allows citizens, under limited circumstances and police officers as the primary agents of arrest, to take someone into their custody according to the law of the land. The Supreme Court of Canada in their judgment in *Asante-Mensah*, (2003), indicated that the process of arrest implies confrontation and a potential for the use of force by one party or the other. If the officers could rely on a citizen to appear before a

Magistrate voluntarily in answer to a violation of law there would be no need for arrest; however it appears that voluntary appearances in court are of limited practical value.

Therefore, the process of an arrest occurs when a police officer verbally advises the subject of the arrest about the reasons for the arrest.

Sometimes more than words or just touching of the subject is required to secure compliance and the law authorizes the additional step whether it requires a negotiation to achieve compliance or physical force (R v. Asante-Mensah, 2003). The court in R v. Asante-Mensah (2003) indicated that in Canadian common law, an interference with the arrested person's liberty, which includes the use of force, must be no more than is "reasonably necessary". This same court articulated that "a police officer has the right to use such force as may be necessary to make an arrest however, the right to use reasonable force attaches at common law to the institution of an arrest, not to the status of the individual making an arrest" (p.20). The court continued by declaring that, "the ability to use force is necessary to the efficacy of the arrest power because it often provides a necessary precondition to securing the submission of the person arrested" (R v. Asante-Mensah, 2003, p.2).

During an arrest, the Supreme Court of Canada asserted that, "a certain amount of latitude is permitted to police officers who are under a duty to act and must often react in difficult and exigent circumstances" (Cluett v The Queen, p.222). Reasonable force is associated to the context of the crime implying that the concept of reasonableness is not only related to the gravity of the offence but to what force is necessary to accomplish the arrest or whether a forcible arrest was necessary, given all the circumstances (R v. Asante-Mensah, 2003). In Canada, justifiability for the application of physical force, depends on a number of factors

including, the duty being performed, the extent to which some interference with individual liberty is necessitated in order to perform that duty, the importance of the performance of that duty to the public good, the liberty interfered with, and the nature and extent of the interference (R v. Asante-Mensah, 2003).

The court in, R. v. Bottrell (1981) indicated that the police are in a special position of power over the prisoners in their custody. If a prisoner strikes a police officer, that is called assaulting a peace officer. Secondly, the prisoner cannot run from a policeman without fear of a charge of escaping lawful custody. There is really not much that a prisoner can do to protect himself against assaults by a police officer. The justice system puts the police officer in that position of power and it is the justice system that must protect the prisoner. In this regard the Supreme Court of Canada, in the case of Cluett v. The Queen, (1985), said that:

Police officers are authorized to use such force as is reasonable, proper and necessary to carry out their duties, providing that no wanton or unnecessary violence is imposed. What is reasonable and proper in the particular circumstance, and in the particular case, will depend upon all the circumstances. It is not possible to lay down any hard and fast rule, except the test of reasonableness. (Para. 10)

This same court further held that: “There should be no doubt that the police are not entitled to use force unless an arrest is warranted and has been properly made. The obligation to inform a citizen of the reasons for arrest ensures that police officers will exercise their powers properly and with some degree of discretion.” (Para. 12) Therefore, if the police officer fails to properly arrest a subject, and to give reasons for the arrest, the arrest is unlawful, the officers are not acting in the execution of their duty and therefore not justified in using physical force. This

would then constitute an assault on the subject of the encounter, wherein the subject would be justified in resisting under the self-defense components of the criminal law (*Cluett v The Queen*, 1985). The legal standard set out by a more recent Supreme Court of Canada decision in *R. v. Nasogaluak*, (2010), indicated that, when the police had cause to use force in order to complete an arrest or prevent someone from escaping police custody, the degree of force allowed remains constrained by the principles of proportionality, necessity and reasonableness. It is the responsibilities of the courts to guard against illegitimate use of power by the police against citizens, given the consequences of excessive force applications.

The common law in Canada essentially provides that, “a police officer is justified in using force to effect a lawful arrest, provided that he or she acted on reasonable and probable grounds and used only as much force as is necessary in the circumstances” (*R v. Nasogaluak*, (2010), Para. 34). The court addressed the concept of reasonableness in their comments of, “objectively reasonable” (Para. 34), requiring some objective components in the assessment of the requirements to use force. Meaning, that the substantive law on use of force, “is to be judged on a subjective-objective bases” (*R. v. Nasogaluak*, 2010). In *Chartier v. Greaves*, (2001) the court explained the subjective-objective principle by indicating that the least amount of force was not the objective test. The court said that the police would be justified if they used no more force that was necessary under the circumstances of the case.

The analysis of the issue of excessive force should first consider if any use of force in the apprehension or arrest of the subject is required. Secondly, if force is justified and was applied, was the level of force objectively reasonable, having regard to the circumstances and dangers of the situation? The Supreme Court of Ontario said in *Chartier v. Greaves* (2001) that, “in

assessing the objective reasonableness of the force used, the court should be careful to consider the exigencies of the moment and not measure ‘with nicety’ the exact amount of force required.” (Para. 37) The court’s comments above present as practical an approach as possible by setting limits in terms of requiring the police officers to do their own reasonable assessment of the situation, while not requiring the police officers to unnecessarily subject themselves to dangers inherent in confrontational situations. In practical terms however, confrontations get messy. When officers describe the circumstances, ambiguous and confusing testimonies are often the result making an assessment more difficult and the application of both the common law and the substantive law more challenging.

In the U.S. Supreme Court case, *Tennessee v. Garner* (1985), the suspect Garner was a burglar leaving a home he had just broken into and ran away from the police officer who shot and killed him. A Tennessee statute authorized the shooting of a fleeing suspect but the deceased’s father asked the U.S. Supreme Court to review and render a verdict on the Constitutionality of the state statute and thereby of the officer’s actions when shooting his son. The Court said that the statute was ultra vires the U.S. 4th Amendment and therefore the shooting was excessive force. Until the *Garner* decision, the police in the U.S. pursued suspects with similar vigor. However, post *Garner*, the use of deadly force in stopping fleeing suspects changed. Fleeing suspects are deemed not to be an immediate danger to the police officers and therefore the Court in *Garner* (1985) set out a different approach on the use of deadly force in similar circumstances.

The logic the court applied in *Tennessee v. Garner* (1985) was that, the apprehension by the use of deadly force is a seizure subject to the 4th Amendment’s objective-reasonableness

requirement. To determine whether the seizure is reasonable, the court considered the extent of the intrusion on the suspect's rights. Under that Amendment, the court said, it must be balanced against the governmental interests in effective law enforcement. Therefore, regardless of the probable cause available to the officer to seize or arrest the suspect, deadly force is not necessarily justified (*Tennessee v. Garner*, 1985, p.471). Furthermore, the 4th Amendment should not be interpreted relative to the common law rule in force up to the time of the *Garner* case, allowing the use of whatever force is necessary to accomplish the arrest of a fleeing felon. Changes in the legal context and in the application of technology of the time means that the rule is distorted almost beyond recognition when literally applied. In terms of the legal context, in the past, felonies were capital crimes and now with changes in the law, few are capital crimes, if any. Also at the time the original common law rule was developed, weapons were rudimentary. Based on the reasons relative to the changes in the legal context and technologically, the Court held that there was no reason to believe that the effectiveness of law enforcement would not be significantly hampered by this decision (*Tennessee v. Garner*, 1985). Lastly, the crime of burglary is a serious offense but that does not mean that the suspect is dangerous to the police or the public and particularly given that the suspect in this case was young, slight, unarmed and running away from the officer (*Tennessee v. Garner*, 1985).

The court in the *Garner* (1985) decision changed the law in the United States and to an extent in Canada, on how the use of deadly force was going to be applied in the future. The reasons for justification of deadly force applications was to be based on the "objectively reasonableness" standard rather than a subjectively held concept in the officers' minds based on beliefs that may not apply to the circumstances at hand, going forward. Previous experience in

other deadly force circumstances may not necessarily be objectively applied within the circumstances of a current and evolving situation. The current situation must be evaluated on the events within the situation as they evolve according to the Garner (1985) decision.

In the United States, the 4th Amendment to the Bill of Rights ensures citizens the right to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures, including arrest, and warrants shall be issued only upon probable cause, supported by oath or affirmation, and particularly describing the place to be searched, and the persons or things to be seized (www.law.cornell.edu). In a landmark U.S.S.C decision in the case, *Graham v. Connor* (1989), the 4th Amendment again addressed the concept of objective reasonableness during an arrest. Mr. Graham, the Appellant, was a diabetic and felt the onset of an insulin reaction. One remedy to counteract the insulin reaction was to ingest orange juice or another sweet substance. Mr. Graham asked his friend to drive him to a nearby convenience store to acquire the orange juice. Upon entering the store, Mr. Graham found a long line-up and immediately left the store to find the insulin remedy at a friend's house. Officer Connor, a city police officer, became suspicious when he saw Mr. Graham hastily enter and exit the store and conducted an investigative stop of the car containing Mr. Graham and his friend who was driving the car. Backup officers arrived on the scene, handcuffed Mr. Graham, and ignored his attempts to explain and treat his condition. During his encounter, Mr. Graham sustained multiple injuries. He was released when Officer Connor learned that nothing had happened in the store. Mr. Graham filed suit alleging that excessive force had been used in making the stop in violation of his Constitutional Rights (*Graham v. Connor*, 1989).

The Supreme Court held in this decision that excessive force complaints, “in the course of an arrest, investigatory stop, or other seizure of a free citizen, are properly analyzed under the 4th Amendment’s ‘objective reasonableness’ standard, rather than under a substantive due process standard (p.392-399 of the original decision). The Court in *Graham v. Connor* (1989) made four important points. First, the courts must identify the specific constitutional right allegedly infringed by the challenged application of force, and then judge the claim by references to the specific constitutional standard which governs that right (*Graham v. Connor*, 1989, - Justia p.2). Secondly, invoking the Fourth Amendment protection in such claims guarantees citizens the right “to be secure in their persons...against unreasonable seizures,” and that they must be judged by reference to the Fourth Amendment’s “reasonableness” standard (*Graham v. Connor*, 1989, - Justia p.2). Third, the Fourth Amendment’s “reasonableness” standard is whether the officers’ actions are “objectively reasonable” in light of the facts and circumstances confronting them, without regard to their underlying intent or motivation. The “reasonableness” of a particular use of force must be judged from the perspective of a reasonable officer on the scene, and must allow for the fact that police officers are often forced to make split-second decisions about the amount of force necessary in a particular circumstance (*Graham v. Connor*, 1989, - Justia, p.2). Last, the previous test referencing “malicious and sadistic” components in the use of force applications are incompatible with the Fourth Amendment “reasonableness” test (*Graham v. Connor*, 1989, - Justia p.2).

The court in *Graham v. Connor* (1985) implied that while physical resistance can be experienced within the course of police duties, there remain principles of fairness and justice

within these encounters and the officers should be mindful of such principles when engaging citizens who indicate that they should physically resist an officer's arrest attempts.

The courts in the U.S. and Canada have struggled with the concepts of police use of force issues over time. The landmark cases of *Graham v Connor* (1989), *Tennessee v Garner*, (1985) and the Canadian cases of *Cluett v The Queen* (1985), *R v Assante-Mensah* (2003), and *R v Nasogaluak*, (2010), have made great strides in bringing the concept of use of force into modern times. The Courts that have addressed these issues, I am sure, have struggled to provide as much guidance as the law can possibly provide to police officers and citizens alike in use of force circumstances. The limitations of these cases are in the language, although used with intent to guide it falls short in terms of the application to the many new circumstances that evolve over time along with the technological and philosophical changes in society. Better equipment to help guide police investigations might preclude the need to use force in apprehending fleeing citizens as expressed by the court in *Garner* (1985). Even though the gravity of the crime being investigated may contribute to the assessment of the threat of physical force or the amount of force to be applied during the apprehension of the suspect(s) (Klukkert et al, 2009; *Tennessee v. Garner*, 1985), the changes in the law over time might treat former capital crimes as misdemeanors thereby precluding the need to apprehend the offender who can be dealt with in other ways. Therefore, examining the justifications of actual or presumed legal use of force by police officers is important so as to identify the thin line where the legal is replaced by the officers' perceptions of what justifies the behavior.

Public Perspectives on Police Use of Force

How the public perceives the police is important in terms of how effective the police will be. The behavior of the police within the context of police-citizen encounters and the use of force directly influences public perceptions and the legitimacy of the police. Additionally, it impacts the public satisfaction, and willingness of the public to cooperate with the police (Mystrol, 2011). In other words, the ability of the police to get people to comply with their instructions is a key indicator of police effectiveness (Mystrol, 2011).

The use of coercive authority is probably not the most efficient strategy for gaining citizen compliance. Each police-public encounter becomes an act of civic education whereby individual police officers teach citizens about the nature of the legal authority of the state in society (Mystrol, 2011). In assessing public satisfaction, “two aspects of police officer behavior within the context of face-to-face encounters with members of the public are particularly important in shaping citizens’ assessment of procedural justice and trust: the quality of officers’ decisions, and the quality of officer treatment of citizens” (Mystrol, 2011, p.374; Tyler and Huo, 2002). Research indicated that although the public is generally satisfied with police services overall, they have a low tolerance for police misconduct. Therefore, when the police are involved in a situation wherein a citizen is injured by police officers, the public expectations of what the police are supposed to do are violated, and discussions quickly surface ambiguities and vague justifications along with hypothetical consequences (Kuhns and Knutsson, 2010).

Those members of the public that request assistance from the police may have varying opinions about the quality of the service they received (Maguire & Johnson, 2010). If policing

can be gauged as part of the service industry, then service industry standards relative to the quality of that service should apply and public expectations of service quality is more easily understood. Applying the customer service perspective to the police has some limitations, however, social science research on service quality appears to be expanding (Maguire & Johnson, 2010). The private sector publishes research on quality service features that appear mostly in business and marketing journals but are focused on specific or particular features related to customer services.

Although the customer service perspectives for police performance are appealing, police services are unique in that the police have the ability to use state-sanctioned force, they have a monopoly over their specific service sector, and they have the capacity to deliver their services involuntarily to clients (Maguire & Johnson, 2010). Therefore, while service quality is in some ways appealing, it also has its limitations in its application to policing. In the true service industries for example, industry monopolization does not improve service quality. Instead, competition forces service enhancements thereby delivering market share to the services providers.

Although opinions about police services come from a broad range of the community, only a small portion of society have direct contact with a police officer (Maguire & Johnson, 2010). What are the impacting factors that influence public opinions about the police in their communities when citizens have not had any direct contact with a police service? We can only guess that media reports, magazine articles or reports about someone else's experiences might be the source for some opinions.

Finally, legitimacy is “a quality possessed by an authority, a law, or an institution that leads others to feel obligated to obey its decisions and directives voluntarily” (Maguire & Johnson, 2010, p.705; Kuhns & Knutsson, 2010, p.208; quoting Tyler and Huo, 2002, p.102). The notion of voluntariness in compliance marks the defining qualities of legitimacy (Maguire & Johnson, 2010). Researchers typically ask people about their perceived obligation to obey the law, their perceptions about the law and legal systems and about their trust and confidence. Maguire & Johnson (2010) indicated that public perception of legitimacy overlap in both concept and measurement, with satisfaction, justice, fairness, and quality of service. It would appear that to make legitimacy specifically relevant and empirically distinguishable, greater depth of research would be needed to focus on these specific characteristics.

Legitimacy can be conceived of as the foundation or strength of the law in all cultures even though legitimacy is derived from different sources depending on the culture (Kuhns & Knutsson, 2010). Therefore, culture, history and tradition play an important role in the public perception of legitimacy. In that regard, procedural justice plays a part in the cultural roles that demonstrate that legitimacy underlies the effectiveness of the law universally even though legitimacy does not have a universal source (Kuhns & Knutsson, 2010). As an example, in China cultural values encourage citizens to subordinate individual liberty to the collective good of the people. In modern liberal democracies, legitimacy is derived from the free, and fair elections of representatives.

Organizational Structure and Interests

Challenges faced by police managers influence how employees respond within an organization that may directly affect how their clientele are treated. In this context, the

structural features of police organizations may contribute to the quality of decisions on all police related matters including use of force decisions. The theoretical concepts regarding how people are treated within an organization in some instances are referred to as organizational justice (Crow & Lee, 2012). These concepts can relate to issues that define ideas about compensation and benefits, or processes that are more results oriented. Research suggested that perceptions about organizational justice are correlated with factors including job satisfaction, organizational commitment, trust, and legitimacy (Crow & Lee, 2012). Changes in the structure and management of police forces over time closely related to the aim of creating more business like organizations (Terpstra & Trommel, 2009).

Managerial innovations in the modern police agencies largely imitate private sector and market driven organizational structures. The notions of market sector management include modern ideas about leadership, economics management, quality management and customer service initiatives. The underlying notions in the restructuring of modern police organizations are related to the assumptions of improved efficiencies, effectiveness and economies (Terpstra & Trommel, 2009). In short, the business-like ideas and practices in the public sector that are designed to emulate the private markets sector management styles. Missing however are the market driven motivators of profitability that measures the successes of any private sector businesses. Therefore, the real motivator for public sector restructuring can be seen more of an effort in restoring the legitimacy of the police in terms of public satisfaction (Terpstra & Trommel, 2009).

The reorganization of police agencies is probably more related to different types of presentational strategies aimed at restoring the legitimacy of the police (Terpstra & Trommel,

2009). Whether in the private or in the public sector, successful operations are often measured in terms of organizational legitimacy, that is related to the acceptance of the organization by the larger society because of their capabilities of providing services of significant importance. One principle in public services management is the importance of improving performance (Terpstra & Trommel, 2009).

Performance measures in the public sector are somewhat related to the ideas about organizational commitment and job satisfaction features within the organization. Organizational commitment as it relates to police officers is related to issues such as officer stress, decision-making, absenteeism and potentially officer turnover (Crow & Lee, 2012). The idea is that employees who are more strongly committed to their organization are likely to make better police officers. In police organizations cynicism might replace commitment or demonstrate a psychological detachment from the organization (Crow & Lee, 2012). The concern being that early organizational experiences that cause disenchantment with the organization mitigate commitment that can have a cascading effect when experienced officers influence and shape the attitudes of new recruits through the socialization process (Crow & Lee, 2012). Cynicism might be as much a result of repeated experiences of dealing with human tragedies than organizational structure or other management features. However, the role of management might be to search out emotional help for their employees who are demonstrating signs of stress and burnout.

Another powerful feature in organizational commitment is job satisfaction that has long been recognized by scholars in the field of organizational psychology as influencing the effective functioning of organizations (Crow & Lee, 2012). Crow & Lee (2012) further

indicated that, job satisfaction is subjective and depends on how much an individual's needs are met. In the organizational and psychological literature, there was found to be a strong support that job satisfaction was an antecedent to organizational commitment and a significant relationship between job satisfaction of police officers and their behavior (Crow & Lee, 2012).

Experiments conducted by Milgram (1969), focused on obedience to authority. He observed that people in positions of authority can experience a decrease in personal identity and responsibility that is the result of obedience to the psychological mechanism that links individual action and political purposes (Hodgson, 2001). All indications are that the individual, subject to authority, comes to view himself or herself as the instrument for carrying out another person's wishes and therefore he/she no longer regards themselves as responsible for their actions (Hodgson, 2001). The responsibility for their actions may have been assumed by the authority figure. Therefore, Milgram (1969) suggested, that for many people, obedience might be a deeply ingrained behavior that overrides ethics, sympathy, and moral conduct. The premise to Milgram's (1969) experiments, with respect to obedience to authority, was that ordinary people, simply doing their jobs, and without any particular hostility on their part, could become agents of a terribly destructive process (Hodgson, 2001). The implication in a use of force context is that police officers are the agents within an organizational structure wherein each officer is subject to directions or instructions for action either directly given or expected by their direct supervisor or manager. The depersonalization of their actions in Milgram's (1969) theory is quite simple to understand. The action of patrol officers becomes an expected activity by convention, which transfers to the treatment of citizens.

Authority structures and authoritarian personalities might draw like-minded people into its presence. A military person lives and operates within a framework wherein he or she tends to eliminate many uncertainties. There exists an element or a perception of control in such a life. Individuals who are exposed to the military life over time will exhibit much of the same characteristics as the organization (Hodgson, 2001; Rhodes, 1969). The authoritarian personality, according to Penner (1986), reflects a person who uncritically will submit to and identify with authority figures. Penner (1986), further indicated that characteristics of an authoritarian personality encompasses conventional values, that are rigid adherence to middle class values, submissiveness to authoritarian like thinking, uncritical attitudes towards the leaders of the group, and obedience to that group and, authoritarian aggression, the tendency to reject and punish people who violate middle-class values and, power and toughness (Hodgson, 2001). The implications of an authoritarian personality are that individuals will internalized corporate or agency ideology such as authoritarianism and subsequently transmit such occupational and subcultural norms, values, and beliefs (Hodgson, 2001). Organizationally, police agencies structured along paramilitary lines will exhibit characteristics of a central command structure, a rigid superior subordinate relationship defined by rank, control exerted through the issuance of commands, directives, general orders, lines of authority with communication primarily vertical, from the top down, and with employees who work under threat of punishment for breaches of organizational rules or directives (Hodgson, 2001). Consistent with long-standing historical tradition, police institutions continue to be organized along paramilitary lines. This 19th century organizational design is probably not that efficient

from a services perspective, given the reality of contemporary policing demands and what we already know about service oriented organizations.

Police officers learn the use of force principles and the physical application methods in basic training. Hodgson (2001) confirmed that violence is a learned value. Once trained, the officers take those skills to the field where the field trainers assist in introducing them to the practical application of force tactics and strategies. Through the acceptance of their role with the application of physical force, police officers may become accustomed to either witnessing the application of force or be personally involved in the use of force.

Professional management styles in police agencies create that assumption that the police are able to compete in a world that treasures professional like behavior thereby enhancing the image of public safety. Terpstra & Trommel (2009) found that the important factors in police community relations are related to the expectations of citizens about the police and the symbolic meaning of this institution. The conundrum relative to this concept is that while positive experiences between the police and citizens may contribute to the ideal of legitimacy, one bad experience can be deeply discrediting. Other studies reviewed by Terpstra & Trommel (2009), indicated that legitimacy of the police is a social value. Satisfaction with the police depends to a degree on the visibility of the police in the community and their ability to interact with members of the community. The self-promotion of the organizational image of the police agencies is a difficult method of gaining public satisfaction and thereby enhancing police organizational legitimacy. Self-promoting behavior may create an interpretation that the promotional message is covering a problem. Perhaps change strategies that allow for renewal relative to societal changes could be important in contemporary terms. The idea is that through

professional police management strategies, the use of force applications will be more appropriately and reasonably managed.

Occupational Stress in Policing - a Dichotomous Potential

Stress has been referred to as feelings of anxiety or frustration, and as an emotional response (Haar & Morash, 1999). Research on workplace stress has suggested that police officers face a work environment that is commonly depicted as one of the most stressful occupations (Bradway, 2009). In this context occupational stress might be a matter of both theoretical and practical concern. There may be consequences impacting job performance. Currently, occupational stress might be contributed to by the ideas that officers encounter violent criminals and examine gruesome crime scenes during the course of their daily work and generally face a lot of the tragedy and misery of life (Salo & Allwood, 2011). Further contributions to the stress experienced by police officers is that in the course of their duties, officers possess a great deal of discretion that requires them to make tough decisions about arresting suspects, (McCarty et al., 2007). Contributing to the vague ambiguities of the work are the organizational managers and supervisors who may be less than helpful to the frontline officers and thereby helping to create a hostile work environment (Terpstra & Trommel, 2009). In an organizational model where the work is seen as masculine, tough and aggressive it all combines to create a mixture of frustration and violence that when not adequately controlled results in citizen complaints or circumstances wherein someone gets hurt (Sims, 2003).

The consequences of job related stress might ultimately lead to sickness, mood changes, and sleep disturbances in the short term and perhaps even cardiovascular disease and psychological disorders in the long-term (McCarty et al., 2007; Bradway, 2009; Salo &

Allwood, 2011). The direct consequences for health may be experiences of poor health, frequently absent from work, burnout, and job dissatisfaction. The manifestations of illness may resemble chronic stress depression, heart disease, stomach disorders and alcohol and drug abuse (Morash et al., 2006; Bradway, 2009). The issues at work may have an impact on job performance and an inability to interact with members of the community (Morash et al., 2006; Bradway, 2009). In Norway it was found that, “ higher levels of cynicism, a more significant prediction about attitudes towards the use of force, a lower level of professional efficacy, and a less favorable attitude towards the use of social skills to solve problem were some of the noted consequences from working in a stressed environment like a police organization” (Salo & Allwood, 2011, p.2).

Important for this discussion is that work-related stress may differ between male and female police officers (McCarty et al., 2007; Salo & Allwood, 2011). The differences could be problematic in that the observations and conclusions about male officers may not apply to the female officers. Morash et al. (2007) indicated that women in policing were almost always members of a token group and therefore were likely to have had different experiences in the workplace than their male counterparts. Further research indicated that female officers often felt pressured by their male colleagues to prove themselves on the job (McCarty et al., 2007; Salo & Allwood, 2011). It was suggested that female officers felt that their male partners provided inadequate backup and often questioned their abilities and performance (Morash et al., 2007). The research is not conclusive on this point but we know from former research in other blue-collar industries that men and women had different sources of stress especially in occupations that had long been dominated by men (McCarty et al., 2007; Novak, 2011).

The point of this discussion with respect the decision-making, stress, and occupational burnout is to help determine whether there are significant differences in terms of how police officers' decisions are impacted by stress. It appeared from the literature that policewomen and policemen experienced different sources of stress in the workplace. Furthermore, both genders reacted differently to the same circumstances regardless of the influences of workplace stress. The noted differences were that policewomen leave the job more readily than do policemen, and women were harder to recruit for police work (McCarty, 2007; Morash, 2007; Novak, 2011). By understanding the influences created by stress and understanding whether these influences vary between organizational subgroups is a point where future research might look in terms of identifying the consequences of stress particularly as it relates to operational decisions in police work.

The discussion on workplace stress in police work indicated that police officers work is stressful and that decisions are based on the situational factors and circumstances without the benefit of guiding principles or operational templates. Flexibility and discretion in police decision making seem to be relatively normal features. The discussions indicated that policewomen experienced workplace stresses differently. If the differences experienced adds to the stress experienced by policewomen how do these experiences impact the job performance based on gender? What are the determining factors that explain this phenomenon? These are two of the questions that will be addressed in my study.

Gender-based Harassment

Although I briefly touched on gender-based stress issues in the previous section of this paper, a more focused gender discussion is appropriate to gain a better appreciation of some of

the more difficult issues that impact policewomen. This part of Chapter 2 will focus more specifically on harassment issues that appear as a significant issue that policewomen face in the course of their work life within their agencies. According to the literature the concept of gender-based harassment is a problem in police agencies and therefore merits a discussion in this chapter given its potential impact on decision-making.

It is unknown the extent to which harassment is a problem in any given organization but one researcher thinks that, “sexual harassment is a universal phenomenon in all contemporary societies where the gender power is unequally distributed” (Lan-Ying & Cao, 2008, p.1). The extent of sexual harassment does vary depending on the type or nature of the organization and the culture within which the behavior occurs (Lin-Ying & Cao, 2008). The issue of sexual harassment is less tolerated in the more developed societies while in other societies the behavior is more latent and less subject to observation and study. Sexual harassment could be viewed organizationally as an abuse of power by the dominant gender occupying all positions of power within an organization. Sexual harassment is recognized as a social problem because of its negative impact to individuals, organizations and society in general (Lan-Ying & Cao, 2008).

Sexual harassment is especially common in male-dominated work settings, particularly in blue-collar occupations such as policing (Chaiyavej & Morash, 2009; Lan-Ying & Cao, 2008). Recent studies indicated that between 53 percent and 99.1 percent of policewomen experience some form of harassment (Chaiyavej & Morash, 2009). Gender harassment has been reported to be one of the most frequent complaints made by study participants. The perpetrators of harassment behavior may subject their victims to sexist remarks, crude or offensive comments

about appearance, body shape or size, sexual activities, and sexually suggestive stories and jokes or physical conduct of a sexual nature that interferes with the person's work conditions (Collins, 2004; Chaiyavej & Morash, 2009). One of the focuses of research regarding harassing behavior incorporates the gendered nature of organizational structures and the internal processes of organizations that encourage or discourage harassment behavior at work.

Although numerous forms of harassment have been described in the literature, there is little consensus on the definition of sexual harassment. A definition by DeHaas (2009), defined sexual harassment as improper behavior that has sexual dimensions. According to DeHaas (2009) and as formulated by Fitzgerald, Swan, & Magley (1997), another frequently used psychological definition was stated as, "unwanted sex-related behavior at work that is appraised by the recipient as offensive, exceeding her resources or threatening well-being" (p.2). Lan-Ying & Cao (2008) defined sexual harassment as unwelcome, uninvited, coercive, or threatening sexual attention, often in a nonreciprocal relationship. Included in these definitions were the concepts of, "sexual or suggestive comments, attempts to coerce a sexual relationship, punishment or threats of punishment for refusal to comply, a demand for sexual favors in return for jobs or the creation of a hostile, intimidating and offensive work environment" (Lan-Ying & Cao, 2008, p.2).

The literature indicated that in work environments that are male dominated, men are the primary perpetrators and that harassment assumes a form that has little or nothing to do with sexuality but everything to do with gender (DeHaas, 2009; Welsh, 1999), and I would perhaps suggest power. In much of the literature, gender harassment represented a broad range of verbal and nonverbal behaviors that convey insulting, hostile, and degrading attitudes about

women solely because of their gender (DeHaas, 2009; Collins, 2004; Garcia, 2003). These behaviors or comments are not designed to accomplish sexual cooperation but may be more intended to promote belittlement or embarrassment for the target among their peers. In their 2008 study, Chaiyavej and Morash used the Sexual Experience Questionnaire (SEQ) that identified 3 components of harassing behavior; gender harassment, unwanted sexual attention, and sexual coercion. Of the 117 participants, 90.6 percent reported at least one SEQ behavior and 58.2 percent of the women indicated that they had been actually victimized by sexual harassment (Chaiyavej & Morash, 2008). Further, in the gender harassment category, 86.6 percent of the participants reported suggestive jokes or offensive stories, 68.3 percent indicated having been subjected to crude sexual remarks, 69.2 percent said they were treated differently due to their gender (Chaiyavej & Morash, 2008).

At the individual level, those being sexually harassed have experienced some decreased job satisfaction, lower organizational commitment, withdrawing from work, physical and mental illness, and symptoms of post-traumatic stress (Lan-Ying & Cao, 2008; Chaiyavej & Morash, 2009). Studies that focused on the well being of victims of sexual harassment reveal that some of the hazards found in the mental and physical health of victims were problems such as; “anxiety, depression, irritability, anger and uncontrolled crying” (DeHaas, 2009, p.3). Organizationally, sexual harassment may be destructive in terms of productivity and performance costs, while at the societal level the negative impact may extend to those who are indirectly exposed to it by creating a fearful atmosphere for women (Lan-Ying, & Cao, 2008). The consequences of experiencing sexual harassment may endure over time such as a lifetime

risk for posttraumatic stress disorder that was reported to be higher for female victims compared to nonvictims (DeHaas, 2009).

In terms of the frequency of harassing behavior, Lan-Ying, Cao (2008) indicated that, sexual harassment was an ongoing process, influenced by the individual, organizations, socio-cultural interactions and multiple legal variables. Changes within each of these elements, “feed back to the process while changing our perceptions, attitudes and responses to sexual harassment” (Lan-Ying & Cao, 2008, p.3). Responses to sexual harassment are impacted by organizational and workplace environments. Chaiyavej & Morash, (2009) indicated that feeling powerless and pressured to tolerate harassing behavior was a prominent response, intimating that it was part of working in a male dominated world. This resulted in modification of individual female behavior. Another reaction was responding to the feelings of resentment instigated by harassing behavior by verbally challenging the harassers (DeHaas, 2009; Chaiyavej & Morash, 2009). Even though the behavior was considered hostile some women adopted the strategy of making jokes or just saying nothing (Chaiyavej & Morash, 2009). Their response is more associated with ignoring the incident, laughing it off, or just making a joke in response to comments that characterized harassment behavior. DeHaas (2009) reported that men and women were both affected by harassment behavior. Women might be more used to the harassment and perceive it as an occupational hazard and simply live with it, whereas sexual harassment is more rare and unexpected for men resulting in more negative emotional consequences (DeHaas, 2009).

In the context of this literature review, the discomfort created by male co-workers for women in policing could impact the decision processes in the field when female police officers

are required to deal with difficult work related matters. Decisions to arrest or not arrest a citizen, decisions on the application of force and decisions regarding the application of deadly force are probably near the forefront of importance in officer decisions while on duty. A hostile work environment created through sexual harassment behavior may seriously impact the workplace factors that are associated to use of force decisions (DeHaas, 2009; Chaiyavej & Morash, 2009). In the more traditional police context it was thought that the empowerment in the workplace for both women and men was the recognition that harassing behavior was illegal and not to be tolerated (Garcia, 2003). This is probably still true in the current police organizational environments.

In the earlier research relative to hostile work environments, the indications were that when hostility was directed at minority groups within organizations it systematically destroyed opportunities to advance in the organizations through promotions. In police organizations, historical records suggested that occupational segregation has been the product of deeply ingrained attitudes (Garcia, 2003; Aker, 1992). Furthermore, Garcia (2003) said that, “keeping women out of male occupations had been the product of society’s gender norms and had resulted in lack of recruitment and failure to keep women in the professions, an inability or refusal to have defined women as competent, and to stagnate the occupational culture” (p.336). Currently, although women are generally accepted in police work organizationally, male officers still express skepticism about women’s capabilities as officers and oppose women’s full integration into police work (DeHaas, 2009).

In summary, the research noted in this discussion indicated that policewomen rely on a different style of policing. They are better at defusing and de-escalating potentially violent

confrontations with citizens, and are less likely to become involved in problems with use of excessive force. Yet, the imbalance in performance recognition and the harassment behavior by their male counterparts creates a work environment that may be difficult to tolerate. The work absenteeism resulting from stressful treatment can be costly organizationally and it might impact the delivery of services to the public. If under more normal circumstances policewomen do their work differently than policemen with significant successes such as reduced use of force events, then it is important to determine what policewomen do that is so different. Policewomen learn about use of force in their police training and experiences along with their male counterparts. Yet, Bierie (2012) indicated that the literature was clear that gender did not impact ability. The literature also indicated that gender did impact style of problem solving wherein female police officers used less force than male peers in similar situations where there was discretion as to how a given problem would be solved.

Police Subculture and Use of Force

The creation of a culture or subculture happens when groups of people gather to focus on a particular function in a society and wherein all share the common experiences. Generally, culture is defined as the foundation of values, attitudes and beliefs upon which a social group operates within the world around it and researchers have long noted the link between police culture and coercion (Feemster, 2010; Marche, 2009; Paoline & Terrill, 2005; Terrill & Paoline, 2003). Coercion is a significant link that is shared by all police officers everywhere, as mandated by their specific society. It is the culture of the society that defines how the police are going to apply force (Waddington, 2009). The police apply the coercive powers of the State, to stop activities viewed as harmful to society, through making arrests and deterring

illegal activities through the risk of arrest (Marche, 2009). Through these unique patterns of behavior along with other features of police work, the police subculture is created. Entry into a subculture has been associated with a process of socialization whereby recruits learn the values and behavior patterns of experienced members of the group (Kenny & McNamara, 1999). The process of socialization begins at the recruit training stage for any group and is likely to continue throughout the participant's career.

Historically, research findings indicated that, police officers who closely embodied the values of the traditional police culture were more coercive compared with those that differentially aligned with the surrounding social culture, suggesting that police use of force is a function of officers' varying attitudinal commitments to the traditional view of the police culture (Terrill and Paoline, 2003; Cockcroft, 2009). The central characteristics of a traditional view of police culture reflected distrust and suspiciousness of citizens and a strong endorsement of the crime-fighting mandate. There also existed a "we-versus-them" sentiment and a strong loyalty to fellow officers (Paoline and Terrill, 2005). Although differences in the conceptual nuances of police culture exist, one could assume a number of common themes present within the literature on police culture, primarily in the context of how officers viewed and responded to their occupational and organizational environment (Terrill and Paoline, 2003; Paoline and Terrill, 2005; Cockcroft, 2009). The literature emphasized how the culture in policing emerged out of the fundamentals of the work through elements that encompassed the need to be suspicious and search beyond surface appearances while dealing with suspects. The most fundamental element of all was the ability to use force as an instrument of the work (Waddington, 2013).

In terms of the occupational environment, it is apparent that officers held a negative attitude towards their primary client, the citizens, who were seen as suspicious, distrustful and uncooperative (Paoline and Terrill, 2005). Another characterization of police culture stressed the secrecy and loyalty components among officers working in a dangerous and hostile environment (Terrill and Paoline, 2003). A third characterization features the police function with all the dangers and apprehensions of the work noted that the use of coercive authority over citizens was a predominating characteristic, along with the officers' efforts to appear efficient in the eyes of supervisors and managers (Feemster, 2010; Terrill and Paoline, 2003).

According to crime reports, whether it's through media reports or via official crime reports, law enforcement officers face unprecedented levels of toxicity, stress, crime and deadly violence (Feemster, 2010). As human beings, the law enforcement community "is not immune from the predispositions that affect life in all societies" (Feemster, 2010, p.1). Currently, emergency services workers, including the police, world wide, have never experienced so many facets of crime, toxicity, and stress from events labeled as terrorism, environmental sabotage, political misconduct, traditional criminal violations, and random violence (Feemster, 2010). Therefore, we can take from this discussion that historical and contemporary experiences help to mold the police officers' attitudes toward the public in somewhat negative terms. That is, the public is the officers' source of human trauma that the officers get to view as a continuous stream of problem issues. The dangers associated with their occupational environment prompt officers to distance themselves from their perceived source of danger, citizens (Terrill et al., 2003; Feemster, 2010). Social isolation from citizens and reliance on one another for mutual support from a dangerous and hostile work environment, are precursors to developing a "we-

versus-them” attitude towards citizens and strong loyalties to fellow officers (Terrill & Paoline, 2003).

Feemster (2010) indicated that officers who are tasked to deal with human tragedies on a daily basis could be considered as being wounded in all human dimensions. That is, it is not normal in anyone’s lifetime to witness so much human tragedy without impacting attitudes and values systems. Therefore it could be anticipated that some officers’ responses toward citizens could be characterized as maladaptive behaviors that are normalized by an existing law enforcement culture (Feemster, 2010). The human mind may only be able to absorb a certain amount of tragedy before responding inappropriately. Therefore, one important source of police officers’ subcultural values is the constant and continuous negativity experienced through the human trauma associated with police work.

Secondly, officers are compelled to deal with an organizational environment that might compound the trauma experienced occupationally. Terrill & Paoline (2003) indicated that, "patrolmen lead something of a schizophrenic existence. They must cope not only with the terror of an often hostile and unpredictable citizenry, but also with a hostile, even tyrannical, and unpredictable bureaucracy” (p.2). Organizationally, officers deal with ambiguity in their social roles and with supervisors by maintaining a crime-fighting orientation (Terrill et al., 2003; Feemster, 2010). Cumulatively, the effects of the strains that officers confront in their work environment and the coping mechanisms to deal with these strains, produce two defining outcomes within the police culture, “social isolation and group loyalty” (Terrill and Paoline, 2003, p.2). Feemster (2010) talked about these organizational concerns from a health and wellness perspective in terms of vocational vitality maintenance and emotional health training.

In summary, when the aggressiveness is displayed by police officers inappropriately in the course of a non-enforcement event between police officers and citizens, it might quickly become a matter of a citizen complaint even though the officers believed their behavior was within the scope of their duties. The normalization of the cultural components of police attitudes and values seems incapable of allowing some officers from recognizing the abnormality of offensive behavior. This could be the point where conflict between the citizens and the police officers evolve.

Researchers note a “stylistic difference among officers, which calls into question the homogeneity of attitudes of the traditional culture” (Paoline and Terrill, 2005, p.2). Statistically, the evidence suggests that the vast majority of police-citizen encounters take place without any type of physical violence. Therefore, what police officers do in the course of their duties on a day-to-day basis does not necessarily contain the application of physical force.

The current understanding of police culture implies that a universally shared culture might be an overstatement and that the police culture is more complex than originally acknowledged by researchers (Terrill and Paoline, 2003; Feemster, 2010). Although the incidents of excessive use of force by police officers is extremely insignificant, the seriousness of each such event indicates that if the matters are not addressed with serious consequences that citizens may feel vulnerable and unsafe contrary to the intention of the original purposes of policing.

Feemster (2010) indicated that historically, law enforcement has focused training on the mental and physical development of the officers. Primarily, the goals of this type of training produces tactically proficient officers who take charge of situations and bring order to chaos, deal with disruptive elements and protect the public from harm (Feemster, 2010). This type of

training develops skills in the officers to apprehend those who “deceive, oppress, terrorize, rape, pillage, and murder citizens” (Feemster, 2010, p.2). As suggested earlier, the repeated exposure to these negative behavioral circumstances has an impact on the psychological well being of the officers, the effects of which might manifest themselves in officer behavior characterized by, suicide, inappropriate violence, burnout, alcohol abuse, domestic abuse and other behaviors of discord (Feemster, 2010). Obviously the existing training for police agencies produces tactically sound officers, but what about the psychological well being of the officers during their careers and after?

The literature on police organizational management indicated that managing and supervising employees is less about rules and regulations and more about a need to create a social organization to cope with the difficulties and stresses of performing the role of a law enforcement officer. In managing the difficulties, ambiguities and uncertainties of police work, officers have turned to their co-workers for comfort. Feemster (2010) implies that, mental and physical health might be tied to police officer occupational and organizational stress, for which there are few resources to help officers deal with these stresses, manifesting in behavior issues including use of force.

Police Officers’ Perspectives and Use of Force Decisions

The police officers’ perspectives on use of force include the officers’ perceptions and the components commonly referred to as situational factors. The following discussion will touch on these two issues. The most common situations for police officers in use of force circumstances focus on the arrest of suspects, the escape of arrested persons, and the defusing of violent circumstances (Baker, 2009). Police officers, responsible for engaging in force

tactics, form their own view of what is the appropriate level of force depending on the situational factors (Kuhns & Knutsson, 2010). After all, it is the individual officers whose safety is threatened during a physical confrontation. When analyzing officer behavior the police supervisors, managers and the courts focus on precepts like reasonableness, appropriateness, or the necessity of these force applications. Important to consider in the evaluation is whether the police used force after experiencing suspect resistance, or was the resistance experienced after the police used force (Terrill, 2005)? This question should be at the heart of every use of force evaluation. A consistent theme among police, and public policy analysts, is that the appropriate amount of force is that which is reasonably necessary to achieve citizen compliance (Terrill, 2005). However, determining what constitutes “reasonableness”, as we see in the discussion on law and use of force in this paper, is not necessarily a straightforward determination. In use of force circumstances, police officers will often refer to situational factors in describing how they arrived at a use of force decision. Police officers have a reservoir of use of force tactics such as verbal commands, restraint tactics, empty hand maneuvers, impact and chemical weapons, and deadly force. The restraints on the police in the application of these force factors are that, force is not to be used unless their goals fall within the scope of ensuring control of the situation (Baker, 2009). Officers however must consider the perspectives of the public views, organizational policies, and legal standards, which might differ from the officer’s perspectives.

The police officers’ perceptions of the circumstances is relied upon as a means of understanding the challenges that police officers face in making decisions about use of force. Police officers rely on the perceptual interpretation of their environment to possibly give them

an advantage in predicting the behavior of a difficult subject they are tasked to deal with.

These predictions are related to whether the subject will violently resist arrest when approached by the police officers, or whether the subject will acquiesce to the instructions given by the police officers. The risk factors or perceptions of danger are important cues for police officers to consider when faced with the unknown outcomes when dealing with difficult people and situations.

Muir (1977) indicated that, when police officers perceive their occupational world to be dangerous, one way to minimize potential danger is by “taking charge” during encounters with the public (Kuhns & Knutsson, 2010,). A complication to the idea of taking charge is that the very nature of taking charge limits citizen freedoms, sometimes unnecessarily, that might foster citizen resistance to the police initiative thereby creating the potential for violence. It is not the notion of arrest or the notion of the minor nature of the police and citizen encounter, but the perceived need that officers feel is necessary to take control of a situation even when the circumstances are already calm, that creates an increased volatility within the circumstances (Kuhns and Knutsson, 2010).

A strong influence to the police response in any situation is the police officer’s perception of the circumstances. Perceptions of the components of a situation and the decision to act that result from those perceptions, depend on their experience and skill level (Kuhns & Knutsson, 2010). Perceptions are a subjective factor and are related to how the officers assess the situational factors and the surrounding conditions that might impact the outcome of a confrontation. The surrounding conditions could be related to the number of subjects the officer is trying to arrest, the size and physical appearance of the subject(s), the presence of

weapons, the number of officers present, the seriousness of the matter under investigation and other factors pertinent to the circumstances. Perception may invoke the emotion of fear based on the desire to avoid escalation of situational factors, an inhibiting factor to maintaining control, and a strong indication of disregard for the officers' authority (Kuhns & Knutsson, 2010). The more intense the emotions of fear the greater the probability that force will be applied and legal guidelines will be ignored (Klukkert et al., 2009). Then under the motivations of an emotional response the application of force becomes more difficult to control and de-escalation of force is less likely to become a reality.

In an effort to perceive the appropriateness of force, police officers must manage the affairs of citizen confrontational events with strong considerations for officer safety. Alternatively, their considerations will entail concerns for career, continued employment and prosecution if their force actions are considered unreasonable, inappropriate or unnecessary (Kuhns and Knutsson, 2010). The challenge in assessing the use of force applications depends on the extent to which each view of force appropriateness, the officer's view, public perception, organizational policies, or legal analysis, agree or disagrees with each other (Kuhns and Knutsson, 2010).

Officers' Perceptions and Use of Force Decisions

In psychological terms, the mind tries to organize, identify and interpret sensory information in order to understand its surrounding environment (Fuchs, 2005). Perceptions largely evolve from signals in the nervous system, which in turn result from stimulation of the human senses in the early stages of trying to understand the environment (Fuchs, 2005). In the early stages of a police/citizen encounter perception is what officers rely on in the risk

assessment phase of the encounter. However, perception is not solely based on objective information that is specified by the environment, but is also based on physiological and psychological states of those involved in the situational circumstances (Nieuwenhuys et al., 2012). Expectations of risk for police officers can have a variety of meanings depending on the participants in the circumstances. When people are afraid of something, fear is associated to their perception of the environment in terms of anticipated next steps in the event such as falling or being struck with an object (Nieuwenhuys et al., 2012).

Perception and the ideas associated with reality depend on the complex functioning of the human nervous system. The notion of a complex systemic function appears to be out of place because subjectively it seems like an effortless function of the mind because this process happens outside conscious awareness (Fuchs, 2005). In this context, the process begins with an object or an event in the real world. The objects or events stimulate the sensory organs of the human body with the resulting signals being transmitted to the brain and there processed (Fuchs, 2005). The outcomes are stated in psychological or physiological terms when officers consider their possible responses to the perceptual stimulations (Nieuwenhuys et al., 2012).

In an officer safety context, perceptions are related to risk assessments that evaluate the chance of injury. The concept of risk starts with the perception of the danger factors faced by the officers at any given time and space within the context of the officer's duties. If one was to accept the argument that risk is socially constructed then one could think of risk assessments as inherently subjective, representing a blend of science and judgment with important psychological, social, cultural and political factors (Slovic, 1999). In this way, risk is more dependent on the descriptions humans give situational circumstances to help them understand

and cope with the dangers and uncertainties of life. This tells us that all risk assessments are in part based on theoretical models whose structure is subjective and whose inputs are dependent on judgment (Slovic, 1999).

In more practical terms, psychological research has established that human beings are prone to experiencing a range of unusual reactions in stressful circumstances. These reactions could include, “distorted perceptions - during highly stressful events” (Klinger & Brunson, 2009, p.122). These reactions to unusually traumatic events refer to, “a lack of association in one’s thoughts and perceptions” (Klinger and Brunson, 2009). The trauma experienced, may result in post-traumatic reactions that result in intensified feelings of fear and anxiety (Klinger & Brunson, 2009). Research on emergency workers working in catastrophic recovery efforts were more likely to report greater levels of peri-traumatic dissociation symptoms. The research on perceptual aberrations in police shootings has focused on three specific sorts of anomalies resulting from these kinds of events. Distortions of vision, often referred to as tunnel vision or heightened vision, second, distortions of hearing wherein sounds as softer than normal, not hearing them at all or amplified sounds, and lastly, temporal distortions meaning time is either slowed or accelerated in many cases (Klinger & Brunson, 2009). These perceptual anomalies are most often discussed in police use of force situations involving deadly force events in particular.

With respect to the visual, auditory and temporal distortions of officers involved in deadly force events Klinger & Brunson (2009) concluded that officers experienced at least two of the three types of perceptual distortions during an event. The perceptions and their corresponding distortions, change over the course of the events and that some specific distortions are more

likely to occur in tandem with others whereas some are less likely. Klinger & Brunson (2009) indicated that “reasonable officers on the scene of police shootings are subject to experiencing substantial levels of perceptual distortions – both prior to pulling the trigger and as they fire” (p.134). The indications in this research are that, “the decisions that officers make about firing their weapons will frequently be based on perceptions of the situation that do not enjoy a one-to-one correspondence with objective reality” (Klinger & Brunson, 2009, p.134). Therefore the implications of this research are that the police officers’ account of the circumstances of a serious use of force event should be filtered through the lens of objective evidence rather than to let it stand on its own merits.

In Summary, research does not tell us much about what the stress threshold for perceptual distortions is, which if identified could have some implications for police training. Research appears to indicate that, the perception of the officers assessing a situational circumstance prior to using force and during the application of force can be distorted by the urgency and seriousness of the circumstances of the event. The officers’ accounts of the situational circumstances and decision factors in use of force are but one source for reconstructing the events after the circumstances. The force appropriateness or reasonableness is mostly viewed with the eyes of the beholder and appears to vary widely across perspectives or disciplines. If perceptions can be so easily distorted in a stressful use of force situation, should the perceivers who carry dangerous and deadly weapons decide unilaterally when to use force, particularly deadly force? Are there more objective approaches to use of force applications?

Situational Factors and Perception Components

Situational factors can be seen as the data analyzed by emergency workers during a risk assessment exercise within an encounter with a citizen. The analysis requires a substantial amount of discretion when deciding how the matter should be concluded. In use of force circumstances by police, “discretionary force is transmitted to criminal justice workers within a legal context, providing explicit reference to legal criteria which must guide application” (Bierie, 2012, p.240). The sort of legal criteria that guides discretion varies across the disciplines involved in the criminal justice systems (Bierie, 2012). The police as criminal justice workers are empowered through legislation to use force under the guidance of law in a myriad of situational circumstances representing police and citizen encounters. The anticipated outcomes of police encounters with citizens can seldom be predicted or is not easily foreseeable, mostly because of the variety of environments, subjects, and situations the police encounter, (Gabaldon et al., 2009). Although policies on use of force try to maintain a consistent approach to confrontational situations, the variations of the many different situational circumstances preclude the application of uniformity in responses to confrontational matters.

Although researchers cannot fully explain the phenomenon of police violence, situational factors have added to the understanding of police practices in such circumstances (Burns & Crawford, 2002). In that context, police officers are often faced with numerous conflicting tasks that seem to have no positive solutions. Officers are often required to make split-second decisions or make arrests quickly, forcing them to act on incomplete situational information that prevents them from a careful weighing of all the information (Burns & Crawford, 2002).

In this context the promise of the appropriateness of their training, experience and the moral maturity of the officers may help them to make the best decisions possible under the circumstances.

The police are suspicious of citizens, assisting them in gaining an advantage when encountering new circumstances. Trust is a human relations condition and a prerequisite for carrying out police work uneventfully. The lack of trust might hinder the efficient work of the police members and thereby encourage more force for overcoming any opposition in a given situation (Gabaldon et al., 2009). The level of trust or the lack of it is related to the risk management components of police work. These components are related to the projection into the future of consequences, real or perceived. The unpredictability of ensuing citizen behavior suggests that the application of force or the potential for its application provides some comfort for the police officers feelings of safety (Gabaldon et al., 2009). Alternatively, the police officer may be influenced by feelings of threat that feeds the dimensions of uncertainty in police work which can lead to use of force by either side” (Gabaldon, et al., 2009). These confrontations can be defined by situational circumstances, cultural characteristics and personal factors. The factors of confrontation significantly overlap. Perception, as an example, identifies and interprets personal factors of police and citizen encounters that may pose a risk to the officers and start the analysis process of the situation that will determine how the circumstances will be guided to its eventual conclusion. Gabaldon et al. (2009) indicated that in Latin America there are higher levels of confrontation between the police and citizens than in other democracies. Increased antagonism socially, unpredictability and subsequent uncertainty may result in more frequent and more serious confrontational consequences. The

cycle of reciprocal violence between the police and citizens then becomes a condition of uncertainty in the police relationships with the public. The overt public response would probably be relative to the cultural components of the society being studied (Waddington et al., 2009). It is therefore evident that force will be used to overcome uncertainty, thereby translating force into the components of the police intervention (Gabaldon et al., 2009). If uncertainty is the predicting factor in use of force applications by the police then one method of controlling the application of force by the police may be to increase the predictability of everyday contacts with the police. The predictive assessment and management of risks can thereby influence the frequency and levels of force applied by the police (Gabaldon et al., 2009).

If there is a variance in perception of situational circumstances among police officers as well as citizens, do these variances lead to divergence in the use of discretionary powers and thereby use of force (Bierie, 2012)? One of the components of training for police officers is the temptation to emphasize the 'high-cost events', often where officers have been injured. This sort of training may have some significantly detrimental effects for police officer perceptions in police and citizen encounters by emphasizing that all such encounters should be treated as highly suspect and potentially dangerous events. Yet the evidence indicated that these are the least common events for police officers in citizen encounters (Bierie, 2012). Studies indicated that women engage in less force than their male colleagues when faced with similar situations (Garcia, 2002; Kakar, 2003; Rabe-Hemp, 2007). This difference in situational responses may not be so much focused on the legal components of the circumstances but in the determination of what happened in the first place which is a perceptual matter (Bierie, 2012).

The situational approach attempts to account for police use of force by relating it to specifics in the characteristics of the circumstances in which the police encounter citizens (Burns & Crawford, 2002). Situational explanations may entail a number of contributory factors that are likely to be ever evolving during the police and citizen encounter such as officer/subject factors and characteristics, environment or structural features of the encounter, suspect behavior, availability of weapons to the officer or to the suspect and so on. As an example, there is a wide body of research that is available on individual officer characteristics and violence. Additionally similar research is available regarding the impact of suspect characteristics and police violence indicating that if the police officers or the suspects display a propensity for violence then the risk of violence in that encounter is enhanced (Burns & Crawford, 2002). Additionally, if both officer and suspect are prone to displaying violent behavior than the chances of a violent encounter is exacerbated. Suspect behavior is likely to precipitate officer use of force responses if that behavior reflects resistance to the officer's goals in the circumstances. Therefore, a concentration on the type of resistance the subject engaged in with respect to the officer's attempt of gaining control of the circumstances is important. One type of resistance could be a verbal expression of noncompliance or a verbal challenge to the officer's authority. Another type of resistance could be some physical means of preventing the officer from completing his or her investigation. These two events could be judged differently because of the difference in the demonstration of resistance however the police officers might resolve both with an arrest and/or physical force. Therefore situational factors form a significant part of the arrest procedure and the understanding of how the use of force was initiated and then carried out to its conclusion.

Police Use of Force Decisions based on Gender: Is there a Difference?

The discussion in this section confronts the traditional policing model that is mostly law enforcement focused and largely remains a male dominated occupation. The purpose in this study is to examine whether officer gender particularly influences decisions in use of force situations. In the history of policing, their work was seen as tough, aggressive and even violent (Sims, 2003). The role of women in policing was complicated by the perception that women were deemed to be not capable of doing the work demanded of police officers for a variety of reasons (Garcia, 2003; Rabe-Hemp, 2007). The more contemporary studies however indicated that the historical under-representation of women in policing limited the research, probably due to the insufficiency of available data (Novak et al., 2011).

The complexity of the topic of gender in policing traditionally has focused on gender inequality and all the features that are represented in situations wherein social power is unevenly distributed. That is, policewomen experience more harassment issues organizationally, delays in promotions, uncomplimentary job assignments and lack of adequate back-up support while in the performance of their duties (Rabe-Hemp, 2008; Morash et al., 2006). Females are currently statistical minorities within police organizations and as such they are likely to experience the police culture and workplace differently than their male counterparts (Novak et al., 2011). The challenge for research is to determine how the differences in workplace experiences impact job performance.

Waddington et al. (2009), indicated that policewomen use their powers of arrest less than their male counterparts, and seldom are policewomen subject of an excessive use of force complaint. Novak et al. (2011) argued differently in that for policewomen, the arrest powers

were used much the same as for their male counterparts and the only thing that changed was that policewomen used their powers of arrest more often when their supervisors were watching. Although the powers of arrest are a formal exercise of police authority and control, the measures provided in the literature do not provide a clear picture on what influenced police officers' arrest decisions (Novak et al., 2011). In practical terms the decisions to arrest may be more subject to the requirements of the laws that often do not allow for police officer discretion on whether to arrest or not to arrest. However, during an arrest, use of force decisions are made based on situational factors different than for arrest decisions. My study was focused on the use of force decisions that entailed different factors leading up to the application of force, than the considerations for invoking a lawful arrest.

There are different perspectives on why the behavior of female officers may differ from male officers. Differences or predispositions suggest that men and women are biologically different and from infancy are socialized differently (Novak et al., 2011). The training academy influences would likely be insignificant in changing gender socialized values and attitudes, yet the occupational socialization perspectives suggest that individual characteristics like gender or race significantly become muted once individuals are assimilated or socialized into police work (Novak et al., 2011).

Based on the differences in the opinions of Waddington et al. (2009), and Novak et al. (2011), it is not clear whether women process situational cues in encounters similar to men during arrest or use of force decisions. If the belief that female officers' conduct with citizens is directly influenced by their feminine nature alone, then a significant difference in decision factors regarding use of force would be obvious. However, it is more logical to assume that

police training has some impact on female officer attitudes and values and that training teaches the fundamentals of the work in policing. Lonsway (2003), indicated that in her study when she reviewed the Los Angeles Police Department use of force statistics, the differences in civil liability pertaining to excessive use of force was significantly higher for male police officers and that policewomen rarely were complained about in a use of force context. Yet Novak et al. (2011), indicated that studies looking at officer use of coercive police actions, behaviors more considered to be masculine, have generally found limited effects for officer gender. These different perspectives are significant and interesting in terms of their influences on my study.

I examined the situational cues in use of force circumstances that impact decision factors regarding use force or not to use force for both policewomen and policemen. I further noted similarities and differences as presented by the data. My anticipation in this type of study was to determine the extent to which occupational socialization actually impacts officer behavior relative to gender. The impact may not be as significant as police trainers and human resource specialists hope for. It might be that occupational socialization impacts male and female officers differently meaning that in my study I should expect there to be a difference in the use of force decision factors (Garcia, 2003; Terrill & Paoline, 2005; Rabe-Hemp, 2008; Novak, 2011).

The research discussed here indicated that policewomen rely on a style of policing that uses less physical force and are better at de-escalating confrontation with citizens (Waddington, 2009). It would be reasonable to assume that police agencies would take advantage of the gender-based skills to mitigate civil liability from excessive use of force events. My study tested a small part of the theory that is focused on the use of force decision points, whether

there is a gender specific difference and the extent of any noted differences. My research was limited to examining only the decisions to use force. These results will have implications for the examination of how use of force in police services is exercised across gender and have implications for future training and policy adjustments. This research is expected to expand the understanding of the influence of officer gender on use of force decisions.

Conclusion

In summary, a critical examination of the literature in this discussion demonstrated that the topic of police use of force is complex. The research questions in this study look within the focus group discussions and individual interviews that form the data gathering component of the study specifically to learn more about the specific legal, normative and practical considerations that police officers believe to be important factors while engaged in confrontational circumstances. What is unique about this study is that I will be looking for any differences in gender-based responses and will analyze any differences found. Although the research discussed in this paper appears to provide a thorough explanation of behavioral influences in violent circumstances involving police officers, this discussion by itself has not reached the depth of the topic. Critical to understanding the issues faced by police officers when they use force are the factors that foster the attitudes and beliefs of the officers. It is easily understood that if an officer is attacked by a suspect that the officer must defend himself or herself. Yet these cases rarely happen.

The range of considerations preceding the force applications vary. According to the literature, the gender of the police officers is an important factor in arrest decisions. Policewomen do not use force as frequently and are subject of fewer liability cases emanating

from excessive use of force complaints (Waddington, 2009; Lonsway, 2003). One of the dimensions in the application of police use of force discussed in this paper is that gender is probably the most significant influence in the delivery of police services that emphasizes a less violent approach to confrontation management. Some have argued that the presence of female officers can decrease the likelihood of negative police-citizen encounters, not only because of their gender but also because of the larger society's expectations (Rabe-Hemp, 2008).

Waddington et al. (2009) found a strong influence of host cultural values relative to the police officers' approach to use of force in the research relative to the International Study. As an example, the two Latin American countries participating in the study were more likely to shoot people than officers in England, Australia, Germany and Netherlands. In these studies the researchers used focus group interviews as their data source and presented the focus groups with an evolving scenario the officers were tasked to evaluate during the interviews.

I used some focus group discussions, complimented by individual interviews, to develop my data. I compared and analyzed the differences in police officer decision factors to use force based on gender. The analysis demonstrated a difference in the male and female police officer responses to the scenario. The female participants indicated that they used less force because firstly they did not like using physical force and that physical force was not their strongest response. Persuasion was more effective and efficient in the longer term.

Chapter 3: Research Method

Introduction

This study was designed to examine the differences in discussion themes that impact the officers' beliefs and how they impact officer behavior. In my study, the belief systems of the officers were identified, analyzed and compared based on gender. Generally, I gained sufficient guidance from the data analysis to direct further research that might be more representative thereby instructing a larger portion of the participant population. The aim of the study was to build a greater depth of understanding through the data about police officer decision-making on force applications during an arrest and as reported by gender.

This chapter describes the research design encompassing the theoretical traditions of inquiry, more specifically the qualitative grounded theory approach of inquiry and sampling, populations sampled, method of data collection through focus group interviews and structured individual in-depth interviews, data management, method of data analysis, and issues of ethical consideration.

Research Design and Approach

Two primary research questions were used to guide this study:

RQ1. What were the different ways in which police officers explained the application of physical force as a strategy to maintaining social order?

RQ2. What were the different ways in which police officers were critical of the applications of physical force?

Three secondary questions were used to help answer the primary research questions:

RQ3. What criteria do police officers identify in situations justifying or not justifying the use of force as a police practice?

RQ4. What were the points of consensus among police officers on these matters generally, or do they display a significant variety of different viewpoints?

RQ5. What were the perspectives wherein the police officers' viewpoints differed about using force?

A goal of this research was to use a grounded theory paradigm to develop a better understanding of the problem that centered on differences in use of force decision-making based on gender. The data were derived from the content of focus group discussions, and in-depth individual semistructured interviews with police officers. These discussions and interviews were used to develop ideas about how police officers talk about using force, and provided me with indicators about decisions in use of force applications.

Several theoretical approaches were considered in this study. Grounded theory was the most appropriate study method because it is not bounded by parameters in the same way as a case study, for example (Charmaz, 2006; Patton, 2002). Grounded theory was more conducive to contributing to strategy development and served in the building of a model or framework based on the data collected (Charmaz, 2006; Patton, 2002; Creswell, 2007), and generated theory rather than a particular theoretical content (Patton, 2002).

A quantitative study tests theory or hypothesis rather than building theory and therefore a quantitative method of study would not be applicable to the purpose of this study. I applied the

grounded theory study method to explore the critical decision factors in police use of force circumstances and learned from that the differences in decisions based on gender. The study was designed to provide clarity and focus about the critical factors relative to police use of force decisions. Patton (2002) suggested that in gaining that critical focus, researchers should examine the relationship of participant responses that are gender-generated, look for observable patterns and plausible explanations in the data and determine if there is a truth-value or relationship within participant responses.

Charmaz (2006) suggested something similar but she suggested that increasing the list of observations in the data by looking for sufficiently detailed descriptions in a range of participant views and actions would be helpful, and then to look beneath the surface of the data for answers. In my study, the ideas that were discussed in the focus groups about the parked car on the roadside obstructing traffic, that the women treated as a problem solving exercise and the men looked at it as a potential to discover something more sinister, was one example. This seemingly simple event according to Charmaz (2006), could generate data sufficient to reveal changes over time, while looking at multiple views of the participants' range of actions in the focus group scenarios and at the data as a way of developing analytic categories during analysis and how all this worked to inform my ideas about the study topic. The mechanism for these in-depth reflections by the participants was the result of the questions asked of the participants to reflect upon experiences in their lives in ways that seldom occur in everyday life (Charmaz, 2006). The uniqueness of the experiences described by the participants in the individual interviews was of particular interest for me in my study when analyzing the data.

In my study, I explored the real and sometimes dangerous environments that police officers work in every day, so as to learn more about how they make decisions relative to the objectives of a justice system that requires the police officers to face volatile situations. Strategies to resolve volatile circumstances are important but are commonly influenced by personal factors specific to the situational circumstances the police officers are experiencing. I wanted to know something about what the officers felt about the subject they face in these circumstances. If situational factors allow or force psychological perceptions to predominate and dictate police responses, this would be important information to discover within the framework of this study.

Data Collection Method – Settings and Sampling

I collected data from four focus group discussions, each group containing 5 to 7 participants; these focus groups consisted of two female groups and two male groups. I also conducted 12 structured individual in-depth interviews conducted, divided into equal gender numbers. Waddington et al. (2009) primarily used focus group interviews in the International Study. My study design followed this example, but also added semistructured individual, to obtain a depth in responses beyond the focus group discussions and that also demonstrated the rational and strategic components of use of force applications. As a study method, Charmaz (2006) indicated that intensive interviewing has long been useful in gathering data in various types of qualitative research. This type of interviewing permits an in-depth exploration of a topic or experience and is helpful in interpreting the data.

The participants of this study were drawn from the ranks of police agencies across Canada. All participants were police officers that were experienced in general duty patrol duties, serious crime investigators and supervisors in those particular roles. Participation in the study was

voluntary and all participants were recruited based on their desire to volunteer. The distribution of participants within each focus group was chosen to create a mixed distribution of duty assignments, varying lengths of service and age within each focus group. These criteria were chosen to balance the discussions in the focus group sessions. Supervisors were excluded as much as possible from participating in a focus group with their direct reports in order to promote more free flowing discussion within these groups.

Participants for the study were recruited through email solicitations for volunteers. The ads were specific that participation is strictly voluntary. A liaison person within each of the police offices was appointed to assist in gathering the volunteer names and contact information of the potential participants. I used this contact list to make direct contact with potential participants and thus made the arrangements for their voluntary participation in these interviews. These email advertisements were structured to inform the participants about the study, its intended purpose, and the voluntary nature of participation in the study. My personal contact information and that of the local liaison person in each of the police offices were included in the emails to potential participants in order to present more information on the study to assist with their decision to participate before they expressed their desire to volunteer.

Larger cities in Canada are policed by city and municipal police agencies. The Chief of Police for the City of Saskatoon, Canada, and the Chief of Police for the Metro Vancouver Transit Police in Vancouver Canada, consented to allow access to their human resources pool to search for volunteer participants. I also solicited other police agencies for letters of cooperation. A request for research permission was realistically not at the top of any police chief's priority list and so I focused on those agencies that responded quickly and decisively

about the research request. The Walden University IRB affirmed my request to also recruit for participants through a snowball sampling process which entailed connecting with police officers whom I knew personally to participate and to connect with any associates they knew who might want to participate. My name and contact information was sent to potential participants and I acted in the role of providing potential participants with sufficient information about the study. Potential participants did not need much prompting for participation. Each person that volunteered to participate contacted me personally and expressed an excitement about the study. Each consenting participant signed a Consent Form as approved by the Walden University IRB.

Therefore in summary, the participating volunteers contributing to the data in this study were members of police agencies across Canada. Two Letters of Cooperation provided my study with 3 focus groups, and 3 individual interview participants. Liaison persons within each of the agencies issuing a Letter of Cooperation signed confidential agreements. The fourth focus group was a group of volunteers found through a snowball sampling effort. The other 9 individual interview participants were also found through snowball sampling.

Focus Group Interviews

My study followed a format that had already been established by a group of international researchers from Britain, Netherlands, Germany, Australia, Venezuela, and Brazil who conducted an International Research Project study on police use of force (Waddington et al., 2009). Dr. P.A.J. Waddington, Professor of Social Policy and Director of the Central Institute for the Study of Public Protection, University of Wolverhampton, U.K., led the British study team. Dr. Philip Stenning, at that time, from the University of Toronto, and currently from

Griffiths University in Australia, led a conference of the international study groups at Simon Fraser University in Vancouver in 2002 for purposes of further planning the study procedures.

I contacted Dr. Waddington to gain a better understanding of the study and to discuss the study method and outcomes from the British perspective. The outcomes for the International Study focused on discussions about law, situational factors leading to use of force justifications and normative practices. During our discussions Dr. Waddington granted verbal permission to follow the established format developed by the study team and he sent to me a description of the progressive scenario used in the British focus group interviews, an outline that I have been following to develop my study methods and procedures. He has since forwarded via email permission to use the British study model including the focus group scenario and has waived any copyright concerns.

I presented the focus groups in my study with a progressive scenario with time for discussion at each step of the scenario. With the permission of the participants I audiotaped the interviews and created transcripts from the recordings. These discussions are described in Appendix "A". Each progressive step of the focus group scenario was discussed by the focus groups before the next step of the evolving circumstance was revealed. The focus group scenario was designed to emulate a real life police related event. The focus group interviews were designed to stimulate discussion among the participants relative to the circumstances in the scenario. Upon completing the focus group discussions the group was informed again of the study purpose and the importance of their participation in the study. The study participants were advised that if any follow-up questions are required that will help to explain a particular comment during the interviews that direct contact will be made by myself, the researcher.

Again, the idea of the importance of the study was reinforced with the participants along with an expression of appreciation for their participation in such an important study and how the study results applied to practical circumstances. The privacy and confidentiality of the data collected was reinforced with the participants before they left the focus group meeting room.

In-Depth Individual Interviews

Interviewing is about people's stories and these stories are a way of knowing something about their experiences (Seidman, 2006). This step of the study involved semistructured, individual, in-depth, interviews. I met in person and conducted face-to-face interviews with the study participants during which the subject matter was explored in detail. Some participants interviewed were living and working in far off locations and those interviews were conducted by telephone. Five of the 12 individual interviews were conducted by telephone. Each of the interviews was recorded and transcripts made of the recording. The interviews ranged in time from 15 minutes to half an hour in length.

Researchers look for experiences, examples, narratives and stories, through the use of open ended questions allowing for responses that elaborate upon answers or explore the context of the questions (Rubin and Rubin, 2012). I conducted these interviews in a manner that imitated a conversation wherein I ask a question of the participant to find out about a certain aspect of their work life. Seidman, (2006), indicated that at the root of in-depth interviewing is an interest in understanding the lived experience of other people and the meaning they make of that experience. The interviewer considered these experiences to be of considerable worth to the research being conducted. Although, there are limits on our understanding of others, the

effort is to strive to comprehend them by understanding their actions or behavior (Seidman, 2006).

In my study, conducted 12 interviews that helped gain access to the decisions on use of force behavior from the perspective of police officers who do this type of work and allowed me to search for greater depth in the meaning officers ascribe to citizen behavior in confrontational circumstances. The interviews were in a semistructured format wherein the topic had a specific focus. There were a number of questions prepared in advance, see the interview protocol in Appendix “B”, with plans to ask follow-up questions for clarification of specific features of participant responses. The interviews were of topical interest that looked for specific facts, descriptions of use of force events and situational examples that contributed to answering the research questions. This part of the interview required impromptu questions that arose during the interviews that helped to explore the specific experiences of participants, who each came to the interview with their own experiences, concerns, and behaviors.

The participants were debriefed at the end of the interview by thanking them for their time and their willingness to participate in such an important study. The application of the information they contributed to practical circumstances was discussed with the participants. They were asked for permission to make a follow-up contact with them should any questions arise from the analysis of their interview statements. Again, the privacy and confidentiality of the data were reinforced prior to the participants leaving the interview.

Sampling Method and Design

The sampling method resembled a convenience sample drawn from the population of serving police members in Canada. Two agencies, Saskatoon Police Service and the Metro

Vancouver Transit Police consented to participate. The Chiefs of Police for these two agencies signed Letters of Cooperation. A liaison person was appointed from within these two agencies to help connect with volunteer participants. Each potential participant contacted me personally to consent to their participation and provided me with a signed Consent Form.

The focus groups were gender specific. Each focus group regardless of gender had a mix of participants from different duty assignments, length of service and age to balance the discussions. Supervisors were not excluded from participating in the discussion groups however I asked the other participants about their comfort level regarding supervisor participation. The focus group discussions in each case went very well and all participants appeared to be comfortable in participating in the discussions. I conducted the focus group discussions in each of the respective agency head offices in meeting rooms set up to accommodate the number of participants in the discussions. The individual interviews were conducted in private locations where there was no interference or distractions during the interviews. As well, as stated earlier in this paper, some individual interviews were conducted by phone to accommodate for the distance between the interviewee and myself as the researcher. The telephone interviews were recorded and the participants were advised that they would be recorded and transcribed. Each of the interviewees signed a Consent Form and either emailed it to me or handed it to me in person if the interview was conducted in person.

There were no interferences from work related issues during either the focus group discussions or the individual interviews. All the participants that consented to participate in this study were excited about their involvement and were anxious to find out the possible results of the study.

The in-depth interview samples and the focus group samples are convenience samples and are not meant to represent a particular population. During the focus group discussions and individual interviews the participants were asked to anecdotally provide details about their policing experiences and the decision criteria relative to use of force circumstances as set out in the scripts at Appendix “A” and “B”.

Data Collection and Analysis

The focus group and individual interviews were audio recorded and permission was obtained from each of the participants to record the interviews. Transcripts were created from each of the audio recordings that represented the data during the coding, memo writing and analysis. Notes were taken during each of the focus group and individual interviews about some of the important points made during the interviews to supplement the recorded data and/or the transcripts. Transcripts were made immediately following each interview session, by a transcribing service.

I used a content analysis to examine the data for specifically repeated themes. In order to conduct this analysis I used a coding approach. Coding involved assigning a word or short phrase that ascribes meaning to a portion of the data (Saldana, 2013). The coding cycled through phases or stages of analysis. Saldana (2013) also indicated that the initial phase single words or short phrases might predominate the process. Yet, in subsequent phases of analysis the data initially coded was grouped to critically link the collected data with explanations of meaning.

The meaning of the coded data was partially a subjective evaluation by the researcher even though the participants might assign their own meaning to a particular coded data set during the

interview. Saldana (2013) indicated that most researchers will code their data both during and after collection as an analytic tactic for coding, is part of analysis. Coding should link the data to an idea and the idea to all the data pertaining to that idea (Saldana, 2013). Therefore coding leads to grouping the data or categorizing it, allowing researchers to look for patterns in the data that help to tell the story.

In the analysis phase the data were grouped relative to each of the research questions posed in the study. The coding process identified some of the similarities in responses that related to the specific research questions that were helpful in identifying the critical factors of interest for these study results. The analysis was conducted manually. I have not acquired a software program specific to qualitative research to help me with conducting this analysis. A more comprehensive explanation of the coding method to be applied to this study is described at Appendix "F". I used Saldana's (2013) coding manual as a guide to help with the coding process and with the categorizing of the data. Further I am depending on the independent reviews of the coding from my committee members to add validity and reliability to the coding process.

Ethical Concerns and Informed Consent

Systemic research concerns are significant in relation to participant well being during and after the study. The Walden University IRB, Ethical Standards in Research, U.S. Federal regulations, and Canadian Federal standards in research on human participants, that is, the National Council on Ethics in Human Research (NCEHR) governing the standards by which this research will be conducted, guided this research. That is, the way the research was structured, and the manner in which questions are posed, along with the voluntary nature of

participation are important features of this research study. The literature indicated that social scientists generally agree that research involving human participants should be performed with the informed consent of the participants (Frankfort-Nachmias and Nachmias, 2008). Informed consent about the study related to the study processes such as the study content, its purpose and the problem to be addressed. Therefore, ethics in the social sciences research concerns the participants' rights and welfare in the pursuit of the development of systematic and verifiable knowledge (Frankfort-Nachmias and Nachmias, 2008). The protection of these concerns and considerations was important to, the participants personally, the integrity of the project, as well as the reputation of the researchers going forward in time.

The participants in the focus group part of my study received a full description of the study in advance of the interviews a copy of which appears at Appendix "G". Upon their arrival at the interview location and as part of the pre-interview administrative function, the study purpose was again reviewed with the participants along with the voluntariness of their participation. The participants were asked to sign a consent form, see Appendix "D", to their voluntary participation, and consent to recording of the interviews, prior to the commencement of the actual study.

Informed consent implies elements of competence, voluntarism, full information and comprehension and is absolutely essential whenever participants are exposed to substantial risks or are asked to forfeit personal rights (Frankfort-Nachmias and Nachmias, 2008). The risks to the participants in my study were minimized. That is the officers were not participating in a real life scenario along with the dangers inherent in a real life event. The officers were participating in a discussion stimulated by either a progressive scenario or individual interview

questions. Physically there were no risks involved in either the focus group interviews or in the individual interviews.

The scenario and the questions prepared for these interviews have been thoughtfully and carefully prepared to evaluate and identify decision processes in resistive circumstances for police officers. The concern of discomfort or potential risk to the participants triggering post-traumatic memories was not an issue. Concerns and considerations discussed prior to the interviews provided an opportunity for participants to leave the interview before the discussion or during the discussion as they saw fit. The decision to leave or to continue with the study focus group and individual interviews was the participant's responsibility based on personal perceptions of his or her ability to continue or not to continue within the study. There were no such incidents during either the focus group discussions or the individual interviews. Care was taken during the participant selection process to choose participants that were considered fully fit for active duty, a step in mitigating incidents of post-traumatic recall.

Competence implies that any decisions made by reasonable, responsible, and mature individuals with the relevant information will generate the correct decision. The voluntary nature of participation ensures that participants have the freedom to choose whether they participate and that any exposure to risk is undertaken voluntarily (Frankfort-Nachmias and Nachmias, 2008). The term, full information, appears to be somewhat ambiguous. If full information were available the value to doing the research would be limited according to Frankfort-Nachmias and Nachmias (2008). Therefore some level of reasonably informed consent might be more appropriate which according the Frankfort-Nachmias and Nachmias (2008) includes a fair explanation of the procedures and their purposes, a description of the

discomforts and risks reasonably to be expected, a description of benefits to be expected, an offer to answer questions concerning procedures, instructions that participants are free to withdraw consent and to discontinue participation in the study at any time, and a disclosure of alternative procedures that might be advantageous to the participants. I found these elements to be as close to being comprehensive as is imaginable. Looking back on the data gathering process there appeared not to be a hint of discomfort for the participants. The opposite might have been observed, couched in enthusiasm and excitement demonstrated by the participants about the study topic.

The element of comprehension by the participants refers to knowing when the research procedures are associated with complex or subtle risks. One important method of testing participants for comprehension is to ask them directly if they believe that they have enough information to competently participate in the study. I asked each participant before beginning the interviews and the focus groups as a group if they understood the purpose of the study and were freely volunteering to participant.

The researcher should test for emotional risk during the interview process by asking the participants about how they feel and if they are comfortable in proceeding or continuing with the interview. The circumstances that police members are required to investigate in real life do not evolve into comfortable circumstances. During discussions on in both the focus groups and the individual interviews, as the participants talked about their potentially stressful experiences I looked for and sometimes asked the participants about how they felt at the moment when the participants could experience stress. It is important to monitor the participant responses for

stressed reactions. None were identified during any of the interviews or focus group discussions.

Privacy

The right to privacy relating to the individual's right to pick the time and circumstances under which, and the extent to which, attitudes, beliefs, behavior, and opinions are shared or withheld from others that may easily be violated during a study or after its completion, may be a very sensitive consideration. In my study, this could relate to participants making comments about past behavior during use of force events they were involved in or talk about personal beliefs relating to consequences that citizens should suffer based on behavior. The privacy considerations relate to the sensitivity of the information that the participants disclose during both the focus group and the in-depth interviews, the setting in which observations are made and how the information is disseminated (Frankfort-Nachmias and Nachmias, 2008). Declarations of privacy with regard to statements made in the context of discussion or while answering interview questions were made in writing for each participant. Privacy concerns overlap somewhat with anonymity and confidentiality. In this study, I separated the information the participants provided from their identity to preclude any opportunity for what was said by the participants to be linked to the participants' names. The participants chose to identify themselves for purposes of the transcribers by initials. The information to link the participants and their responses may be needed by the researcher for any follow-up questions but when the research has been completed and at an appropriate time, the linking information will be destroyed.

Anonymity and Confidentiality

Research data should be confidential and all participants should remain anonymous. Exceptions would be where written permission is given for compromise (Frankfort-Nachmias and Nachmias, 2008). While anonymity relates to the separation of the identity of the participant from the information they give, confidentiality relates how information is stored. It is important to separate the information from its sources. Participants need to know how the separation of source identity and the data will be achieved. Audio recordings allow for limited voice identification. The recordings should be safely stored in the researcher's control, not accessible by third party sources. The audio recordings are for building transcripts. Connecting participant identity with the comments would be difficult and part of my comments about the confidentiality offer covered that point. With audio taping the focus group interviews, the identity of the persons speaking would be possible only by others who know that person. Promises of confidentiality will assure the participants that no others will have access to the audio recordings than the researcher and that audio recordings will only be used to build transcripts. Transcripts will not contain any identifying information about the participants. Participation in a focus group setting as in my study, limits anonymity. The participants in the study are working together to expand the thinking on the topic of the interview and thereby open their thoughts to the group. The anonymity I am concerned with is after the focus group interviews, when the safe storage of the data becomes the concern for me as the researcher.

The statement of confidentiality, see Appendix "E", issued by the researcher for each of the participants was presented to each participant. The participant's name does not appear on

this document. The participants' names appear on a list of participants but no effort was made to identify the participant with any comments made during the focus group interviews. In terms of the individual interviews, the participant's code appears with the interview documents and transcripts for purposes of follow-up questions if required. The list of names will be stored in a secure location and only referred to by the researcher. The data will be stored on an electronic storage device such as a computer memory stick. The memory stick will be locked in a filing cabinet in my office for security and safekeeping. The transcripts of the interviews will only refer to the participant by their assigned identity code that will eventually be destroyed when that reference is no longer needed in further studies. The focus group and the individual interview transcripts will never be made available to anyone and will only be used for my study purposes. Direct quotes will not be used if they can identify individuals, participants or locations where events occurred from which individuals could possibly be identified.

Protection of Rights and Welfare of Participants

The dignity, privacy and interests of the participants should be respected and protected to the extent possible (Frankfort-Nachmias and Nachmias, 2008). The welfare of the participants should take priority over all other concerns. Damage and suffering should be mitigated through procedural mechanisms and through the termination of risk prone studies in a timely way (Frankfort-Nachmias and Nachmias, 2008). The participants in my study will be afforded the opportunity to privacy considerations, promises of confidentiality, and the ability to leave the interview at any time without question.

Role of the Researcher

In a focus group interview, the researcher brings together a group of individuals representative of the population whose ideas are of interest (Rubin and Rubin, 2012). In my study, I conducted 4 Focus Group discussions representing groups of police officers chosen for their willingness to participate voluntarily. I audio recorded each of the focus groups and transcribed the audio recordings into text. Permission was obtained from the participants in the focus groups to record and transcribe the discussions. During the focus group interviews I read out a prepared scenario that has been broken down into progressive steps of how a law enforcement event might occur. At each step in the scenario I prompted the participants in the group with prompts that kept the discussion going. Therefore, my role was mostly to facilitate the conversation and ensure it moved along smoothly.

In my role as the researcher in this study, I had no direct supervisory or professional relationship with members of the contributing agencies. I was formally employed by the RCMP as a regular member and designated by statute as a “peace officer”. I have not been so employed since 2006. Police officers whom I know personally from the time of my employment with the RCMP were not be asked to participate in either the focus group interviews or the in-depth, individual, interviews.

In terms of the individual interview, my role was to appear in a face-to-face structured conversation with the participants. I also conducted a total of 12 interviews. Five interviews were conducted by telephone as a point of convenience and/or to cover great distances between the participant and myself as the researcher. As an example, one participant interviewed worked in law enforcement in the Maritime Provinces of Canada, while I as the researcher live

on the West Coast of Canada a significant distance. Conducting this interview by telephone precluded the expense of travel to facilitate the interview. I asked pre-scripted questions along with probing questions during the interview while the participant responded. These in-depth interviews were audio recorded. Transcripts were created from the audio versions of the interviews. Participants were advised that if they wish to obtain a copy of the transcript that a copy will be provided to them. I took notes as the interviews progressed to supplement the recording. At the introduction phase of the interview I gathered the personal demographic information from the participants. I obtain signed consent forms that contained statements about privacy, anonymity and confidentiality. There have been no requests for copies of the transcripts produced and participants willingly and enthusiastically took part in the focus group discussions and the individual interviews.

Researcher Bias

My role as the researcher puts me in close contact with the data collected. The literature reviewed in preparation for this study is comprehensive and was chosen for the value of the information contained in the articles or textbooks. The judgment about the value of the literature reviewed was mine as the researcher. The problem with personal judgments as Maxwell (2005) indicated is that the data seemed outstanding to the researcher and could be a threat to validity. Miles and Huberman (1994) indicated that threats to the validity of qualitative conclusions are the selection of data that fit the researcher's existing theory basically describing researcher perceptions or preconceptions. Together, these qualitative threats involve the researchers' subjectivity or "researcher bias", as indicated by Maxwell (2005). The corollary to this data selection bias would be for the researcher to also address the

evidence that does not fit his or her personal theories to balance the presentation of the evidence. It is important to understand how the researcher's values and expectations influence the conduct and conclusions of the study. Validity in qualitative research is not the result of indifference but of integrity (Maxwell, 2005), which involves personal communication including the researcher's background experiences and motivations while balancing the presentation of all the evidence found in the data.

Researcher bias or pre-existing beliefs are bound to impact my study, if I understand the literature. I have a law enforcement background and in that role and through personal experiences have formed my own preconceptions about the world in law enforcement. Further, I instructed use of force for police officers for more than two decades, adding an additional level of knowledge and understanding to the topic of my research. Third, I need to address issues of gender particularly as it is intrinsic within the subject of this study. My own gender might influence a particular point of view during the interpretation of the data and that is an important awareness for me as the researcher in this study. Fourth, the research is being conducted within a Canadian culture context. As discussed in Chapter 2, Canada has built its own culture through democracy, a parliamentary system of government and common law legal principles and procedures. It is within this cultural context that the data will be interpreted. I will take steps to compare my analysis to the findings of each of the researchers in the International Study (2009) referred to in this paper to control for culture bias to the extent possible.

Maxwell (2005) indicated that the researcher might influence the setting or individuals studied generally referred to as "participant reactivity". He further indicated that, eliminating

the actual influence of the researcher is impossible and the goal should be to understand researcher influence and to use it productively (Maxwell, 2005). The researcher's influence in the world he or she is studying is powerful and inescapable (Maxwell, 2005). We can conclude from the comment that the researcher always influences participant responses during an interview. What is important to understand for the researcher is the impact the researcher may have on the participants and how that might affect the validity of the inferences the researcher draws from the interviews (Maxwell, 2005). Therefore, the goal in a qualitative study is to understand the researcher influences and to use these influences productively.

In my literature review I tried to choose articles and textbooks that provided a diversity of views on the subject of interest. I have discussed some of these varying views in the Chapter 2 discussions. What I found in the literature review was that as much as theory was important to the understanding of the study purpose and problem, the discussions about some of the practical components that are specific to the exercise of day-to-day law enforcement and use of force, required some judgment on the part of the researcher. These judgments may represent researcher subjectivity where the strengths of the researcher's background and experiences might help to navigate through complex data otherwise not well understood within the study project. The Chapter 4 discussions will address the judgment factors specific to the research data in this project.

Dissemination of Findings

The findings of this study will be offered to the law enforcement agencies that issued Letters of Cooperation for their cooperation in offering access to their police members as participants. I spoke at a conference in November 2014 in Las Vegas sponsored by the

Institute for the Prevention of In-Custody Deaths (IPICD). I spoke on my dissertation topic to the Canadian Bar Association, Victoria Chapter and have been invited to speak about my study findings at the Canadian Association of Civilian Oversight for Law Enforcement (CACOLE) in the May 2016 national conference. Further, I have given evidence on police use of force matters in the criminal and civil courts in Canada and I anticipate that the findings in this study will assist the courts in their decisions going forward.

Conclusion

Chapter 3 examined the theoretical method of inquiry and design for the study. The study is designed to analyze the use of force decisions of police officers according to a prescribed scenario to help researchers understand the considerations within situational circumstances that cause officers to make decisions about when to use force or not to use force. The focus groups were gender populated to give more emphasis to the differences in the decision factors that lead to the application of physical force. The structured individual in-depth interviews focused on exploring greater depth within the decisions of the participants to use force during an arrest and based on gender, through the use of structured and probing questions.

Combined, these two methods of data collection provided for me as the researcher the relevant data that generated a greater understanding of the decision factors applied by officers. If they can be objectively identified, it will be important to know what those factors are. The data analysis identified differences in use of force decisions based on gender. These differences currently contribute to a theoretical framework for change in the approach to police and citizen confrontational events, helping to create a safer environment for both the citizens

and officers. The impact of these findings is being distributed to groups of interest and it is anticipated that over time will influence training and policy.

This grounded theory study was focused on building theory and provided data that was applied to the concept that the application of force by police officers in the traditional model is ready for change. The data were coded and analyzed through detailed descriptions, aggregation of categorical information, establishing of patterns and generalizations about comments that have a common meaning. The findings were validated through multiple data sources and committee reviews.

This study will contribute to social change through potentially reducing the incidents of violence perpetrated during police arrest circumstances. The change for contemporary society will be toward an enhanced Community Policing model of service, a concept that helps to build community through collaborative efforts in problem solving, that means taking steps to move away from the traditional and more coercive enforcement model.

Chapter 3 is the final step in the Proposal phase of this study. With an IRB the study went ahead as planned and the findings are discussed in Chapter 4, which follows. The implications of the study results and any recommendations that have emanated from this study are discussed in Chapter 5.

Chapter 4: Results

Introduction

The purpose of this qualitative study was to develop a theory that explains differences in decisions about the use of force in police practices and provides a deeper understanding of the decision factors in use of force circumstances. The study used a grounded theory approach and was conducted in Canada. An important decision factor tested in this project was the contribution of gender. The data collected were generated through four focus group discussions and 12 semistructured individual interviews. The participants were serving peace officers at police agencies in Canada with varying lengths of service in operational and supervisory positions. All participants were volunteers, each bringing their thoughts and ideas to the study that formed the data for this study. This chapter presents, examines and discusses the analysis of the data collected and its findings.

Although this study was conducted in Canada, the study approach followed an International Study published in 2009. This larger study is divided into seven substudies focusing on police actions in different countries: England (Waddington et al., 2009), Netherlands (Adang & Birkbeck, 2009), Germany (Klukkert et al., 2009), Australia (Baker, 2009), Venezuela (Gabaldon, 2009), Brazil (Machado, 2009) and the United States (Barrett et al., 2009). The International Study was helpful in preparing my thoughts and ideas for this study.

The Study Problem

The problem investigated by this study was police officers' use of force during an arrest or in pursuit of a suspect as part of their profession of policing and how the abuse of physical

force in these duties impacts public confidence in police services. A general precept of this study was that programs that impact use-of-force by police officers should be specific to the work that police officers do and their training. The factors contributing to the officers' decisions to implement physical force are somewhat subjective and fall into a broad range of considerations.

In considering use of force events, researchers have argued that, the range of circumstances in which police use force is almost unlimited and is the essential defining characteristic of the contemporary police (Stenning et al., 2009). It is apparent that it is in the manifestation of force applications where problems begin. Ultimately, the goal in modern societies is to reduce violence, whether it is bullying in schools, citizen generated domestic violence or the use of force by police (Klukkert et al., 2009). Democratic principles that form the basis for police decisions regarding the interference with civil liberties, serve to protect all members of society through concepts of law and order. In this context, any effort reflecting a reduction in applications of physical force during an arrest contributes to safety within the circumstances of that arrest and democracy in action.

This study used a grounded theory design that allowed themes and patterns within the data to emerge from a systematic comparative analysis that is grounded in fieldwork so as to explain what has been and is observed, as suggested by Charmaz, (2006) and Patton, (2002). The challenges in this study were to consider the decision factors contributing to police use of force including the influences of gender in those decisions.

I used a gender-specific approach in focus group discussions and semistructured interviews that I was able to obtain some ideas about use of force differences specific to this study.

Research Study Questions

Two primary research questions were used to guide this study:

RQ1. What are the different ways in which police officers explain the applications of physical force as a strategy for maintaining social order?

RQ2. What are the different ways in which police officers are critical of the application of physical force?

Three secondary research questions were used to help answer the primary research questions:

RQ3. What criteria do police officers identify in situations justifying or not justifying the use of force as a police practice in maintaining social order?

RQ4. What are the points of consensus among police officers on these matters generally, or do they display a significant variety of different viewpoints?

RQ5. What are the perspectives wherein the police officers' viewpoints differ about use of force?

Results of Study Questions Analysis

A summary of each question and a discussion of the data pertaining to it follows;

RQ1. What are the different ways in which police officers explain the application of physical force as a strategy for maintaining social order?

In my study the participant sample was chosen from a population of police officers serving in various agencies in Canada. The sample reached from the east coast of Canada to the west coast. I conducted four focus group discussions consisting of two female and two male groups,

and 12 semistructured individual interviews involving six women and six men. The focus groups were provided with a phased scenario that described a vehicle parked on a roadway in a manner that caused an interference with passing traffic. In this scenario, this vehicle had blacked out windows and loud music can be heard coming from within the vehicle, with the motor is running. The question to the focus groups after each phase was; “What happens next?”

Scenario Phase 2

In the second phase of the scenario the occupants of the vehicle treated the inquiring police officers disrespectfully by the use of language and they refused to comply with the officers’ requests to produce documents and move the car. Participants were asked, “What happens next?”

Scenario Phase 3

In the third phase of the scenario the driver of the subject vehicle suddenly drove away from the police officers at high speed. Participants were asked, “What happens next?”

Scenario Phase 4

In the fourth phase of the scenario the subject vehicle collided with another vehicle while trying to elude the police at high speed and then ran off the roadway into the ditch where the vehicle was disabled. The subjects in the vehicle jumped out and ran toward a residential complex. Participants were asked, “What happens next?”

Scenario Phase 5

In the fifth phase the subjects were running on foot and still trying to elude capture by the police. A police car arrived at the scene of the accident and one of the officers pursued the

subjects on foot. The subject vehicle's driver was seen running with what appears to be a gun in his hand. The subjects then ran toward a nearby busy shopping mall. During the foot chase the subject with the gun turned and pointed the gun at the pursuing officer. Participants were asked, "What happens next?"

Focus Group Comments

In the focus group comments the simplest solution proposed for to the phase one circumstances as discussed was to ask the driver to move the vehicle far enough off the roadway to clear the traffic obstruction or to find a different place to park. All the participants in the focus group agreed that the problem in the scenario was significant enough to ask the driver to move the vehicle to a safer location. Participants discussed legal authority as the reason to act rather than just curiosity about what the vehicle occupants were doing that caused them to park in such an obstructionist manner.

The scenario next indicated that the occupants of the vehicle refused to cooperate with the police officers while demonstrating disrespectful behavior. The literature review indicated that showing disrespect to police officers intensified the desire of the officers to find a reason to arrest (Waddington et al., 2009).

Male Participants Strategies

The discussion in the male groups was focused on searching for ways to legitimize controls in the situation through making lawful demands of the subjects. That meant, asking for drivers license and registration documents, requesting the occupants to step out of the vehicle and asking for identification documents from the other subject(s) in the vehicle. This protocol

could be considered as a prearrest strategy wherein the officers are making lawful demands of the driver that if compliance is refused an arrest is possible and use of force is appropriate if the subject continues or increases resistance. The discussion ended in general agreement among the male participants in both male focus groups that this approach is effective and has merit. Continuing with the steps of the prearrest process, the male officers were prepared to open the driver's door and then ask the driver to step from the vehicle. If the driver still refused, the male participants in both groups generally agreed that they were prepared to help the driver get out of the vehicle, physically. This would likely be sufficient to motivate the passenger to also get out of the car and cooperate.

Female Participants Strategies

The female focus groups participants indicated a different approach. They would request the help of their partner to attend at the car to demonstrate additional resources on the scene. They indicated that they would call for other patrols as backup to help with the next steps of the circumstances. The female participants in both groups indicated that they would continue to negotiate and build relationships with the vehicle occupants. Perhaps two or three female participants would ask the subject to step from the car. The rest of the female focus group participants indicated that there was no use asking them to do something without adequate backup to force the issue if they refused. Therefore, the predominant strategy was to continue to negotiate until back-up patrols arrive and then if the occupants were not motivated to cooperate with the police officer's requests, they would then seek to arrest them.

Discussions About Phase 3

The scenario says that the driver suddenly drove away, leaving the officer(s) standing on the side of the road. The immediate reaction from all the participants is to call for further back-up support. They generally agreed that they were under a restriction from getting into a high-speed pursuit but some of the men said that they would pursue anyways until the supervisor ordered them to stop pursuing. Some men and one woman participant would merely drive in the direction that the suspect vehicle was travelling and try to inform other patrols of what was happened along with a description of the suspects and their vehicle. One group of female participants was emphatic that they would not pursue the fleeing subject vehicle. The parking problem had been solved, they indicated, and the pursuit policy prohibited them from even following the subjects at a distance.

Generally, all the participants talked about varying ideas in persuading or coercing the vehicle occupants into compliance. However the discussions were divided because in addition to the parking problem the scenario indicated that the officer confronting the occupants also smelled marijuana smoke coming from inside the vehicle and that one of the occupants was a known local criminal, all of which raised the suspicions about what other unlawful activities were actually going on in the vehicle or what the subjects had just done. That is, was there a crime that had just been committed that the police were not aware of yet? These considerations tended to complicate the discussions to the extent that the drug issue and the disrespect demonstrated toward the officers began to take priority over other considerations even though the evidence was circumstantial at best. Waddington et al., (2009), indicated that police officers would react to disrespectful behavior through finding ways or authority to arrest at which time they might physically deal with the disrespectfulness. There was no direct discussion about the

disrespect other than it formed part of the subject resistance to being compliant, while the officers completed their inquiry. Yet, in the scenario the disrespectfulness formed the essence of the resistance demonstrated by the vehicle occupants. The participants talked about it in that way.

Individual Interviews Discussion

The participants in the individual interviews discussed use of force from a control perspective. The objective was to bring a physically resisting subject under control or to a point where the subject stopped resisting police efforts. Handcuffing the subject was considered a primary step to reaching the desired level of control. Therefore, there were some direct similarities to what the participants in the focus groups talked about in dealing with the resistance demonstrated in the form of disrespect along with the Waddington et al.'s, 2009) comments about dealing with disrespect towards police officers, and the interview participants in my study. The most common desire expressed by the participants was to achieve a level of control in any circumstance sufficient to allow the continuation of the police investigation of the circumstances in question. In the focus group discussions subject control/cooperation would allow for the participants to satisfy their curiosity about the marijuana smoke detected when they first made contact with the driver. Therefore, resistance became the measure of the effort required by the participants to control the circumstances.

RQ2. What are the different ways in which police officers are critical of the application of physical force?

Gender Physiology and Force Strategies

The most significant critical argument I heard in these study discussions centered on the need to use physical force. The female participants indicated that because of the smaller stature of female police members than their male counterparts generally, and given that offenders when arrested are mostly male, that policewomen were forced to use alternative measures to physical force. The thoughts were that a person needed a critical mass of physical strength to be successful in overcoming various levels of physical resistance. The relative differences in physical size and strength forced women to employ different approaches to achieving control in most circumstances. That is, physical force was not deemed to be their first choice for seeking situational control.

Female Focus Group Discussions and Relationship Building

The focus in overcoming resistance as discussed by the female participants centered on relationship building through negotiation. One of the participants indicated that overcoming communication barriers takes a little bit longer but it most often precludes having to use physical force. Another female participant indicated that, “she had not had to use very much force, ever.” She said that it was because, “firstly, I don’t want to, and second, because I know my limitations... so I have to resort to, more verbal interaction.”

The female participants talked about witnessing excessive force in the course of assisting in effecting an arrest or booking an unruly prisoner into cells. The most significant aggravation

expressed by the female participants was during an arrest when they had spent significant time and effort in de-escalating the emotional components of the event, the subject was consenting to cooperate and then another officer would change the emotional component by aggravating the subject leading directly to a continuing conflict. This tended to place the female participants into a position to be the first physical responder in the newly created circumstances.

The interesting phenomenon that appeared in the individual interviews in this context was that the female participants tended to stop unnecessary force at the time it was occurring. The men demonstrated a tendency to not intervene and tended not to speak about it after the fact. In one interview the participant indicated that, she was chastised for intervening when a male co-worker was using force to control a subject. It was talked about as interfering with the efforts of a co-worker rather than quelling unnecessary physical force.

The participants considered public safety as one of the key considerations as a decision factor for using force. The participants were not unanimous about what public safety meant. Some participants considered public safety and officer safety as synonymous. The pretense about public safety was considered to be that public safety couldn't be assured unless it is preceded by officer safety. The circular arguments within these comments are not likely to generate a meaningful conclusion. It fails to address the threat generated by the presence of the police which heightens the subject's fear causing the subject to contemplate a hostage situation for self protection. The female participants indicated that warning the public and negotiating with the subject with the gun was more productive and less threatening to public safety than reciprocating with their own firearm.

The participants considered a plan for the apprehension of the subjects in varying ways. Some participants considered continuing with the foot chase with weapons drawn in case the subject turned and faced them with his weapon. The remainder of the participants in the focus group discussions mostly considered the public safety concerns and implemented a plan to follow the subjects by following their escape path while warning the public of the presence of imminent danger from the subject with the gun. When the subject in the scenario did turn and point his firearm at the participant in the foot chase, it was the comments from the male participants that focused more on engaging the subject with their own weapon. The women generally considered continuing to negotiate and persuade the subject into compliance considering particularly the dangers of shots fired in an area where the public is present or nearby.

Public Safety as Critical Decision Factor

The critical decision factor in the controversy was public safety and how it should be observed. Those participants who, considered officer safety as being of the ultimate importance, were quicker to consider the more serious or injury causing use of force strategies. The differences in the considerations rest in part on the self-interests of the participants faced with a dilemma that imminently impacts his or her personal safety.

RQ3. What criteria do police officers identify in situations justifying or not justifying the use of force as a police practice in maintaining social order?

The participants in this study talked about subject resistance and the situational circumstances as their focus in determining the force they would use to gain and maintain

control. The concept of control was achieved when the subject acquiesced and stopped resisting. Handcuffs were used to encourage subjects to stop resisting that, however, was not always successful.

Subjective/Objective Legal Test Discussion

Legal concepts discussed by the participants such as reasonableness, encouraged a subjective/objective (*R. v. Nasogaluak*, 2010) justification to use of force. In their discussions the participants talked about reasonableness, a common law principle, as that force that would be applied by any trained or experienced police officer in similar circumstances (*Graham v. Connor*, 1985). That was the objective test. Subjectively, the element reasonableness still needed to be defined and appeared a little more abstract.

The emotional components of a confrontational encounter, the participants indicated were different than the discussion they enjoyed in the comfort of the meeting rooms. In the focus group discussions they could talk dispassionately about the principles of use of force applications, but everything changed when the frustrations were present that exist in every physical encounters. Under emotionally charged conditions an extra strike with a fist or throwing a suspect against a wall to emphasize the officer's authority is an easy abuse of authority. It is between the rational judgments in a confrontational circumstance and the emotional motivations that public perceptions live that grant legitimacy to the existence of the police (*Kuhns & Knutsson*, 2010).

RQ4. What are the points of consensus among police officers on these matters generally, or do they display a significant variety of different viewpoints?

The participants in this study generally agreed that in considering use of force the decisions involved the seriousness of the crime to be investigated, the situational circumstances and the amount of subject resistance to police objectives. As an example, in one focus group discussion when considering the seriousness of the matter of the parked vehicle obstructing traffic, the participants indicated that it was a minor matter and that when the driver sped away the problem was solved. There was nothing more required to dealing with the issue of the parked vehicle. In the meantime however the police had learned some new information about the vehicle occupants. Firstly they were smoking marihuana or had smoked it recently, and next while the vehicle was speeding away they learned that the vehicle had been present at a drug related shooting. These elements caused the participants in all the focus groups to take some additional action by notifying other patrols and where the vehicle was last seen and its direction of travel. The new information motivated some to initiate pursuit like action while others considered their department policy and did not pursue.

Yet, in their focus group discussions some participants indicated that while the vehicle was still parked and discussions were ongoing with the occupants that they would ask the driver and passenger in the subject vehicle to step out of the vehicle. If they refused that they would open the driver's door and make the same request. If the driver refused they would be prepared to help the drive step out of the vehicle. The participants were somewhat divided on how far to go with the occupants. The legal authority was at best grey at this point in the circumstances

according to the participants, although the subjects were entering the parameters of obstruction under the law, prescribing other police responses.

Pursuing the fleeing subject was strongly considered by the male participants. The female participants were not going to pursue. Although the male participants indicated that there was a strongly worded “no pursuit” department policy, the circumstances evolving were strong enough to consider pursuing and some said they would want the supervisor to call off the pursuit while in progress. This action involved another level of decision making in these circumstances.

The next point of controversy in the discussions was at the point when the subjects were running toward the shopping mall, one subject with a gun. The critical decision point was when the subject with the gun turned and pointed the firearm at the pursuing police officer. What happened next was important.

Decision Differences Criteria

The female participants considered their responses solely based on public safety considerations. They would engage the subject in a way that would not start a shootout. Negotiating with the subject while warning the public about the dangers of the circumstances would be the agreed female approach. This required confidence in their ability to negotiate and they trusted that, no further steps would be undertaken by the subject to resist. Trust is a human quality that mitigates circumstantial uncertainty and discussions in this paper indicate that trust is not a strength for police officers.

The male participants however would be more confrontational. One male participant strongly indicated that he would draw his weapon and engage the subject in that manner. The

risk with this approach is that it might start a shootout between the participant and the subject with an unknown outcome. Public safety concerns would be significant in these conditions.

There was consensus among the study participants that police officers needed to take control of situational circumstances. An investigation is difficult or impossible to conduct when the events surrounding their investigations are in turmoil. Control can be achieved by citizen consent during a police investigation or by force, depending on the decisions of those causing the difficult circumstances. The decision to implement either strategy is mostly based on the officers' judgment. Judgments in police work as in other areas of real life vary according to the person(s) making the decisions.

RQ5. What are the perspectives wherein the police officers' viewpoints differ about use of force?

The previous question illustrated a variation in decisions to use of force. In the focus group discussions the clearest differences in police use of force application decisions in difficult circumstances differed at specific decision points. As in other professions there are standard procedures and processes that don't change through the practitioner's decisions. However, at the point of arresting a subject the circumstances are unique sufficiently to require the decision about the details of the arrest that becomes the sole responsibility of the police officers executing that arrest. The situational circumstances present the challenges and the outcomes belong to the decisions and skills of those conducting the arrest. That is, if the subject resists by using a weapon the process requires the police to implement a process that

overcomes the effects of the weapon of resistance that would be different than if there was no weapon used.

However, the clarity in the decision differences in policing was most obvious in the gender differences. The focus group discussions involving the female participants clearly demonstrated that communication was the key to gaining compliance when the subject vehicle was still parked and they were attempting to persuade the occupants of the vehicle to comply. In the next phase of the scenario, when the vehicle left and was fleeing the police presence at high speed, there was a no pursuit decision and there was little discussion about initiating a pursuit. The alternative strategy was to seek the help from other patrols to set up a containment network that would help to apprehend the subjects who were now known to possibly have been involved in another more serious crime a concept complicated by them fleeing from their current contact with the police.

The last example in the focus group discussions was associated to the final phase of the scenario when the subject running away from the police turns and points his firearm at the pursuing police officer. The difference in what happened next was telling. That is, some of the male participants indicated that they would engage the subject by drawing their weapon with the associated warnings and threats that would possibly coerce the subject to drop his weapon. The possible outcome if this action played itself out to an unwanted conclusion could be a significant public safety threat. The unknown is how the subject will react to the officer's threat. The scenario could play itself out in an exchange of gunfire thereby threatening public safety.

The female participants indicated a different strategy. They would negotiate and persuade the subject to comply, thereby mitigating the potential exchange of gunfire. The risk to public safety was considered to be too significant if shots were fired. The appropriateness of either action is not as apparent as it might seem. There are risks to both the male and the female participants' positions. The risk of a gunfire exchange is significantly mitigated by this approach relative to the previously discussed approach of subject gun versus participant gun.

Some of the discussion at all the phases in the focus group scenario addressed the concept of control. What does it mean to take or achieve control? This question has significant points of differences. If control means shackling to immobilize the subject's physical capability, the connotations of the outcomes suggest different consequences than control that means voluntary subject compliance. The data in this study indicated that the men were more focused on the former method of achieving controls. Control for the women participants was more about persuading the subject to cooperate voluntarily through verbal persuasion and negotiation. That difference is significant from the perspective of this study and would possibly be supported by a more representative sample.

Participant Demographics

Participants in this study were members of various police agencies in Canada. Table 1 in this report sets out the breakdown of the participants by gender and service ranges. The participants all had a significant amount of operational police experiences. At the time of the study the most junior male officer in the study had 7 years of experience and the male participant with the most service is 37 years of experience; females, officers' experience ranged from 12 to 29 years of experience.

The demographics of the participating volunteers in this study indicated that most of the participants had significant lengths of service with varied levels of experience in operational policing. The men indicated that most if not all of them had served in more than one police service in their careers. The female officers generally had single organizational police service albeit there was one female officer who had experienced more than one police agency as well as correctional services.

The semistructured interviews and focus group discussions were each directed by myself as the researcher. I conducted some travel within Canada for purposes of this study. All of the focus group discussions were conducted in person. Mostly, the semistructured interviews were conducted in person in a face-to-face setting. Four semistructured interview were conducted by phone. Two of the four phone interviews were because the participants lived in another province. Two of the four phone interviews were conducted by phone because of the participants' requests and convenience. Participants were all volunteers and were eager to take part. There was a keen interest demonstrated by the participants in the topic of this study.

Table 1

Participant Demographics by Gender

Focus Groups (four focus groups)	Semi-Structured Interviews	Police Service
13 men (2 focus groups)	6 men	7 - 37 years
11 women	6 women	12 – 29 years

Table 2

Participants' Regional Locations

Locations In Canada	Gender Breakdown
Midwestern City (2 focus groups 2F, 2M)	6 women, 7 men (focus groups)
Midwestern Municipal	1 woman interviewed
West Coast Nonmunicipal (1 focus group plus 3 interviews)	3 men interviewed 6 men (focus group 3M)
West Coast Municipal	3 men interviewed
West Coast Municipal	4 women interviewed plus 5 women (focus group 4F)
East Coast Provincial	1 woman interviewed

There were two conditions under which participants were recruited for this study. Firstly, police agencies were asked to provide a Letter of Cooperation. Participants who volunteered under the umbrella of a Letter of Cooperation all signed Consent Forms and willingly and enthusiastically participated in the focus group discussions and in the semistructured individual interviews.

The second group of participants was more independent of their agencies in that they represented police services members whom I as the researcher knew personally or whom I was able to contact through someone I knew personally and who volunteered to participate. The independent volunteers each signed a Letter of Consent. Through my conversations with the

participants, I as the researcher am satisfied that the volunteer participants all participated based on their desire to contribute to an important study.

Data Collection

The data collected in my study, was generated through semistructured individual interviews and focus group discussions. Discussions within the individual interviews generated curiosity that led to probing questions wherein the participant was asked to explain or elaborate on specific comments made during the interviews. Each interview lasted between 16 and 40 minutes. The interviews were audio taped, transcribed and analyzed. Coding processes were applied as discussed by Charmaz (2006), Creswell (2009), and Saldana (2013), in a grounded theory method of analysis.

The focus group discussions generated data based on a phased and progressive scenario that represented subject resistance while conducting routine patrols in a busy neighborhood. The scenario used in these focus group discussions was similar to the scenario that Waddington et al., (2009) used in their Six Country study. I made some minor changes to the scenario to allow for the Canadian content of my study. The focus groups in my study were gender specific. Gender separation aided in the analysis of the participant responses to determine if there were any differences in gender-based decisions.

A reflective journal was created to keep track of what was done and to assist in producing an audit trail. General comments were recorded in the journal about each interview and focus group. Transcripts were created immediately after each interview and focus group. The transcribing company generally did a one to three day turn around for each transcript allowing

for the recent nature of the discussion or interview to assist when I reviewed the transcript content for accuracy and meaning.

Data collection began on December 1, 2014, continued as more participants volunteered and was completed March 5, 2015. Letters of Cooperation were received from two police chiefs in Canada, one West Coast nonmunicipal agency and one midwest city police service. Some travel was required to complete the focus group discussions. The study was completed with four focus groups and semistructured individual interviews with six women and six men. The individual interview participants were police officers from various police agencies. Three, male interview participants were from a West Coast nonmunicipal agency, two men and four women were from various West Coast municipal agencies, one woman from a midwest municipal agency and one woman from an East Coast Provincial police agency.

Walden University IRB approved a snowball recruitment method used to find participants that were not part of the Letters of Cooperation process. Participants were found in police agencies across the breadth of Canada. I contacted the volunteers to confirm their willingness to participate. I then forwarded to each volunteer a copy of a letter to participate and a copy of the Consent Form as approved by the Walden University IRB. We then established a date for the interview that usually took place within one week of the original contact.

The purpose of the study was explained and how the study results would be used at the beginning of each discussion. The promise of confidentiality and anonymity was re-stated to the participants. The participants were open in their discussions while responding to questions and the discussion scenario. The focus group discussions were approximately 35 to 45 minutes in length and were audio recorded. The recordings were uploaded to a secure web address for

transcribing. I was able to download the transcripts from the same secure web address when they were completed which was anywhere from one day to three days from the time the audio files were sent. No names were included in any of the transcripts to protect the participants and their agencies.

Semistructured interviews of three senior and very experienced officers from the west-coast nonmunicipal police agency mentioned earlier provided detailed information regarding arrest and control processes that proved valuable to my study. Again, the depth of knowledge that was provided by these experienced officers added to the quality of the data. The semistructured individual interviews took approximately 16 to 35 minutes. The interviews were audio recorded and immediately uploaded to a secure web address to be transcribed. The transcripts were returned to me as the researcher within one to three days after being sent. No names were included in any of the transcripts to protect the participants and their agencies.

There was one variation in the data collection from the plan as presented originally. The IRB approved the use of a snowball recruitment process to supplement the Letters of Cooperation method. This helped to acquire sufficient numbers of participants to complete the study. The advantage of the recruitment change was that it helped to include police agencies that reached a target population across Canada. Although participant representativeness of Canadian police services was not the goal of this study, interviewing officers from different jurisdictions across the country, added strength to these results through the mix of varying experiences and intra-cultural variances in a Canadian context.

Data Analysis - Grounded Theory Coding

Grounded theory coding as discussed by, Charmaz, (2006), Glazer and Straus, (2006), Rubin & Rubin, (2012), Saldana, (2013), focused the analysis of the data. The codes show how the data is selected, separated and sorted during the analysis (Charmaz, 2006). In grounded theory approach, concepts and themes emerged from the data bit by bit (Rubin and Rubin, 2012).

The transcripts were divided into two vertical columns, one containing the original interviews and discussions data. The parallel column was left blank which became the space I used in which to code the data. I went through each interview and discussion transcript line by line to search for evidence of concepts and themes related to use of force decision factors and ideas that moved the participants closer to making these decisions. Each line of data did not necessarily contain enough information to properly code. I coded the theme related thoughts as they occurred in the data. Charmaz (2006) described this coding method as “incident to incident” (p.53) coding. It was soon obvious that the coded data became my central focus while building the structure for the analysis.

Coding links the data and the themes (Charmaz, 2006). Theoretical integration (Charmaz, 2006) of the coded data in my study brought these thoughts and ideas into focus. Comparing the data collected from both gender groups I found the gender-based decisions conceptually different. Charmaz (2006), asked the question, what does the data suggest? Further she asks, from whose point of view?

In the context of the data collected for this study, the study participants brought their personal opinions and biases to the interviews and discussions. These biases were reflected in the subjectivity displayed in the focus group scenario dialogue. As the researcher, I brought

my own biases to the study and having done the research outlined in Chapters 2 and 3 of this paper, I was therefore influenced by additional opinions when analyzing this data. Charmaz (2006) indicated that as the researchers, we construct our codes and through our codes we actively name the data by choosing the words that make up the codes. This very point might impact the empirical reality that we are trying to create by the very action of doing this research. However, the interactive nature of the process involved myself, as the researcher, interviewing participants, and then studying the data emerging from the interviews for meaning. The interactive nature of this process helped me to understand what the participants actually meant within the data that emerged from the interviews. That is, researcher codes might change, new themes might be discovered in the data and the researcher's biases might have been impacted in terms of understanding the data through the active research process. Would it not seem logical for the researchers to change their thoughts about a particular topic during the finding of information not considered before? Would this not represent an impact to personal biases previously held but now changed through the course of research conducted?

In this study, the coding described by Charmaz (2006) as, "incident to incident", seemed the most relevant. Then as Glaser & Strauss (1967) indicated and as referenced by Charmaz (2006), I used a comparative method to establish analytic distinctions at each level of the analysis. The task was to make sense of the data as presented by the participants in the interviews and discussions that may challenge, taken-for-granted understandings of the topic of interest (Charmaz, 2006). The challenge in working with biases are viewing your own perspective as the real or true perspective rather than as one view among many which may be part of the taken-for-granted understandings as noted by Charmaz (2006). In this study, I paid

significant attention to these concepts because government agencies like police departments use acronyms and expressions that are specific to the work they do that have evolved over time, not easily understood by others outside of police organizations. The effort of analysis in this study included, being aware of my own biases as the researcher.

Specific Codes, Categories, Themes and Quotes

The code words and definitions listed in Table 3 below are derived from language used in the focus group discussions and within the individual interviews. Police members, like other professions, develop a language that is specific to the work they do that represent special meaning. The language used provides some ideas about the thought processes engaged in use of force decisions.

Table 3

Coding

Coding Categories	Definitions	Quotes
a) Back-up	- Additional resources to help in special circumstances to overcome resistance	i) "Even an extra car could swing by." ii) "Calling for another car." iii) "But there's going to be other officers that are going to be in surrounding that are going to be there to help you, hopefully, because you've been calling it in for how long."
b) Communication	- The ability to verbalize meaningfully	i) "Would have tried the verbal thing a little bit more prior to four or five years ago." ii) " I think being alone, and not having the back-up, it was a matter of

		<p>using that good old verbal judo to talk the guy into the car.”</p> <p>iii) “... I was telling my students last night, "Women and men communicate differently.”</p> <p>iv) “Well, I read one study where it said 97% of all contacts between the police and the public involves nothing more than the police uniform and a conversation.”</p> <p>v) “That to me is the most important tool. So if I was to pick my own police force, I would pick communication, and I would take....</p>
c) Compassion	- Showing sympathy or concern for others	<p>i) “...it was clear she was in the throes of potentially some sort of nervous or mental breakdown, the decision was made to go by way of social services stepping in, resources through Mental Health being provided, and then just a follow-up by us afterwards. So I was satisfied with the outcome.”</p> <p>ii) “...believed that you solve the problem so that you don't have to go back, because next time someone might not... she might hurt someone else or she might get hurt.</p> <p>iii) “Empathy. Understanding, good listening skills. Inner reflection, and I'll say that because how I tended to...”</p> <p>iv) “Compassion, and that's the one thing that I think I actually based my entire career and my life around.”</p>
d) Containment	- A strategy to use other officers in the area of an	i). “Well, we get a perimeter”

	incident to block potential escape paths. Containment was a theme that developed in response to the “no-pursuit” department policies.	ii) “With the laptops, we could even see where the perimeter units are. We could tighten the perimeter, and then with a plane we’ll lock them into an area and the dog will find them.”
e) Confident	- Appearance of self assurance	i) “So the whole respect part is I give respect to people and I expect it back, and I think I come across as quite confident and not cocky, but confident.” ii) “I think it's the confidence of being able to be in a group or even individually and communicate with somebody and I don't know if you can. I think because I look at it like there's... It's personality also.”
f) Control	- Subject stops resisting, handcuffs applied.	“Just a strong boy and once we eventually found out who he was, we discovered that he had been in fact around the block and it was probably just a good stroke of luck that we got him in the handcuffs and managed to have a successful outcome for him and for us.”
g) Cover	- Referred to in firearms scenarios when subject produces a weapon.	“...You can't shoot. Just find cover
h) Critical Moments	- Timing in decision making.	i) “So I just thought that given the situation that trying to pin the guy and trying to muscle him down, and I saw that I had a hand with somebody. I was able to control him, get him cuffed.” ii) Yeah, but if I didn't have that extra help, I probably would have had to go to one of these other tools, and it might have been, if I was able to,

		maybe OC spray.
i) Culture (police)	- Habits specific to experienced police officers.	<p>i) "Leave him alone. I just calmed him down." We were never friends again. He... I got told that I was wrong to make that decision by my trainer, who was no longer my trainer but another person on the watch. He told me that I was wrong to do that, that I should have let this other member behave the way he was and do what he wanted to do, that he saw something I didn't clearly, and that I needed to apologize to him."</p> <p>ii) "And... Well, no, but he didn't trust me or want to work with me after that."</p>
j) Decisions	- The point at which plan is implemented	<p>i). "Anyway, I'm kind of going hands-on with this guy and I don't want to punch him. I want to use as much force as I feel is reasonable so we're kind of doing this grappling, and he is trying to get away...."</p> <p>ii) "An ASP baton also is... you can cause quite a bit of injury with that."</p> <p>iii) "Maybe it's some real minor, minor thing, and you go, "Is it really worth putting everybody in danger here?" You got to gauge that."</p> <p>iv) "I had very, very limited information and about maybe two seconds to process and make a decision."</p> <p>v) "Is there anything I could have done where we could have taken this individual into custody without having to really go hands-on?"</p>

k) Early Intervention	- In use of force decisions	<p>i). "So you know you're probably going to have some problems right there. Now, that's the guy that maybe you got to get this done quickly."</p> <p>ii). "And I make that decision because I think that if I don't get him under control right away, I'm going to have a big fight there."</p> <p>iii). "So it's an extraordinarily dangerous environment and getting on top of a situation earlier rather than later is more important than if you're standing on somebody's front lawn having a discussion."</p>
l) Emotional Stress	- Based on work demands	<p>i) "When I can think about the particular incident and keep on running it through my mind from time to time, not a lot of anxiety but there is a little bit of anxiousness... a little bit of anxiousness that I feel."</p> <p>ii) "...so why even go there? Why not find...? So it bothers me when it doesn't always go that way."</p> <p>iii) "And now I still have that positive enthusiasm about the job – "Let's solve the problem without getting in a fight"”</p>
m) Escalation	- The increase in resistance from the routine to something more.	
n) Force Options	- Choices for implementation of force	<p>i) "...what are my options? I carry a lot of I cool tools. I've got OC Spray. I carry a Taser. I carry an ASP baton."</p> <p>ii) "at which point I shot out the front tires of the car. And then did a nice</p>

		<i>Starsky & Hutch</i> roll over the hood, got my..."
o) Force Mitigation	- De-escalating force options	"...mental illness that these are not people who are choosing to be criminals and choosing to be violent, that they have an illness that affects their ability to cognitively reason the situation out. They don't need to be hurt. You use as little force as possible."
p) Negotiate	- The most passive force option by using verbal communication to achieve a peaceful resolve.	<p>i) "... sometimes a switch-off, within two or three minutes he had her agreeing to give her name and the information I needed to fill out a ticket. I thought, that's an excellent technique is get to the point where you're not getting anywhere and bring in the mediator."</p> <p>ii) "Now I think a lot more of our male officers are resorting to discussion in an attempt to resolve things."</p> <p>iii) "We've got to do something about this individual because he's certainly not safe to be himself. I ended up engaging in conversation, creating a delay until cover got there, and then we basically just came in close quarters and then got him there."</p>
q) Officer Safety	- The absence of observable threats	<p>i) "You've got time to deal with that rather than wham-bam. Here, fight's on. "Get in my car." You might lose and you might end up losing your life. So it's a matter of talking your way out of the situation."</p> <p>ii) "So you're always better doing something other than knock-him-down-drag-him fights, because you</p>

		<p>might lose and you might not go home at the end of it.”</p> <p>iii) “I mean, rather than getting hurt or not going home at the end of the night, I think that's probably a little more important.”</p> <p>iv) “No, definitely not. Officer safety I think has to be paramount and number one.”</p> <p>v) “Well, if the officer's not safe then the public's not safe as a possibility. Yes, the public has to be safe as well. However, if you're not safe doing your job as a police officer, then you can't help the public, and therefore you can't help the bad guy who's got to get arrested.”</p> <p>vi) “I guess my first concern would be the window so that I can see inside for my safety.”</p> <p>vii) “...and we are useless to protect anyone in the public if we ourselves are hurt or dead. So at this point, I'm going to protect myself first.”</p>
r) Perception	- Subjective considerations based on subject behavior	<p>i) “At the point that I put the handcuffs on him, he hadn't formulated the plan yet but I could see the wheels were turning and it was going there.”</p> <p>ii) “Yeah, and sometimes we're wrong, and that's where we have to be able to take the step back and say, "You know what? I'm sorry, but this is what I believed at the time and here's why I did what I did.”</p> <p>iii) “Personally I rely on a lot of</p>

		<p>experience in that, and I usually can... I usually can tell fairly quickly if things are one way or the other. But I'm not always right. I can only go by my best judgment, and that's the scary part is I'm going to be judged on what my best judgment was at the time.</p>
s) Presence	- Police presence changes behavior.	<p>"And frankly, use of force is police presence, so if he immediately reacts to the police presence by yelling or swearing or being even a little bit difficult, as far as I'm concerned, he's show me that he's not capable of caring for himself and it's time for me to step in and he can have a night at our fine hotel for the night until..."</p>
t) Public Safety	- Concerns during confrontation	<p>i) "...my first priority was to protect the people in close proximity,..."</p> <p>ii) "...and at that point I was concerned for the public."</p> <p>iii) "like if there's kids playing in the street or whatnot, we can say what... I wouldn't even start a pursuit."</p> <p>iv) "...not just for the bad guys to hear you but for people who are in the area. So you're like, "Police. Stop. Drop the gun," whatever, so that people in the surrounding area know what's going on."</p>
u) Reasonable	- Legal definition of force in Canada	<p>i) "Reasonable Officer Response. So what is reasonable? What force is reasonable under the circumstances to arrest that guy?"</p> <p>ii) "A lot of our guys sometimes are</p>

		<p>very apprehensive about how much force is necessary, but I think as long as you can articulate why did you do what you did,..”</p> <p>iii) “But I think as long as you articulate and say, "This is why we had to do...”</p>
v). Resistance	- To authority, instructions given, physical behavior that rejects police objectives	“He's pushing me, tries to take a swing at me.”
w) Respect	- A positive manner of treating others	<p>i) “How I come across is, A, smile, show that you're human, and talk to people. So the whole respect part is I give respect to people and I expect it back, and I think I come across as quite confident and not cocky, but confident.”</p> <p>ii) "You know, the day that you don't treat people like humans is the day that you shouldn't do this anymore.”</p>
x) Situational Circumstances	- Description of a confrontational event.	“been involved in lots of scuffles over people that just don't want to have their liberties deprived, don't want restraints put on them,”
y) Strategy	- Planned action or response	"I just about shot your son," because he pulled a switchblade and he was ready to come after me over the bed and dad intervened instead. Had dad not done that, I don't know what would have happened.
z) Subject Safety	- Safety of the person subject of arrest	i) “Again, we're in that dangerous environment and if we can get them in a place where we can get them physically controlled we can still help them and help them through their crisis. We can probably do it without

		<p>injuring them if we get them in cuffs sooner.”</p> <p>ii) “Yes, his safety, okay, I got to say. I always did consider that, because yes, I could have hurt somebody. Opted not to because I didn't want to hurt him or her. So their safety is important as well.”</p> <p>iii) “They called me to help. I ain't helping here, because your kid's now dead.”</p> <p>iv) “...but if there's a bunch of families running around and whatever, I'm not going to fire.”</p>
aa) Weapons	- Referred to in firearms application	<p>i) “If you can't be sure of your target and you're potentially putting the public in danger, then, no. I wouldn't be.”</p> <p>ii) “...I think at the time, it actually did cross my mind, "Oh, shit. I'm going to have to shoot this guy in front of the mom and dad." That came up.”</p>

Table 4 shows the six theme words that were most commonly found in the data. These themes are defined in part by other code words that could apply to the themes identified. As an example, resistance is a word commonly referred to in police parlance as a justification to use force and to identify the amount of force necessary to achieve the goal associated to controlling the circumstances. Effectively communicating with subjects threatening public safety is one way to improve the public safety factor.

Table 4

Applied Themes and Codes

Themes	Code Words Applied
Communication	- Negotiate, Communicate, Compassion, Respect, Confident, Justification, Persuasion
Decisions	- Containment, cover, escalation, negotiate, safety, resistance, strategy control, communication, force options, early intervention, justification, respect, compassion, confident
Officer Safety	- Cover Cars, Perception, Resistance, Weapons, Control, Justification, Early Intervention, Critical Moments
Public Safety	- Justification, Control, Resistance, Escalation, Conflict, Force Options
Resistance	- Conflict, Escalation, Weapons, Critical
Situational Circumstances	- Control, Justification, Force Options, Early Intervention, Officer Safety, Strategy, Public Safety,

Table 5 represents a table arranged in a hierarchy of use of force options referred to in the data.

Presence in uniform is the least amount of force in the police continuum of force. We know from experience when police are present in uniform, subject behavior changes.

Communication is then deemed as the next step in the escalation of force followed by empty hands manipulations, intermediate weapons and lastly, deadly force applications. Deadly force can be more than firearms. It can mean the application of a strangle holds designed to render a person unconscious but when force is applied too long oxygen deprivation to the brain causes death. The application of electronic devices such as the TASER can also result in death. The final step in use of force is the application of firearms. The Force Options can be considered a hierarchy of force where a police/citizen encounter begins with a conversation and through circumstances evolves into a confrontation and ultimately a use of force scenario.

Table 5

Police Officers Use of Force Options

Force Options	Definitions
Presence	An officer's presence impacts behavior.
Communication	Negotiation and persuasion.
Empty Hands	Use of physical manipulation techniques.
Intermediate Weapons	Batons, Pepper Spray, Electronic Weapons.
Deadly Force	Application of firearms

Focus Group Scenario Discussions

Focus group discussions were conducted in person. The size of the focus groups varied with between 5, 6 or 7 participants. I found that 5 participants was ideal and allowed each participant ample opportunity to take part in the discussions.

Understanding the participants' comments in the focus groups requires some understanding of the scenario for discussion. The scenario starts off my saying that; "It is dusk on a warm midsummer evening. People are out and about. You and your partner are on patrol in a rougher part of town when you notice a vehicle stopped on the side of the road, engine running but parked in a manner that partially obstructs one lane of traffic. The windows are blacked out and loud music is playing inside. You decide to pull over to check on the circumstances. What happens next?"

The obvious problem to solve is to have the driver of the vehicle move the car to clear the traffic obstruction. Experienced participants looked beyond the obvious to identify the

contributing factors associated to the parking issue. The contributing facts might a medical emergency or mechanical problems with the car. The participants decided that they would investigate. As one of the participants approached the subject vehicle, she tapped on the driver's window resulting in the window being lowered a few inches. The participant immediately recognized one the vehicle occupants as a petty local criminal. The scenario indicated that through the slightly open window the participants smelled marihuana smoke. What happened next?

The new and evolving features to the scenario raised the officer's suspicions that more might be needed than just to get the driver to move the car or to call for emergency medical services. The participant's response when the window is lowered slightly could be to ask the driver if there was a problem. If there is no positive response from the occupants about a particular problem then the next statement could be about their vehicle obstructing traffic and the associated traffic hazard. The occupants would then be asked if they could move their vehicle off the roadway to remedy the hazard. The scenario tells us that the subjects refused to cooperate and became verbally rude to the officer making the seemingly simple inquiries with the vehicle occupants.

Having experienced the initial resistance from the vehicle occupants the participants said they would then invoke some legal authority and asked the driver to produce a driver's license and the vehicle registration. This is a requirement of law upon the request of a peace officer. The subjects again refused to comply. What happens next?

The focus group participants talked about the problem and came up with varying solutions. Some said that they would investigate and when they were met with resistance as the scenario

suggested they would ask the occupants to get out of the car. Some suggested they would ask the driver to shut off the car engine and give the keys to the officer at the driver's window. Some suggested that they would open the driver's door and remove the driver forcefully if necessary. Some participants suggested that regardless of the subject responses, they would try to build a cooperative relationship with them and voluntarily get them to comply by move the vehicle to a safer location.

The scenario told us that the driver suddenly sped away. What happens next? The general consensus in the discussions was that there was more to this circumstance than was obvious in the initial encounter and their curiosity was peaked. Therefore a difference of opinion arose within the discussion groups. Some participants wanted to follow the subject vehicle albeit at high speed knowing that policy did not allow for high-speed pursuits. One comment was to pursue with emergency equipment warning the public in the area of an oncoming danger. The male groups strongly indicated the desire to either pursue the subject vehicle or to follow in some way and maintain visual contact until a containment strategy could apprehend the subjects. The female groups however indicated that they would not follow or pursue the subject vehicle. The public danger created by a high-speed pursuit was too significant. Their responses were about notifying other patrols regarding the circumstances of the matter and setting up a containment strategy. The female groups indicated that the traffic obstruction matter was resolved although it resulted in the subjects driving away in a somewhat dangerous manner.

The next phase of the scenario indicated that a computer check of the subject's license plate indicated that, as the car was pulling away the officer is advised that the automobile in

question was suspected of involvement in a drug related shooting incident. The driver has a warning signal for possession of weapons on the computer alert system. What is likely to happen next?

The information learned from the computer check strengthened the participants' desire to apprehend the fleeing subjects. The discussions indicated that if a high-speed pursuit was initiated that their supervisor would call off the pursuit given current police policies on pursuits. However following the fleeing vehicle until ordered to abandon their pursuit was a strong desire for the men. The female participants maintained their initial considerations about not pursuing but to reposition themselves in aid of a containment strategy along with other helping patrols. The police helicopter would be an aid in this sort of strategy.

The scenario further indicated that the offending vehicle ignored traffic lights and speed limits and ultimately collided with another vehicle, coming to rest in the ditch. The occupants jump from the offending vehicle and begin to run into a housing development nearby. What happens next?

The participants generally agreed that because there were two officers, one would attend to the occupants of the victim vehicle hit by the fleeing vehicle, and the other one would follow the suspects on foot to maintain visual contact while reporting to the containment patrols about the suspects' current location and direction of movement.

In the next part of the scenario the officers pursuing the suspects on foot note that the suspects are now heading towards a shopping mall. Further, the pursuing officers notice that the driver is holding what appears to be a handgun as he is running away. What happens next?

The male participants generally indicated that they would draw their firearm when they saw the one suspect with a firearm. The female participants indicated that they would not draw their firearm while running after the suspect. They would however be continually moving in a way that would provide them with the best cover should the suspect turn with the intent on firing at the pursuing officer(s).

The suspects were moving toward a shopping mall. Both gender groups were unanimous about the potential hazards of not allowing the suspects to get into the mall or even in the parking lot area of the mall. The public safety issues were of concern, as the suspects got closer to the mall. The question was asked: Should the suspect with the handgun suddenly turn to face you, the pursuing officer, and raise his handgun, how would you respond? Some of the male participants would draw their firearm and initiate a shootout with the subject. Male officers would however consider the public safety issues surrounding the discharge of their firearm.

The female participants were unanimous about the heightened level of public safety concerns and would not shoot. Moving to a point of cover if that was available or attempting to further negotiate with the suspect took priority over getting into a shootout. The differences in the gender concerns were significant. The female participants indicated that when they became aware that the one subject was armed that they would move in such a way as to be able to take cover should the subject choose to confront them with the firearm during their pursuit. However, presenting their firearms as a threat to initiate deadly force was not an option due to a public safety consideration. A shootout with the subjects would present a danger to public

safety and therefore the application of a deadly force option was not considered under current conditions.

Focus Group Findings

The focus group participants were divided on the exact approach to this scenario from the beginning. The participants openly discussed varying solutions. Initially, the solution seemed simple, to clear a traffic obstruction. Quickly, the problem was complicated through conflict. The vehicle occupants resisted even simple communication with the police officers knocking on the driver's window. Trouble seemed present and the officers were challenged to solve even a simple problem.

The participants quickly became suspicious about what was really happening in the car, more than just a parking issue, and indicated that they wanted to investigate further. Therefore the male participants said they would open the car door and help the driver out of the car if necessary to gain the control that would help in furthering their investigation. The female participants were focused on persuading the driver to cooperate in moving their vehicle. Both gender groups indicated that if the opportunity presented itself they would further a drug related investigation but at the moment the evidence supporting a search of the vehicle or the occupants was weak and they would work on the cooperation angle. The question still lingers: What circumstances would motivate the vehicle occupants to resist the police so strenuously?

While the participants pondered the lingering question, the driver of the subject vehicle decided to drive away at high speed. The female participants said that they would not pursue. Their rationale was that a high-speed pursuit was contrary to department policy and danger to

the public and officers was significant. The seriousness of the circumstances did not support a pursuit decision.

The male participants however were somewhat more willing to gamble on pursuing. Initially they said no pursuit and then the conversation changed. "You have an obligation to follow that vehicle because he is driving at a high rate of speed, there is a crowd, and there is a very likelihood that he might hit a person or another vehicle." They knew that their supervisor would call off the pursuit but if they initiated a pursuit they would be closer to the suspects than if they waited and while they were pursuing they would call for containment support, and the helicopter to help track the subjects. Some men however said that they would not pursue. Policy prohibits it and the risk to the public was a strong consideration for a no pursuit reaction. In summary, the reaction was mixed.

The next significant issue in this scenario was when the subject is running on foot away from the police toward a shopping mall with a gun in his hand. The decision about use of force at this point was about deadly force. The women would not initiate a shoot out with the subject. They would continue try to persuade the subject to put down his gun while warning the public about the presence of a firearm. The exchange of gunfire was too dangerous according to the female participants.

Some of the male participants however indicated that when the subject turned and pointed his gun at them, they would immediately engage by drawing their own weapon, and perhaps warn the subject. They would consider their line of fire relative to the position of any citizens. For some male participants there was an urgency to fire their weapons when the subject pointed his firearm at them. Although, they considered the consequences in terms of the threat to public

safety when initiating an exchange of gunfire, the priority for safety considerations was about officer safety.

Public safety considerations were strong considerations regardless of gender. The women were unanimous in terms of the concerns for public safety first. The risk of injuries to bystanders in an uncontrolled shoot out was too significant for the female participants. The women would continue to persuade and negotiate at their own risk rather than endangering the public. This is a significant difference in the gender-based use of force decisions based on the focus group discussions.

Table 6

Gender Decision Differences

Gender	Situational Circumstance	Officer Disposition	Organizational Interests	Political Concerns	Force Decision
I. a) Female	Subjects in the scenario are non-compliant	Officer Safety	Officer Safety	Officer Safety	-Back up support -Negotiate to cooperate
----- b) Male		----- Officer Safety	----- Officer Safety	----- Officer Safety	----- -Back up support, -Remove subject physically

II. a) Female -----	Vehicle High Speed Pursuit	Public Safety	Public Safety	Public Safety	No pursuit
b) Male		Public & Officer Safety	Officer Safety	Public & Officer Safety	Pursue at HS until ordered to stop pursuit
III. a) Female -----	Point Firearm at Officer during foot chase.	Public & Officer Safety	Public Safety	Public Safety & Officer Safety	-Negotiate, -persuade, -Seek cover
b) Male		Officer & Public Safety	Officer Safety	Officer safety	-Seek cover -Shoot the subject pointing the gun.

The decision factors shown in Table 6 center on three resistance points within the focus group scenario. Initially, the scenario says that when the participants approach the occupants in the vehicle that is obstructing traffic on a public roadway, these subjects resist the participant's efforts in conducting an investigation. The second point of resistance is when the subject vehicle drives off at high speed. There would have been a difference if the vehicle had driven away at a normal speed consistent with the speed limit and other traffic on the roadway but the scenario specifies high speed. Thirdly, after the subject vehicle crashes and the vehicle damage disables the car, the occupants of the vehicle attempt an escape on foot. The scenario indicated that the participants engage in a foot chase while noting that one of the subjects is carrying a gun in his hand. The ultimate resistance is when the subject stops, turns and points their gun at the participant chasing him on foot.

In this paper I examined the decision considerations of the participants from an officer disposition, organizational interests and political concerns perspectives. The decision factors entailed three broad points of consideration, officer, public and subject safety. Table 6 charts these considerations from a gender perspective. In the first part of the scenario the subjects in the vehicle when parked on the side of the roadway are considered to be an officer safety concern. The public is not involved in the circumstance at this point. However, the next point of resistance is when the vehicle drives away at high speed, public safety considerations are part of the equation. Equally, in the third resistance description in the final stage of the scenario where the subject turns and points his gun at the officer chasing him on foot. The public safety concerns are significant at this point. The last column in Table 6 tables the use of force decisions at each phase of the resistance as discussed by the focus groups separated according to gender. The differences in the use of force decisions are not sweepingly different except for the last phase when the subject is pointing his gun at the officer. The female participants talked quite differently about the strategy by negotiating with the subject while the men were more focused on ending the encounter with a use of force event.

Semistructured Individual Interviews Summary

Semistructured individual interviews were conducted of participants who were asked about a time when he or she was required to arrest a subject and the person being arrested did not want to cooperate. The questions required the participants to describe the circumstances, talk about their responses to the situational factors and describe the outcome of the events. This line of questioning allowed the participants to choose events from their career experiences and

talk about their decisions to use force or not to use force while thinking about their own use of force responses.

The data gathered in the individual interviews differed slightly from the focus group discussions. The individual interviews were more clearly focused on individual considerations in situational circumstances that were significantly difficult. Talk about officer safety was significant in these interviews. Public safety, which the participants considered to be high on the police agenda, was largely predicated on officer safety.

The participants in the individual interviews were all senior in police services and mostly supervisors. The policing experiences of the participants were from the Maritime region, the midwest (Alberta) and the west coast of Canada, a significantly broad range of experiences. The participants talked freely about their experiences, the situational resolves and their analysis about what happened or what could have been done differently in some circumstances.

The female participants in these interviews all talked about the size and physical strength of men versus women and the impact of that physical feature on their decisions when arresting a suspect. One of the female participants said about being called to deal with an extremely violent subject who was large and in good physical shape that, "I just resorted to some sort of humor and discussed with him, first of all, to find out what was going on, ...empathizing with his difficulty... sometimes it just the delivery, resorting to more verbal interactions which may take a little bit longer." The same participant also indicated that dealing with difficult people is about, "knowing my own limitations" before considering physical force. One of the limitations this female participant talked about was, "we are weaker than most of our clients – mostly male clients."

One of the male participants indicated that when dealing with a difficult situation he was getting nowhere with the subject and an arrest was imminent. He resorted to calling another officer into the matter and the other officer explained the circumstances in a similar way to the subject. The technique was successful and the event ended without an arrest. The same participant indicated that, “5 or 10 years ago I would have been more inclined to go hands-on... Now I think a lot more of our male officers are resorting to discussion in an attempt to resolve things.” A female participant indicated that the younger officers currently coming into the profession of policing are more inclined to discuss and use verbal negotiation and persuasion than physical force. This comment was based on her experience over two decades of policing and her role as a supervisor.

The predominant considerations with respect to decisions to use force were predicated on the resistance displayed by the subjects. Simply arguing with the police officers required a different response than pushing the officers or threatening the officers with a weapon. The seriousness of the crime being investigated was another consideration when force was contemplated. The arrest of a serial killer would be approached differently than a traffic stop albeit the traffic stop might have a more serious ending.

Semistructured Interviews Findings

Generally in all of the circumstances the female participants were more willing to negotiate the outcomes of the circumstances with the subjects. One female participant indicated that while attending a domestic where a male subject was severely assaulting his wife where she was forced to intervene to save a life, it was the circumstance that required her physical intervention. Even though the male suspect was larger than the participant, she was able to

work her way through the altercation to overcome the resistance and arrest the suspect. The participant indicated that she was successful in the arrest by maintaining a calm demeanor allowing her the opportunities to think about the next steps in the altercation that allowed her to overcome the suspect's resistance.

The male participants were more focused on controlling the circumstances and therefore were willing to get involved in use of force earlier in the circumstances than the female participants. Although the men considered the size and strength of the suspect, they were not as constrained by the differences as were their female counterparts.

The barrier to use of physical force for the female participants was centered on the differences in the male and female physical capacities. These differences required the women to avoid the use of one feature of control, the physical, for another, communication and persuasion, as demonstrated in these interviews.

Discrepancies in Interviews and Discussions Summary

The focus groups and the individual interviews were consistent in the message of female versus male use of force decisions. Based on the Chapter 2 literature I anticipated a larger gulf between the male and female use of force decisions. In my study, I found that the male participants paid more attention to the considerations for not using force than the literature implied. The Canadian police officers participating in my study demonstrated considerations significantly similar to what Waddington et al., (2009), and other researchers in the Six Country Study (2009) in Europe found. In my study, the Chapter 2 literature review is mostly composed of policing articles from the United States experiences. The culture in the United States is more competitive than the Canadian and European cultures. Firearms are more easily

accessible by the general population in the United States creating a different level of risk management for police officers (Machado, 2009). The laws in Canada prohibit citizens from possessing handguns without a very strenuous background check. Long guns are somewhat restricted as well meaning that the accessibility to firearms generally in Canada is restrictive changing the police officers' expectations and perceptions when attending calls for service from members of the public.

Evidence of Quality and Trustworthiness

The characteristics of quality in research at Walden University entail credibility, transferability, dependability and confirmability. Each quality has its own contribution to the trustworthiness of the research and is listed in this chapter's checklist of characteristics to be addressed.

Credibility is about certainty that there is sufficient evidence available to arrive at a convincing conclusion (Rubin and Rubin, 2012). In grounded theory research credibility criteria involves establishing that the results of the analysis are believable from the participant perspective (Charmaz, 2006, Creswell, 2007, Janesick, 2011, Patton, 2002). After all, they contributed to the data for the study. In a qualitative study, the goal is about the curiosity generated by the research questions rather than representativeness of a particular population. In this study, I analyzed data generated through focus group discussions and data generated in semistructured individual interviews of police officers in Canada. Employing this method, as Charmaz (2006) indicated, the research achieved a greater familiarity with the topic. Also, this research considered a broad range of observations in police use of force matters by having included a broad population of participants.

How can these study results be generalized or transferred to other contexts or settings? In my study, I looked at similar work from the past as presented by other researchers listed below in this paragraph, who asked questions about police use of force in a similar way as in my research. The pragmatic nature of the idea behind this research was to encourage other researchers to go beyond the existing data in support of future research. In my study, I created a focus group discussion scenario similar to what had been used by the researchers in England (Waddington et al., 2009), Netherlands (Adang, 2009), Germany (Klukkert et al., 2009), Australia (Baker, 2009), Venezuela (Gabaldon et al., 2009), Brazil (Machado, 2009), and a dissertation study in New Jersey (Barrett et al., 2009). The first six publications are referred to as the Six Country Study or the International Study. My study follows the idea behind all seven studies. Although Canadian culture more closely simulates European and Australian culture it was found that the study format was also successfully used in the Brazil, Venezuela and New Jersey contexts. Therefore, I was comfortable in conducting my research in the shadow of the seven projects conducted and referred to above. I found that the police officers participating in my study talked about some of the same things referred to in the Six Country Study and the New Jersey Study. The participants in all the studies commonly were concerned about the authority in law for them to act, whether it was arresting a suspect or conducting a street search of a suspect for contraband, stolen property or weapons. Another concern commonly discussed was the need to call for backup, a support mechanism to help deal with a potentially violent situation. The participants commonly discussed the level of resistance, the number of suspects, the number of police officers present and the presence of weapons or the

potential presence of weapons. The term potential refers to making a guess or estimating or making presumptions about the presence of weapons in the circumstances.

Where the discussions differed most significantly was that in Brazil and Venezuela and perhaps to an extent in the United States, the public has more access to firearms and other deadly weapons than in Australia, Canada or European, making the police more wary of the potential for facing deadly resistance. The participants in Venezuela and Brazil in particular were ready to use deadly force much earlier than in any other country studied. This represented an attitude in use of force based on specific experiences in policing a particular culture. However, how the participants in the Six Country Studies and the New Jersey Study talked about their work and the application of physical force were reasonably similar in content in terms of the specific considerations applied to the decisions to implementing a use of force strategy.

Dependability emphasizes the context within which the research occurs, the changes that occur in the setting and how these changes affected the research approach. My study was conducted in a policing environment. In Chapter 3, I conceptualized how the study might progress. Some police agencies that I approached for a Letter of Cooperation were very willing to participate and others declined participation. I received two Letters of Cooperation from two police agencies that worked in quite different environments providing law enforcement services within their jurisdictions, significantly adding to the breadth of police experiences in my study. I requested a change in recruiting methods from the IRB to include a snowball recruitment model. The geographic area covered in my study became significantly larger serving to enhance the quality of my study. When I compared the data to the results reported in the Six

Country Study there were similarities in the participant discussions and responses confirming the study process.

How well can the results of my study be confirmed or corroborated by others? In my study, and in following the Six Country Study (2009) format, I noted the themes and ideas in those studies. The themes and ideas in the data I collected were not that different. The differences noted were that in Canada the police were more hesitant in the application of deadly force than in Venezuela, Brazil or in the United States, as an example. With the application of less than lethal force the participants in Canada were no more or less considerate of the subjects they were required to arrest than in the other international study circumstances. A study, Barrett et al., (2009), compared urban, suburban, and rural police officers' responses in the focus group setting. The general findings were that the rural and suburban officers used force less frequently and implemented other strategies that did not require them to arrest, relative to the practices by officers working in urban environments. Of specific relevance to this dissertation study Barrett et al.'s finding, that the rural and suburban officers had much more formal education than their urban counterparts. The researchers hypothesized that it might be that education influenced the results in use of force strategies in their study.

Lonsway, (2003), indicated that women in policing have more formal education than their male counterparts. In my study, one of the women participants interviewed had a Masters degree and the other women had undergraduate degrees. The men were more inclined to have achieved college certificates or to have no post secondary education other than police basic training. The evidence indicates that the differences in the male and female behavior is due to differences in education rather than gender, alone, which implies socialization, age or length of

service in policing. Although if the female participants had more formal education than their male counterparts it could be the same feature that draws the women to the education that influences their use of force strategies during an arrest. More research is needed in this area; however, logic indicates that if education has an impact on use of force and that police women are better educated than their male counterparts, education could make up for some of the differences for the men. The data in this study confirms that there are differences in the gender-based responses that are noticeable throughout the data.

Summary

Considerations for the use of force in policing are based on the subjective judgments of the parties within the situational circumstances, including the police officers. Resistance during a police investigation represented a threat to the participants. It was treated with caution and care at every change in the circumstances in this study. When resistance was introduced in the scenario for the focus groups, the participants immediately raised a number of concerns about safety as well as concerned about what these subjects were really up to. Resistance implied “mens rea”, a guilt complex. The focus group participants generally agreed that the subjects were exhibiting difficult and challenging behavior and in the overall context of policing, it could evolve into something much more significant. The police decisions entailed meeting the resistive challenges while maintaining control of themselves within the context of difficult circumstances.

Female participants indicated strongly that persuasion was the most effective tool to achieve cooperation and advocated continuing with that strategy. The male participants indicated a similar strategy at the beginning when first making contact with the subjects but

when they were met with resistance starting with disrespectful treatment at the onset of the circumstances, the approach changed quickly. The male participants advocated first asking the subjects to step out of their vehicle and if still resistive, removing them physically. Because the disrespect was not felt emotionally in the focus groups, the discussions continued dispassionately but with a “no nonsense” approach. This tone for the encounter continued to the end of the scenario by both gender groups.

The most appropriate response to this circumstance was not obvious and perhaps it is because of the subjective nature of the responses available to the participants. The participants considered various responses giving significant weight to them all. The uncertainty of the response outcomes in the discussions required some consideration of the consequences of their decisions. However, the differences in the gender-based responses were obvious. The female participants responded significantly in favor of public safety concerns regardless of the presence of weapons. The men were public safety conscious but when the subjects pointed a gun at the participants, the men tended to respond with a heavier reliance on using their own firearm. The women advocated more, with concerns for global safety considerations, that is, if there were no-shots fired by either party, the safety was enhanced. This was achieved by maintaining a dialogue with the subject.

The grounded theory method of research, used in the data analysis during this study revealed sufficient information about police use of force decisions to peak the interest of scholars to continue with further efforts of research in this area. The participants in this study willingly shared their knowledge and practices along with their day-to-day experiences to help explain the nuances in making decisions about using force to control resistive behavior. This

study was designed to help, identify meaningful questions on the topic of use of force, and continue the dialogue on alternative intervention strategies.

Chapter 5 - Summary, Conclusion and Recommendations

Introduction

This study examined factors that contribute to the police officers' decisions on the use of force. There are differences in the legitimate and justifiable use of force or whether use of force is even necessary and it is in that context that this study was conducted. Its appropriateness is often passionately debated during disciplinary hearings or in courts of law, regardless of its legitimate appearances and this paper examines some of the ideals that often follow a use of force incident. The factors examined by this study included political concerns, organizational considerations, officer dispositions and gender differences in police decision-making.

The extraordinary powers that are exercised when police are involved in difficult circumstances are unique to their profession alone. The common model of policing in Canada follows a paramilitary structure that is a remnant of colonial times in the late 1800's. The contributing factors to the decisions that emanate from difficult civil circumstances are important to the work of the police and equally important to the subjects the police encounter. While the use of excessive force is rare for police in Canada, Waddington et al. (2009), indicated that the capacity to enforce compliance underwrites a great deal of what the police do. In Canada, police routinely and openly carry weapons not readily available to the population, a situation different from policing in England and Norway but similar to most other countries globally. The presence of weapons implies the acceptance of their application in law enforcement mostly based on the police officers' judgment.

This study found that violence was a mechanism used by police officers to appease features of safety and security in extraordinary circumstances. The study participants talked openly about the factors that influenced their decisions for controlling difficult circumstances. One of the documented factors of particular importance to this study was that police officers' concerns about public safety changed significantly when officer safety appeared to be compromised in a scenario. Under these conditions, police officers' concerns about public safety changed to focus on personal safety (in police parlance, officer safety), to an extent, that suggested that public safety could not be achieved without the safety of the officers and it was the officers' presence that primarily maintained and insured the safety of the public.

This qualitative study used a grounded theory method to examine the decision factors when police use force, as suggested by Charmaz, (2006) and Glaser & Strauss, (2006). Grounded theory captures themes and ideas in the data that generate theories or abstract analytical ideas about a process, action or interaction shaped by the participants (Creswell, 2009; Glaser & Strauss, 2006). The purpose of the study was to find a theory that modeled decision differences applied by police officers in confrontational situations. The core phenomena of organizational considerations, officer disposition, political influences, and gender were examined in this analysis in order to understand these decision processes, as suggested by Creswell (2009).

Grounded Theory Findings

In conducting this study, I applied a grounded theory approach per the guidelines of Glaser and Strauss, (2006), Creswell (2012) and Charmaz (2014). The findings in this study strongly

indicated that gender demonstrated significant mitigating factors in use of force decisions in circumstances where discretion allowed for decision differences.

The strategies employed for data gathering were based on a scenario or vignette design in focus group discussions and individual semistructured interviews. This design allowed the participants to consider identical circumstances that I presented in phases, so as to mitigate the differences in the situational circumstances found in case studies on this topic, as the differences in situational circumstances have a strong potential to be significant contributing factors in the differences in participant decisions. The semistructured interviews provided participants with an opportunity to discuss the concepts of use of force in more depth, and to analyze past events from a personal experience perspective.

The open coding phase of the study identified major categories of information that served as key factors, including:

- organizational considerations where policies and procedures emanated,
- officer dispositions such as public, officer and subject safety,
- gender based decision influences, all briefly mentioned above; and
- Legal concerns, referred to as political influences in this paper.

Axial and selective coding processes in the study were used to examine the causal factors that contributed to the core phenomenon. The key finding was that the female participants in this study more consistently advocated for key strategies that mitigated the application of physical force during an arrest process than their male colleagues. The strategies that police officers applied in place of using force were shown to be related to communication, negotiation, and relationship building, with the subject of the arrest and with other officers present.

Charmaz (2014) advocated for a study perspective that includes emphasizing diverse local worlds, multiple realities, and the complexities of situational circumstances, views and actions of participants. In this approach, more emphasis is placed on the views, beliefs, feelings, assumptions and ideologies of individuals, than solely on the research methods (Creswell, 2012). Following this approach enabled me as the researcher to rely more on the participants' views and strategies within personal value statements. For example, one of the female participants in the individual interviews strongly indicated that she did not consider using physical force to any significant extent because she didn't particularly want to, and that she had other strengths she could rely on to achieve the same result. This core resonated throughout the entire study most particularly with the other female participants. A consequence of this approach was that when less force was advocated, the process in the arrest took more time to complete, but the end result was that safety of all the participants in the process was significantly enhanced.

Creswell (2012) followed a Strauss and Corbin (1990), format in outlining four questions in the axial coding phase:

- 1) What is central to the process?
- 2) What influenced or caused this phenomenon to occur?
- 3) What strategies were employed during the process?
- 4) What effect occurred?

The core phenomenon that was central to this study concerned the decision factors that influence use of force during an arrest. Those factors included legal considerations, organizational interests, officer disposition and gender. Data for this study was collected

through four focus group discussions and 12 semistructured individual interviews. Following the data collection, I used a mixed coding process advocated by Saldana (2013), Rubin & Rubin (2012), Glaser & Strauss (2006, Creswell (2012 and Charmaz (2014).

The causal conditions centered on the situational circumstances of the events that generated a call for police services. Considerations of public and officer safety were key conditions that would trigger use of force decisions. Officer safety was more strongly advocated by the male participants whereas public safety, although important to the men, was of primary concern only to the women. The strategies employed by the participants of this study indicated that when risk factors to public and officer safety increased the option to employ physical force was a comfort factor particularly for the male participants. Although members of gender groups relied on communication and negotiation processes, the female participants were more inclined to use these strategies than their male colleagues, did so consistently throughout the study process, and continued to do so further on the timeline of situational events. The consequences of relying on these strategies for both gender groups were that the male-generated decisions tended to cause more injuries and liability concerns. The female-generated decisions resulted in fewer injuries, fewer liability concerns and more time spent.

The goal of this study was to create a theory that modeled gender differences in police use of force decisions. A substantive-level theory resulted from the data, stating that the female officers responded differently than male police officers in use of force circumstances. The basis of this theory was that the female participants consistently demonstrated a desire to communicate and negotiation in situational circumstances where discretion allowed for

differences in decisions, building a general atmosphere of enhanced safety for all parties involved in the circumstances. The contributing causes of the decision differences might vary but gender was the focus of the study. Based on the results of this study's analysis, female law enforcement officers are more likely to reflect on the general atmosphere of safety while engaging in communication and negotiation, and are less likely to initiate a use of force application. This substantive-level theory may be tested later for its empirical verification with quantitative data to determine if it can be generalized to a sample and population (Creswell, 2012). Currently however, this study will end with the theory as stated above, as the ultimate goal.

Interpretation of Findings

Democratic, Constitutional and Political Concerns

Although legal factors are one of the strongest predictors of using discretionary powers, extra-legal factors also play an important role" (Bierie, 2012, p.210). In Canada, the governing principles in police use of force decision-making are enshrined in substantive laws, common law and the Charter of Rights and Freedoms (Criminal Code of Canada, Cluett v. The Queen, (1982), Constitution Act of Canada, (1982). There is no situation, when guided by legal criteria, in which the gender of the officer should impact decision-making (Bierie, 2012). However, research tells us that enforcement personnel sometimes diverge with respect to use of force, independent of legal factors or gender.

Citizens are encouraged to behave peacefully in all aspects of social existence. The legitimacy of the police is linked to the manner in which they go about their work. Police work

requires personal judgments about every circumstance in which they interact (Kuhns & Knutsson, 2010). When force is misused, public trust is challenged and the legitimacy of police services is threatened. Police managers and media personnel use words like, service, fairness and justice, weighed against the officers' judgments within the situational factors where force is used abusively, thereby impacting the ideals of legitimacy of the police services (Kuhns & Knutsson, 2010).

Police services are complicated by the multi-dimensional nature of the work (Kuhns & Knutsson, 2010). Saving a drowning victim, attending to injuries at a motor vehicle accident, negotiating a domestic disturbance, apprehending mentally ill patients, arresting drug traffickers and apprehending violent robbery suspects, are all part of the list. The officers have little if any choices in which calls for service they attend or how many calls for service in a given shift they are required to attend. Citizens make the calls for service and the police members attend with limited advanced information about what rapidly changing issues they will face within each call. Within the context of each call for service the police members will make decisions about the law and how it applies within the circumstances they are facing. They will make assessments about the psychological fitness of parties within the circumstances, conduct risk assessments relative to a citizen's threat to themselves and to others, and they decide on how much force to use to protect themselves and others from a violent, out of control person or group of people, to name but a few decisions in any one call for service. There is substantial complexity within any of these calls, time is of the essence and does not often allow for comprehensively preplanned or thought through strategies.

Legislators make no attempt to advise the police on how to manage any of the citizen complaints they attend. The courts however use language like reasonableness, appropriateness and necessity to define police responsive behavior within any of the circumstances described above and those not described (*Cluett v The Queen*, 1982). The subjective nature of the court's expectations through decisions quoted above provides limited guidance because of the breadth of possibilities contained in that language.

Police officers are therefore required to use judgment in making the appropriate assessments when interacting with a citizen during a call for service. The participants in my study applied their discretion when deciding how the matter should evolve, based partly on powers guided by legal criteria that served to inform their decisions. The necessary decisions ranged from simple problem solving at the beginning of the focus group scenario, to potentially deadly use of force as the scenario unfolded in its progressive phases. Situational theories, according to Waddington (2009), look towards the circumstances within which officers find themselves. It implied external sources of motivation for the focus group participants in seeking compliance from the subjects or actors in the circumstances. Simply speaking, the situational circumstances created the problem(s). The elements of the problem were represented in the considerations that participants' decisions were required to address and overcome. The participants' judgments were key in how the situational circumstances were going to be addressed.

Uniformity in situational responses is virtually impossible to achieve given the variations of the many different situational events that represent police calls for service. The importance of understanding that situational circumstances present conflicting tasks that possibly have no

solutions creates a reality experienced by officers attending calls for service. One experienced officer in this study indicated that; “ just when you think you have seen it all, something new comes up at the next call for service.” The expectation for first responders in particular is a propensity to look for unusual and unexplainable behavior.

The dialogue by the participants, when talking about the occupants in the suspect vehicle in the focus group discussions, was better understood when they talked about the suspects’ agenda of keeping the police from discovering details encased in secrecy. The notion of suspect secrecy created a strong desire for the participants to investigate and when the occupants drove away from the police it left the participants feeling disappointed. Their investigation obviously was incomplete. The literature indicated that the police are suspicious of citizens, a feeling that will assist in gaining an advantage when encountering new circumstances (Waddington et al., 2009). The law however does not recognize the subjective nature of suspicion alone as reasons for search and arrest. There must be substantive evidence available to justify an arrest and thereafter the application of force to gain compliance if necessary.

Suspicion impacts human trust and the lack of trust tends to hinder the efficient work of the police thereby encouraging more force for overcoming any opposition in a given situation (Gabaldon et al., 2009). Trust or lack of it and risk management appear to be associated, looking into the future for consequences, real or perceived. In the context of the focus group scenario the participants were very suspicious of what secrets the subjects were hiding that the police should know about or if they did, would it cause problems for the subjects? Gabaldon et al. (2009), indicated that the potential to rely on using physical force provided some comfort

for the police officers associated to feelings of safety. The male participants particularly talked about asking the subjects to step from their vehicle and if they refused that the driver would be removed forcefully. The very act of requesting the subjects to get out of their car starts a process of lawful demands by a person of authority that may be relied on by the arresting officers when the subjects fail to comply. Based on my experience in law enforcement, the process of giving lawful commands tests the subjects' desire for compliance and allows the officers to assess their potential safety within the circumstances based on the subjects' noncompliant reactions, based on a male gender-based assessment and interpretation. If the driver resisted getting out of the car, the considerations about how to help the driver get out of the car varied based on discussions in both gender groups. However, there was an indication by some of the men in the focus groups that they would consider physically removing the subjects from the car. The police officers in Venezuela and Brazil definitely said they would order them out of the car at gunpoint (Gabaldon, 2009; Machado, 2009). The police officers in England offered to remove them physically as well if they refused to comply by voluntarily getting out of the car (Waddington et al., 2009). The female participants in this study did not consider removing the subjects from the car but considered continuing to communicate with them and therein negotiate their compliance.

Organization's Structure and Interests

Public perception impacts satisfaction and the willingness of the public to cooperate with the police and follow their instructions, a key indicator of police effectiveness (Mystrol, 2011). Each police-public encounter becomes an act of civic education whereby officers teach citizens about the authority of the state (Mystrol, 2011). Important are the face-to-face encounters with

citizens wherein the quality of the officers' decisions and treatment of citizens is experienced (Mystrol, 2011; Tyler & Huo, 2002). The police have a monopoly over their specific service sector and have the capacity to deliver their services involuntarily to clients (Maguire & Johnson, 2010) thereby changing what a police officer might offer to the requirements of the law.

Seeking legitimacy as a quality possessed by an authority is an important feature in policing as it demonstrates the public trust necessary for the police to be ultimately effective. Notions of citizen voluntariness in compliance, marks the defining qualities of legitimacy (Maguire & Johnson, 2010). Culture, history and tradition play a role in public perception. Procedural justice plays a part in the cultural roles that demonstrate that legitimacy underlies the effectiveness of the law universally even though legitimacy does not have a universal source (Kuhns & Knutsson, 2010).

Ideals that influence police managers in organizational behavior reflect a relationship between how employees are treated intra-organizationally and how they treat their clients or in policing, the public. Research suggests that perceptions about organizational justice are correlated with factors including job satisfaction, organizational commitment, trust and legitimacy (Crow & Lee, 2010). Over time there has been an effort to make organizational structure and management in police organizations more business like to help create police organizations that can be more easily understood, thereby impacting public satisfaction (Terpstra & Trommel, 2009).

Performance measures and management are related to ideas about organizational commitment and job satisfaction. Both commitment and satisfaction are key indicators of

employee behavior and employee interactions with members of the public. Added to this is the work of Milgram (1969), focused on obedience to authority. The idea of obedience indicates that the individual subject to authority, comes to view himself or herself as the instrument for carrying out another person's wishes and therefore he/she no longer regards themselves as responsible for their actions (Hodgson, 2001). According to Milgram (1969), obedience might be an ingrained behavior that overrides ethics, sympathy and moral conduct. In police decision-making the Milgram (1969) hypotheses implied that ordinary people, simply doing their jobs, and without any particular hostility on their part, could become agents of a terribly destructive process (Hodgson, 2001). The action of patrol officers therefore becomes an unexpected activity by convention that transfers to the treatment of citizens.

In this study, some participants were eager to first of all initiate a high-speed pursuit with the subject vehicle then speeding away from where the participants first made contact with the occupants while parked on the side of the road. Public safety was considered as a reason for not pursuing but for some that decision was set aside to pursue until told not to pursue by a supervisor. Later in the scenario circumstances, the participants are told that the subjects being pursued are running toward a busy shopping mall and one of the subjects is carrying a gun. While they are pursuing on foot, the subject with the gun turns and points his gun at the pursuing officer. Some of the participants indicated that they would engage the subject with their firearm. The consideration to use deadly force would be supported by the law. Some participants were more anxious than others to take on that position. The concept of officer safety was paramount in the minds of the participants choosing to respond with force. However, the participants in one of the female focus groups said that they would not engage the

subject with their firearm because an exchange of gunfire would endanger the public at large. Secondly, just drawing their firearm could trigger the subject to start shooting at them and likely before they could draw their weapons. Third, they felt safer not forcing a shootout but to continue to negotiate, persuade or bond with the subject while warning the public nearby about the dangers of the presence of a subject with a gun.

Milgram (1969) might tell us that from these circumstances, those participants who engaged the subject with their own weapon were more sensitive to the concept of “obedience to authority,” as dictated by their police firearms training and therefore the urge to take the next step in the use of force model, that is, meeting deadly resistance with deadly force would be the correct decision. This decision would override the public safety principle, an important consideration in police work but when considered against the concept of personal or officer safety a decision to take proactive steps might be sufficiently inviting.

In the Focus Group scenario the first sign of resistance was when the subjects refused to cooperate with the officers as they inquired into the traffic obstruction on the roadway. A number of participants in the focus groups presented various suggestions. Waddington et al., (2009) found in the participant responses of the Six Country Study that generally, “the precipitating factors of a forceful police response,” (p.132), included, the seriousness of the offence, the degree of resistance demonstrated by the subjects of the investigation, the number of police officers present and other factors.

The participants in this study indicated the following possible responses to the resistance described in the scenario. They indicated with strong emphasis on calling for back-up resources. Help from other officers in dealing with difficult subjects was paramount. Some

participants indicated that they would first call for their partner waiting in the police car, to reposition himself by their side while attempting to continue persuading the subjects in the vehicle to comply with their request. The participants indicated that two officers present would possibly increase the intimidation factor thereby encouraging compliance. Other participants in the focus groups indicated that they would immediately call for other patrols to attend at the location where the subject vehicle was being checked to help with the resistance, should it not change or even increase. There was no way for the participants to recognize the subjects' ultimate ability to resist or what resources they had available to them in their vehicle. They had to play out the circumstances to its final end.

The male participants indicated that upon experiencing the resistance of the subjects in the vehicle, they would immediately ask the subjects to get out of the car and if further resistance were experienced, they would open the driver's door and help the driver out of the car if necessary. This action could be seen as a pre-emptive tactic that would surprise the resisting subjects before they could plan their own continued resistance. The female participants approached this differently. They called for back-up patrols and while waiting for backup to arrive they continued to persuade and negotiate with the vehicle occupants to cooperate, realizing that use of force might be ultimately necessary to establish control. They would not by themselves initiate a use of force event without adequate resources.

In this scenario, resistance was the part of the situational circumstances that the participants noted immediately, triggering a risk management strategy. The subjects' refusal to comply with police requests was a significant enough concern to initiate calling for back-up support. The women indicated that they would mostly ignore the rhetoric and continue to

communicate professionally with the subjects. Although both genders took a similar approach of communicating with the subjects in attempting to manage the confrontation, there was an identifiable difference at what point in the circumstances each gender would initiate forceful measures. During the individual interviews the women all indicated their reluctance in initiating a use of force matter simply because they felt themselves to be at a disadvantage relative to the larger and stronger male subjects whom they usually were arresting. Therefore, the element of resistance played a significant role in their decisions. The response to resisting behavior for the women was to look for back-up assistance to help regain control of the circumstances as needed.

The participants indicated that they achieved control when resistance ceased. That is, the subject acquiesces to the persuasions of the police members, or the subject is physically subdued and handcuffed. The female focus group discussions indicated that they would continue to negotiate and persuade the subjects in the face of any resistance. The ultimate difference in controlling the subjects was in the last phase of the focus group scenario when the female participants almost unanimously indicated that while the subject held them at gunpoint they would continue to use negotiation and persuasion to motivate the subject to stop what he was doing and to put down his gun. This was motivated by concerns for public safety relative to the considerations of public danger when firearms would potentially be discharged in a populated area by challenging the subject by using their own weapons. Some males were more inclined to challenge the subject by drawing their own weapons thereby risking the potential of an exchange of gunfire and increasing the risk to public safety and other police officers in the

area. The primary consideration discussed at this point in the scenario was that of public safety, regardless of the police response applied.

Officer Disposition – Public, Officer and/or Subject Safety

Bierie, (2012), indicated that some researchers have found that female officers are less likely to shoot suspects than were male officers. Female officers were significantly less likely to use weapons than male officers and less likely to injure suspects during force applied incidents (Bierie, 2012). Public Safety is a primary purpose of the police. The public relationship with the police has suffered in popularity in recent decades partly due to the demographic changes of the larger populations (Waddington, et al., 2009). Scandals mark the use of force decisions that have resulted in citizens' deaths such as Robert Dziezanski at the Vancouver International Airport in 2007, and other recent events in the United States.

In every discussion and the individual interviews in my study, the participants indicated that the primary concern in dealing with difficult circumstances was for public safety. However, there were no competing concerns when the participants' safety was not imminently threatened. It appeared that when risk to officers concerns became part of the equation the conversation changed. As an example, in the focus group discussions when the subjects drove away at high speed the discussion focused on high-speed pursuit potentials. The no pursuit policy in almost every police agency definitely assisted in the decisions to not pursue among the focus group participants in this scenario even though some participants were prepared to violate policy in an attempt to apprehend the fleeing subjects. Although some officers thought they would pursue until told specifically by their supervisor to stop pursuing, others indicated that they would adhere to the letter of the policy. The female participants agreed that the policy

was clear. All but one female participant in the two female focus groups agreed that they would abide by that policy for public safety reasons. The male participants were less focused on the policy and possibly more concerned about apprehending the subjects.

In the final phase of the focus group scenario the subject turned and pointed his gun at the pursuing police officer during the foot pursuit. The comments in this dilemma demonstrated significant gender differences. Generally, the female participants indicated, primarily for public safety reasons, that they would not consider initiating a shoot out with the subject. They would continue to negotiate and persuade the subject to comply. The men were more inclined to meet force with force by presenting their own weapons and demand the subject cooperate by dropping his weapon. Public safety under these conditions in the male discussions was subordinated to officer safety. A statement was made several times in the discussions that public safety cannot be achieved without officer safety and that if the officer is down, injured or more, the subject has access to all the weapons on the officer's belt increasing the threat to other officers and the public. Both gender groups agreed with the officer safety considerations but the groups disagreed on how to achieve that end. The men mostly advocated for meeting force with force and the female groups would continue to negotiate and persuade the subject to comply with the police.

Subject safety was not discussed as a priority in this scenario. The subjects were viewed as the problem that had to be controlled and the more difficult the subjects made the problem, the greater force was considered to overcome the resistance. Use of force was talked about as a continuum, wherein the force responses by the police are associated to the level of resistance in

the circumstances. This means, when weapons were produced within these circumstances, the model advocated weapons be used by the police.

In summary, the female participants talked about using force differently than the men. Their discussions focused on communication, negotiation and persuasion. As an example, in the face of the subject pointing his gun at the officer in the foot pursuit, the female participants primarily talked about negotiating a resolution while warning the public about the presence of the subject with a gun. The difference in use of force considerations was consistently different throughout the scenario and most obvious at the time of the pointing of the gun in the scenario. That is the male participants advocated for the application of physical force sooner in the scenario and when they started on this road of using force, the level of force advocated was greater than that advocated by the female participants.

Consistent with the female participants' individual interviews and the focus group discussions, were the assertions that the female participants did the same work as their male colleagues as effectively and capably whether it was about handling violence, use of authority, and problem solving (Bierie, 2012; Lonsway et al., 2003). The literature is quite clear that gender impacts the style of solving problems and that female officers generally rely on alternative methods where there was discretion as to how a problem is to be solved (Bierie, 2012). The comments about use of force in my study reflected a desire to rely on a verbally communicative approach and the participants talked about this as professional policing. Not unlike what Kakar (2002) and Garcia (2003) indicated in their articles was the comment by one agency commander who indicated that calls for police services was equally distributed among

all the officers under her command. Gender was not considered when dispatching her officers to calls for service regardless of the perceived threat risks.

Gender, Control, Perception, Uncertainty and Trust

Recent criminal justice literature indicated that female social control agents, police officers, corrections agents and court workers, use force less often than their male colleagues facing similar situations (Bierie, 2012; Garcia, 2003; Kakar, 2002). If the use of force applications differ by gender, then understanding how the officers arrive at decisions to use force is important. Understanding events involving use of force should consider all the factors that might influence these decisions. The factors discussed in this section that impact decision-making center on concerns about control of situational circumstances, uncertainty of how volatile situations will evolve and threaten safety, perception about the circumstances and the cues that the officers recognize during their interaction with situational players, and trust. Common sense might lead some to believe that men and women are likely to diverge in recognizing and interpreting situational cues that evolve in calls for service. Researchers have found some differences in gender-based responses particularly in areas of police work where the situational circumstances are not that clear or present significant subtleties in cue recognition and thereby challenge the police service provider. This became evident in my research where gender differences in the use of discretionary decision-making from the start of the focus group scenario. The early factors in the focus group scenario could be described as a problem solving exercise where a vehicle parked on the side of the road was creating somewhat of a traffic obstruction. The male participants, when faced with some resistance from the

vehicle occupants, were more willing to search for justification to arrest the vehicle occupants while the female participants were problem solving. When the car eventually drove away at high speed most of the female participants indicated that the original parking problem had been solved, albeit another problem related to reckless driving had been created. The original problem had been replaced with another problem as the scenario evolved.

Bierie (2012) indicated that abilities across gender are relatively consistent but the evidence is that gender impacts the style of problem solving demonstrated in the use of force in circumstances where there was discretion about the problem to be solved. That is, the male participants were more willing to solve the parking problem and the associated subject resistance by arresting the vehicle occupants while the female participants communicated. Persuasion and bonding are character strengths more common for women (Bierie, 2012). In the focus group discussions the female participants indicated that when met with the initial resisting behavior from the vehicle occupants they would call for a backup to assist. If an arrest would be necessary the presence of other resources would be helpful to provide that assistance. It could be argued that the male participants assessed the evolving circumstances through their own abilities to physically take control of the subjects. They were prepared to take the steps of arresting them earlier.

In the individual interviews the female participants interviewed, openly talked about their experiences in physical altercations when the circumstances pushed them to respond physically. The participants indicated that they avoided starting a physical confrontation because they considered it to be a dangerous strategy. One female participant indicated that she had on one occasion confronted male colleagues about starting a physical confrontation when she had gone

through great lengths to negotiate a peaceful resolution to an operational circumstance.

Another female participant indicated that she did not think about using arrest processes unless all other options had been exhausted because simply she did not want to use force. Her strategy was to use persuasion to achieve a peaceful resolution.

In this study scenario, the male participants were much quicker in arriving at an assessment that involved use of force than their female colleagues. The male participants would be more likely to instruct the vehicle occupants to get out of the car and some would remove them from the car physically if they refused to get out voluntarily. The male participants indicated that this early display of physicality could serve to place the vehicle occupants on the defensive a state of mind considered to be an advantage for the officers. The assessment in this scenario then is in part about the availability of the resources to overcome any perceived physical resistance because eventually if the resistance continues a confrontation is likely to ensue. Resistance to police objectives is unlawful and the decision to initiate physical force will be made based on the police officers' discretion.

Reiterating the female participants' responses in the focus group scenario, it was generally found that they sought to call for backup while they continued to negotiate with the vehicle occupants and persuade them to comply with their requests for information. Although the female participants did not initiate a force like response they asked for their partner still in the patrol car to join them while confronting the subjects in the car in a show of strength, encouraging the vehicle occupants' cooperation. With respect to the individual interviews, the female participants indicated that they did not feel that they were physically as strong as most of the male persons they are required to deal with and in that context they indicated that there

was a sense of futility in even attempting to physically manipulate these subjects. The female participants indicated that their strengths resided in their abilities to communicate, bond and persuade and that is what they would rely on mostly in a difficult situation with difficult people. It was clear from the female participant responses and other research that, female police officers used less force or used it less frequently than their male colleagues in similar situations where there was discretion as to how a given problem was to be solved (Bierie, 2012). Empirical evidence indicated that policewomen were just as capable as policemen in handling violence, authority and solving problems in the course of attending to difficult circumstances (Lonsway, 2003; Garcia, 2003; Kakar, 2002; Bierie, 2012).

Situational uncertainty and trust were features that impact use of force decisions (Kuhns & Knutsson, 2010). Uncertainty starts the cycle of perceptions about the circumstances, about the subject(s) involved, and the solution or outcomes. Perceptions in uncertain situational matters build a case of hypotheticals wherein the officer fills in the blanks about the situational circumstances confronted (Kuhns & Knutsson, 2010). There never seems to be enough information to make a fully informed decision and in most circumstances time is of the essence in terms of situational violence mitigation.

There is little certainty in the outcomes of situational matters, and trust according to Kuhns & Knutsson (2010), is not part of the equation. The officers rely on their environmental awareness, the officer's acuity and all the situational factors that are known to the officer at the time. The participants in this study indicated that police officers never know the whole story about situational circumstances thereby complicating the perceptions and subsequent decisions about the situations' resolves. In the study scenario, the male participants indicated that to

overcome the uncertainty faced about the vehicle occupants' intentions was to build a case where arrest was justified after which the certainty of officer safety would be significantly enhanced. A significant strategy expressed by the male participants was to give lawful instructions to the vehicle occupants such as for the driver to produce a driver's license and vehicle ownership documents. The law requires this when the documents are requested by a police officer. Failure to produce these documents contributes to the offence of "obstructing a peace officer", an offence in criminal law for which the police can lawfully arrest the offender. The male participants began building a case for arrest almost immediately when the subjects in the vehicle decided to be noncompliant with the police investigation.

Perception is an important feature in gaining an understanding of situational circumstances. Perceptions reflect an interpretation of events with considerable perceptual ambiguity (Bierie, 2012). However, perception plays a role in making sense of situational circumstances in settings of uncertainty and requires moving beyond the concept of interpretation (Bierie, 2012). It is that the individuals differ in the recognition of cues, their definition of events, and the meaning they ascribe to situational events. Therefore if real world situations are present during conflict ridden circumstances, people will have to draw on personal experiences to decipher the meaning of cues and because of different life experiences perceptions will likely vary (Bierie, 2012). Women and men hold divergent views in the recognition of verbal and nonverbal cues impacted by personal experiences and gender specific socialization history (Bierie, 2012). Therefore one would expect that when confronted by similar circumstances men and women might interpret the event differently and move to solve difficult circumstances in different ways.

The literature reviewed in Chapter 2 of this paper indicated that in Venezuela and Brazil the police had a much more confrontational relationship with citizens (Gabaldon et al. 2009). Increased antagonism socially, unpredictability and subsequent uncertainty result in more frequent and serious consequences between the police and citizens. Therefore the police perception of citizen violence is driven by public acceptance of police and their work in society. Suspicious citizen behavior serves to put the police on notice about next steps in the police/citizen encounter and the officer's perception stimulated by citizen behavior is an early indicator of what might happen next. Therefore if force is used to overcome uncertainty as indicated by Gabaldon et al., (2009), the participants' responses about removing the driver from the car forcefully is one method of overcoming the perception of further resistance by the subjects in the car that could possibly lead to violence against the police if the matter is not dealt with early in the resistance phase of this encounter. With, Gabaldon, (2009) in Venezuela and Machado, (2009) in Brazil, the participants in those two studies said that they would have removed the subjects from the car at gunpoint because experience had taught the officers that in those countries criminals commonly carry guns. The participants in my study did not consider use of deadly force threats as in Venezuela or Brazil simply because the Canadian police experiences are different. The point is that social history to an extent, impacts the police responses to difficult circumstances.

The data in this study indicated that policewomen would respond to the uncertainty in the scenario, differently than their male colleagues. This difference in situational response is perhaps due to differences in the determination of situational circumstances, which is a perceptual matter according to Bierie, (2012). That is, women in policing interpret the

situational circumstances differently than their male colleagues, starting the resolution along a different pathway. I found in this study that the differences in gender responses were particularly different pertaining to use of force decisions, at least analytically. Support for the focus group discussion comments was found in the individual interviews wherein the female participants strongly indicated that they would rather use nonviolence related responses in their interactions with citizens.

A consideration as the researcher in this study was that the situational circumstances in this study's focus groups were hypothetical. Creating a real life event for participant analysis was challenged by the hypothetical nature of the data processes. The comforts and the controlled environment of a meeting room in the company of friendly companions obviously created an event that was absent of some real life experiences. The collective experiences of the discussion participants however reflected wisdom gained through hands on participation in real life events. It was the learned knowledge and real life experiences of these participants that helped to create an environment as close to real life as could possibly be replicated. The participants' abilities to perceive the problem issues and preconceive subject behavior demonstrated significant experience with citizen encounters. However there was an absence of the anxiety associated to conflict in the discussions. Professional groups that work with human trauma appreciate the impact of human emotions. The behavioral changes impacted by human emotions in difficult circumstances could possibly change the outcome of the event. Certainly I would expect that the rhetoric about the solution to a difficult situation would change somewhat when human affect is introduced into an event. However, in this study the consistency of the responses throughout the focus group discussions was remarkable from both

gender groups and indicated that real police experiences supported the participants' responses and that their discussion comments could probably be relied on for purposes of the data analysis. Bierie (2012) indicated that simply, exposure to violence helps subjects develop skills in identifying certain cues that serve as predictors for police officers in future circumstances where violence will be expected at some point within the situation. He said that, "perception scholars suggest that being a perpetrator, witness, or victim of violence is relevant in terms of processing cues and interpreting violent situations in the future" (Bierie, 2012, p.215).

Violence is considered to be a feature of gender-based experiences and police work affords the practitioners many examples of situational circumstances where violence is the central focus of the event. We still expect men and women to differ in some constructs and ideas they bring to life situations when attempting to interpret intent, harm, and meaning of conflict (Bierie, 2012). Bierie's (2012) comments about perception and interpretation of conflict came alive in one of the individual interviews in my study through comments that communicated a meaning for not using violence to initiate an arrest. Firstly, "because I don't want to and secondly, it serves no meaningful purpose and so I take the time to talk the suspects into coming along peacefully."

Relationship of Findings to Conceptual Framework

A key theory emphasized in this study is Durkheim's (1938) conflict theory emphasizing the coercive role of the state in maintaining social order. Police agencies deliver coercive programs under law and order initiatives within a paramilitary organizational structure. The organizational structure in policing, aided by conventional operational traditions, together contribute to a method of law enforcement commonly seen in democracies in modern times. History reminds us that the level of coerciveness required when the European economies

changed from feudalism to industrialization saw civil coerciveness in the form of two world wars and other conflicts change the world to economic systems driven by global capital market resources. The participants in my study demonstrated some of the coerciveness discussed by Durkheim (1938) in their expressions of police powers that saw use of force as an ultimate function of state power.

Social feminism indicated the policewomen do the same job and within the same risk parameters as their male colleagues however they do it differently (Kakar, 2002, Garcia, 2003, Bierie, 2012). Waddington, (2009), indicated that policewomen use their powers of arrest less frequently, and are less reliant on physical control measures which expresses one ideal of gender differences in police work. In this study, I found that the female participants talked about their preferences in citizen encounters that were focused more on communication and negotiation strategies. Conflict management principles for the female participants in my study depended on verbal skills while their male colleagues used verbal tactics but depended on more traditional methods of social control. These findings are not that unexpected in policing, which is based on the idea that policing has its origins from early industrial era times and was created as a male function. Therefore the role of law enforcement was defined in male terminology and carried out by male officers. In Canada women didn't enter the ranks of regular policing until approximately 1974 when Canada's national police force began recruiting women for regular police work. Since that time the proportion of women in police forces has reached as high as 22 percent for some agencies but generally it is at a lower level. The influence of women in policing it can be argued is perhaps minimized by their minority status. Additionally, their influence is mitigated by traditional male influences.

Alpert and Dunham (2004) emphasized that in the contemporary world an increasing distaste for the use of physical force to direct and control others is obvious. Examples of violence reduction in society live in anti-bullying programs in schools, domestic violence initiatives and using force in policing.

The findings in this study indicated that the female participants preferred using nonviolent solutions to difficult circumstances. The female participants interviewed were emphatic that using physical force was never high on their priority list of strategies when managing a confrontational event. When using other nonviolent strategies they experienced greater success and injuries during arrests were nonexistent.

According to Scholnick (2011) it was in the interest of public safety that police should be effective in preserving public order and preventing crime. It is equally good that police powers be controlled and confined so as not to interfere arbitrarily with personal freedoms resulting in compromises between efficient and effective policing and basic human rights. The idea that guided this research was that when police officers acted officiously and used physical force during citizen encounters, the appropriateness of their behavior came into question relative to public safety (Waddington et al., 2009, Scholnick, 2011). How secure is the concept of public safety when the police cause injuries to its members? The findings in my study indicated that the male participants talked about the same law enforcement achievements similarly to their female colleagues but with a more aggressive style. What implications do the gender differences have for impacting police use of force policies? Implications might include enhanced public safety considerations through training and educational programs helping

police recruits and in-service staff and personnel to focus on the nonviolence successes experienced by policewomen.

Social constructionism, a theory about knowledge development poses the idea that reality should be examined through an approach that emphasizes historical contexts, social and human factors and language (Labaky, 2013). Therefore Labaky (2013), argued that what is true is not objectively or factually created but is a construct of negotiation shaped by language, culture and social structure. Applying this argument to the role of women in policing and their subsequent impact on use of force renders some new ideas on the construct of using force in the first place in a social control context. Is the role of physical force in social control artificially created to satisfy a gender-specific approach? The history of social control is such that it is difficult to imagine social control management without the use or threat of using force. The research is clear that using physical force is probably not the primary choice in a social control context even though the threat of force is ever present in law enforcement events.

Theory Generated From the Data

In this study, I developed a new theory that strongly supports the title, “Paradigm of Safety”. This theory will enhance our understanding of police use of force decision factors relating to gender. Based on the analysis of the data generated within this study, new information emerged that assisted in developing this theory that is focused on safety enhancements. In summary, the idea that the application of less force creating a safer environment for members of the public, subjects and officers alike, is somehow counter intuitive. I, however, found that the data in this study demonstrated that the history of gender

in policing supported a view that physical force could be changed in police use of force decisions by impacting the factors that influence those decisions.

The factors to consider that contribute to the use of force decisions entail the legal or political perspectives, organizational interests, officer dispositions and gender. Legal factors are one of the strongest predictors of using discretionary powers, according to Bierie (2012). Personal judgment in every circumstance attended to by the police is paramount. When force is misused, public trust is challenged and the legitimacy of police services is threatened. Legislators and courts use subjective language that provides limited guidance because of the breadth of possibilities contained in that language making the officers' judgments key in how the problems were going to be addressed. The extreme variations in the calls for service, causes the police to become suspicious of citizens, a feeling that assists in gaining an advantage when encountering new circumstances (Waddington et al., 2009). Therefore the difference between suspicion and substantive evidence is confusing and decisions are left to the officers' judgment. Gender interpretations within the judgment parameters reflect responses more common to the female participants in this study, reflecting an enhancement to the Atmosphere of Safety relative to police use of force decisions.

Organizationally, public perception impacts satisfaction with police services and the willingness of the public to cooperate with the police and follow their instructions, a key indicator of police effectiveness (Mystrol, 2011). The notions of citizen voluntariness in compliance, marks the defining qualities of legitimacy (Maguire & Johnson, 2010). Police managers influence the relationship between how the officers are treated within the organization and how the officers in kind treat the public. The effort to make organizational

structure and management in police organizations more business like to impact public satisfaction is an important effort in changing public perception of police.

In the context of organizational behavior, Milgram's (1969) work is important. Obedience to authority indicates that the individual who is subject to authority, comes to view himself or herself as the instrument for carrying out another person's wishes and therefore no longer regards themselves as responsible for their actions (Hodgson, 2001). This implies that ordinary people, simply doing their job, and without any particular hostility on their part, could become agents of a terribly destructive process (Hodgson, 2001).

The choice to initiate a firearms event in a public area at a busy time of the day created a dilemma for the officers that entailed making a choice about the perception of personal safety at the cost of public safety. The police firearms training imply that public safety is primarily dependent on officer safety first. Milgram's (1969) theory about obedience to authority through police training methods comes to life. The public safety factors would be compromised as an exchange of gunfire takes place within the circumstances in the study scenario thereby impacting the Paradigm of Safety.

Researchers indicate that female officers are less likely to shoot suspects than were male officers (Bierie, 2012). Female officers were significantly less likely to use weapons than male officers and less likely to injure suspects during force applied incidents (Bierie, 2012). Gender differences became obvious in the scenario when the female officers indicated that they would negotiate with the subject while pointing his gun at them, while the male participants were divided about whether to negotiation or draw their own weapon. This study was quite clear that gender impacts a style of problem solving and that female officers generally relied on

alternative methods to physical force where there was discretion as to how a problem was to be solved.

Generally, in the criminal justice system female social control agents, police officers, corrections agents and court workers, use force less often than their male colleagues facing similar situations (Bierie, 2012; Garcia, 2003; Kakar, 2002). In this study, the evidence clearly demonstrated that the participants agreed with these scholars. Bierie (2012) indicated that abilities across gender are relatively consistent but the evidence was that gender impacts the style of problem solving demonstrated in the use of force circumstances where there was discretion about the problem to be solved. In this study, both gender groups described the concerns relative to the scenario circumstances in similar ways meaning they each understood the problem and how the law and policies impacted their approach. The male participants included physical force as a mechanism of problem solving while the female participants relied more on less forceful means to achieve the same results. That is, persuasiveness is a character-strength more common for women (Bierie, 2012).

Furthermore, perceptions reflect an interpretation of events with considerable perceptual ambiguity (Bierie, 2012). However, perception plays a role in making sense of situational circumstances in settings of uncertainty and requires moving beyond the concept of interpretation (Bierie, 2012). It is that, the gender-based individuals differ in the recognition of cues, their definition of events, and the meaning they ascribe to situational events. Therefore if real world situations are present during conflict ridden circumstances, people will have to draw on personal experiences to decipher the meaning of cues and because of different life experiences perceptions will likely vary (Bierie, 2012). Women and men hold divergent views

in the recognition of verbal and nonverbal cues impacted by personal experiences and gender specific socialization history (Bierie, 2012). The data in this study indicated that policewomen would respond to the uncertainty in the scenario, differently than their male colleagues. Mostly, in this study the female participants were standing firm in their negotiation role when the subject pointed a gun at them. If public safety is a primary role of the police, initiating a shooting event in a busy public area was contrary to that duty.

The female perspective on use of force is captured in a statement made by one of the study participants. On using force, firstly, “because I don’t want to, and secondly, it serves no meaningful purpose and so I take the time to talk the suspects into coming along peacefully.” This statement is reflective of the predominating attitude throughout this study from the female group.

The idea that the application of less force can provide greater safety in the context of public safety is in some ways contrary to common ideas. The logic displayed when force is not applied in situational circumstances is that the opportunity for injury or more, is somewhat diminished. The “Paradigm of Safety” is compromised at each force application because of the risk of injury or more.

It must be clearly understood that the purpose of this research was to identify the decision factors in the application of force and then search for alternative, less forceful solutions. The female study participants demonstrated a difference with respect to their male colleagues in use of force decision. The impact of this difference on use of force training and policy development is significant. The strength in policing is in public satisfaction with the service that can be improved through developing training policies around an atmosphere of safety, a theme that has

already shown some significant success in field practices by many police officers but demonstrated in a concentrated form by the policewomen in this research.

Police training policies should look at developing officer communication and negotiation skills. Formal education plays an important role in decision-making. Education could be a factor in recruiting policies and where hiring standards reflect that education is valued. Some evidence in this study indicated that the female participants were better educated than their male colleagues. Barrett et al. (2009), indicated in his study findings, that education might play a role in police use of force mitigation and should be studied further.

The social changes impacted by this research reflect a need for stronger laws and policies in use of force applications and training. Training to enhance communication and negotiation skills is paramount to mitigate future excessive use of force incidents. Gender roles in policing are important in serving to enhance some of the features already mentioned in this social change statement.

Summary of Conclusions

This study indicated that gender effects emerged when study participants searched for methods of gaining compliance in the circumstances set out in the study scenario. Bierie (2012) indicated that researchers suggested that women have more skill in terms of talking, bonding and building rapport with people they connect with. In police work it is likely that women are more likely to rely on verbal skills rather than physical power to manage resisting offenders. Therefore, policewomen will use force less often because they draw on alternate skill sets to gain compliance. The female skill sets that emphasize communication are probably not available to their male colleagues to the same degree (Bierie, 2012) because the men have

not been socialized in this way. Some researchers suggest that the social cost of using force for women is a significant deterrent to its applications. The social cost is related to social gender-role pressures that pre-determine the parameters of women's behavior in society (Kakar, 2002; Garcia, 2003; Bierie, 2012), wherein the use of violence is generally prohibited, also a socialization difference by gender.

This research does not reach beyond the participants who volunteered but it is sufficient to start new more representative research that will compliment what was done in this study and the studies conducted by scholars like Waddington et al. (2009), Barrett et al. (2009) and others. Research conducted by Barrett et al. (2009) in New Jersey, followed the Waddington et al. (2009) series of International Studies. The researcher compared use of force in urban, suburban and rural environments. Barrett et al. (2009) indicated that the suburban and rural officers had much more formal education than their urban counterparts. They were more likely to talk about applying the law and policies regarding use of force. Paoline and Terrill (2007) indicated that the more educated police officers used less force when interacting with citizens. The comments on education impact the discussions in this research. It begs the question; Are policewomen generally better educated than their male colleagues? One of my experiences with recruiting women for policing is that education played a very important role in the success of their applications. Several of the female participants interviewed for this research have Masters degrees and one is a part time university instructor. Some other participants had undergraduate degrees. Although I did not test for the education demographic it appeared that the female participants were generally better educated than the males participants in this study.

If education plays such an important role in police use of force applications, were the differences in gender responses in this study based on education? Therefore, does education impact the gender gap in use of force decisions? Alternatively could it be argued that education is more important to women in society generally and therefore they come into the work force generally better educated? Does this in part at least explain the differences in use of force preferences in police work? These questions obviously will be the focus of another study.

The implications of the results in my study are clearly that the female participants, for practical reasons as much as for idealisms, advocated for or placed less emphasis on physical force than their male colleagues. The decisions made in the same set of circumstances by the gender groups impacted the significance of the differences and set a new standard for conflict management, replacing physical force with less forceful but equally effective conflict management tools.

Implication for Social Change

The importance of using force in social control circumstances is changing as democracies evolve. In colonial times, force was possibly more important to maintaining civic order and keeping foreign powers from seizing colonized territory by military force. The literature indicated that the number of use of force events by police relative to the number of citizen/police encounters is very small but the impact of these few events on public satisfaction is significant. Contemporarily, public dissatisfaction is quickly felt through the media when use of force complaints surface.

This research responded to the public outcry for less violent means of social control and law enforcement events. Changes in control require an element of social change, a significant

challenge for any government to face. Waddington (2009) indicated in his paper that mechanisms for government control exist in proportion to social tolerance of use of force as a control factor. The desire to build processes that respond less violently to every day dilemmas of life is perhaps not as new a phenomenon as the challenge of building it. There is currently evidence that violence and physical force are not the most effective tools for implementing meaningful social change. Philosophers through the ages have written and spoken at length about social change from Plato and Socrates to Thoreau, King, and Ghandi. The means of transmitting the words of peaceful social change through social media technology has never before been as available as it is today.

This study is but one example of where social change is possible. Gender based policing in Canada implies that force is probably not the ultimate tool to gain compliance in a law enforcement function. Policewomen have tested the traditional mechanisms, under the scrutiny of traditional values and have demonstrated a less violent manner of doing the work of traditional law enforcement. Social change never comes easy and always demands a price. Women in law enforcement in Canada have paid through mechanisms of sexual harassment, workplace harassment, cynicism, lack of organizational promotions, and other features of change, as discussed in Chapter 2 of this paper.

Pragmatically, the risks to safety possibly increase when physical force is involved, regardless of the precipitating factors. As an example, one of the participants in my study indicated that when attending a complaint from parents of a violent teenager in the family home, the subject threatened the officer with a knife. She considered using deadly force to defend herself. Part of the decision not to use deadly force was her ability to empathize with

the situational factors wherein parents had called for help to control the subject, but not to have the helping agent use deadly force for that purpose. Although the lawfulness of using deadly force would perhaps have been justifiable, the moral and ethical components when functioning in a public safety capacity could have been significantly impacted, negatively.

My research was designed to help create an awareness that physical force can be replaced with less harmful means of controlling violent circumstances, in some instances. The policewomen participating in my study mostly demonstrated verbal communication considerations even when faced with deadly circumstances themselves. The argument could be made that when physical force is used less readily that officer safety and the safety of the subject of the police interventions are significantly enhanced.

The ultimate purpose of this study was to find a theory that would help overcome some of the traditional models of use of force applications. The influence of gender helped demonstrate that risk factors might increase when officers are over reliant on physical force as a guide to conflict management. That is, there can be an iatrogenic effect in use of force applications, where the consequences of the use of force are more harmful than the consequences of the original problem to be solved. This study demonstrated differences in use of force responses and within the parameters of the study identified differences in how force is used in a gender context. That is, the female participants in this study indicated measureable differences in using less physical force in the course of their duties in law enforcement. The implications for social change are more clearly defined when considering the reliance on physical force to be likely to endanger the safety of all participants in the situational circumstances in a law

enforcement context. When deadly force is used a whole community grieves and concepts of public safety are impacted immeasurably.

Therefore, social change could be addressed by legislators in providing more effective guidance for police in use of force scenarios through the law. Police organizations should be reviewing their policies frequently to ensure that they are not only compliant with the law but with human rights regulations and principles in policies and in training. Police officers should receive frequent and comprehensive training in terms of avoiding use of physical force and focusing on the communication and negotiation components of risk management in an effort to build a more comprehensive Atmosphere of Safety.

Recommendations

Recommendation for Action

While public policies are being addressed, the pathways in planning changes are seldom clear or easily defined. The recommended action that results from research begs governments and associated bureaucracies to review with some interest the study methods and results. The appropriate next steps could be a more confirmatory inquiry to test this study's results with a mixed methods research approach. My research was done qualitatively with limited resources. Yet the results appear to confirm existing knowledge. Gender differences studies are not new. My study falls into line with a host of other studies that demonstrate differences in gender behavior and differences in decision-making and problem solving. I am not surprised by the gender differences found in my study and I would expect significantly stronger evidence would be generated in confirmative studies.

This study helped to open the door for gender differences recognition in policing. It is no secret that policing has been thought of as a role for men in most societies not unlike military service, yet when women are placed into policing or military roles their role performances frequently exceed the male performance in certain aspects. There are just some things that women are better at than their male colleagues. This statement doesn't take away anything from the men. Males perform better in other areas of the same job and if one would combine the gender performances while focused on a specific goal, the results of the combined efforts are likely to exceed qualitatively at least, that work which is dedicated to gender specific roles. As experienced in business planning sessions, the greatest results may be from strategists who are different because there is a greater spectrum of opinion and options to explore and implement. Therefore, logic would tell me that individual gender differences should be celebrated and could be used as a tool to enhance performance in most environments including police work.

The research conducted in this study is of paramount interest to police studies, police administrators and other justice system participants. The importance of the study results are that they ask readers to overcome the fears related to gender differences and to trust the differences to stimulate enhancements in the policing systems performance outcomes. There is widespread agreement that the capacity to use force as an instrument of social control is the role of all governments and is mandated to the police to provide that service (Waddington et al., 2009). Eliminating use of force in the course of police investigations is not the aim of this research for when social order is threatened the police must act to regain compliance. During the chaos and confusion of an actively resistive matter, however, force is easy to abuse and

serious injuries sometimes are the result. It is within the conduct during these chaotic events that performance enhancements would reduce injuries and improve public satisfaction.

The research in this study merely demonstrates another method of gaining compliance before use of force is considered. The female participants, along with some male participants in this study indicated that rational reasoning focused on problem solving through communication, negotiation and persuasion works in circumstances where others rely on using force. In a culture where the public demonstration of violence is unacceptable, the strategies advocated by those participants advocating less violence seemed like a viable alternative.

In terms of an action plan to distribute my findings, I have already presented my study method publically at a conference in Las Vegas. I have been asked for my study results by a number of Police Chiefs. Two of them issued Letters of Cooperation for participation in my study and made the study report a condition of their participation. I have been asked to present to a professional group of civilian oversight for police conduct. I have been asked to present my study findings to the faculty and staff of the Justice Institute of BC.

Law enforcement agencies and departments are responsible for deciding whether they can accept the findings in this study and consider implementing programs for change to a less injury causing use of force approach. Currently, the community policing philosophy is helping police agencies with less confrontational approaches. Use of force policies however have not kept up with the Community Policing ideas. As demonstrated by the participants in this study, a stronger emphasis on conflict management training and education would provide the policing community with stronger and safer methods of negotiating peaceful resolutions in confrontational circumstances. Ultimately, some circumstances will still require physical force

solutions. This will still require police training in physical skills proficiency of their enforcement members through meaningful use of force training and education programs. The proficiencies required in decision making in the context of this study are, when to use force or not to use force, as well as when to stop using force once the process has begun.

Recommendation for Further Study

Waddington et al. (2009) found that police officers in various cultures perceive threat in social circumstances differently. In my study conducted in Canada, collectively, the police officers interviewed and those in the focus group discussions were not, collectively, in total harmony about the use of force and best practices associated to its application, regardless of gender. The participants in this study exercised a great deal of caution in their decisions throughout each of the changing circumstances regardless of the perceived risk or threat level. Their collective experiences indicated that the threat level in any scenario could change in a moment and without notice, and this caused them to approach each circumstance with a great deal of caution and suspicion about next steps in their decisions.

Uncertainty in situational outcomes, risk factors within circumstances, perceived threats related to next steps, are all dependent on the perceptions and the experience levels of the officers assigned to a call for services. The officers' abilities to interpret the circumstances of the focus group scenario or the events recalled in the individual interviews were impacted by various influences entailing officer dispositions, organizational concerns, experience, training, and education to name some.

Understanding how these factors that influence the decisions that police officers make daily, under stressful circumstances, is important. Assisting in the understanding of these

decision factors requires an abundance of research. Some agencies attack these studies independently while others rely on external resources to do the research for them. In my study, for example, the data showed differences in the decisions to use force based on gender. The qualitative nature of my study advocates for further work in gender-based use of force decisions as this study is not representative of any population other than the participants in the study.

Important in the police use of force are continued studies that address the influences of education and the length of law enforcement experience. Barrett et al. (2009), conducted a study of similar format to my study looking at the decision influences influenced by urban, suburban and rural environments. The findings of that study indicated that the suburban and rural officers were less likely to engage use of force decisions than in urban departments. The predominant difference was that the suburban and rural police officers were better educated. Barrett et al. (2009), indicated that education could in part make up for the differences in use of force decisions.

In this study I found that the female participants generally had more formal education than the male participants. Almost all of the female participants interviewed were senior supervisors from whom I expected to see different decisions about use of force primarily based on their organizational role, than the less experienced nonsupervisors. Educationally, the female participants were better educated than their male colleagues in this study. Therefore it could be argued that education has a significant influence in use of force decisions. In testing the influence of gender alone, the participant pool qualifications should reflect the same educational levels, experience levels, participant age and training. Regardless, my study

indicated that based on gender, the female participants advocated less reliance on use of force and more reliance on verbal communication in conflict situations than their male colleagues. However, more work is needed to assign study significance to the findings.

Reflections about the Research Experience

The research experience in this study began or became real for me at the time of writing the proposal for IRB approval. It has been approximately one year since the proposal phase of this study process. The research was long, tedious and required a focused mind, yet it was rewarding, stimulating and exciting at the same time.

I was extremely fortunate that Walden University offers such a host of research databases. Further I was able to take advantage of the university libraries at Simon Fraser University and the University of British Columbia, both schools that are located near where I live. From the moment that I selected my dissertation topic I was faced with the task of constantly searching databases for journal articles, and contacting book retailers like Amazon.com in search of a journal article or book that might answer a question that added a few sentences or another paragraph into the study. One of the considerations constantly on my mind was the original context of my study. It required staying focused.

One valued resource that I relied on was Dr. P.A.J. Waddington, Wolverhampton University, UK. He and a group of international colleagues conducted an International Study published in 2009, also referred to as the Six Country Study. I found Dr. Waddington through an online search and we made telephone contact shortly thereafter. My study was formatted similarly to the Six Country Study from the point of using focus groups as a data source. Although Waddington et al., (2009) relied exclusively on focus group discussions, I included

semistructured individual interviews to supplement focus groups based on advice from my Walden University mentor who is also the dissertation committee chair.

I appreciated the depth of review of the proposal for this study by the dissertation committee along with a subsequent IRB review. The effect was that it gave me a much deeper understanding of my responsibilities in the research processes and in particular the ethical considerations required while protecting study participants. In following the committee and IRB concerns I found that it made the process of assuring ethical considerations much simpler, thereby impacting the confidence of the potential participants.

The focus groups for my study were found through connecting with two chiefs of police, at Saskatoon Police Services and at Metro Vancouver Transit Police. I travelled to Saskatoon and conducted two focus group discussions, one male and one female group. When I returned from that trip I conducted one more male focus group at the Metro Vancouver Transit Police and three individual interviews. I then began a process of connecting with police officers whom I knew personally who either volunteered to participate or who introduced me to other police members that would like to volunteer to participate in my study.

The snowball recruiting effort resulted in one female focus group and six female individual interview participants and three more individual male participants. This effort completed my study. The data was now saturated, as the comments and statements in both focus group discussions and individual interviews were consistently similar. The features of the data gathering processes, individual interviews and focus group discussions, complimented each other extremely well. The focus group discussions were used to analyze a progressive scenario that took the participants through a police related event. It provided the participants an

opportunity to apply their decision skills about their responses to a scenario that unfolded during the discussions much like situational circumstances evolve in real life police calls for service. The use of a scenario design addressed an exposure-problem wherein all focus groups participants were exposed to the same set of circumstances allowing for the participant responses to be measured against identical circumstances. The academic nature of the exercise allowed participants to change their minds about their responses during the discussions, an anticipated reaction that I would expect takes place in real world decisions.

The individual interviews provided an opportunity for the participants to talk about their past experiences. They analyzed their own work and some talked about alternative responses if they had to do that event over again. The indications from these interviews were that the police work in an environment that is never perfect. In fact, their world at work could be defined as chaotic while involved in difficult circumstances. The take away from this experience could be that public expectations about how police members make decisions are generally out of context. When humans face hostile dangers in the course of their work, mentally, the mixture of planning, rational thought and emotional factors such as, fear, anger, and frustration, creates a psychological environment that would challenge any professional. Yet, the expectations are significantly beyond that of any professional disciplines were decisions are made in more ideal circumstances.

The findings in this study were somewhat anticipated based on the literature review in Chapter 2 and so I questioned my own preconceived biases and those authors who created the articles. However, upon conducting the first focus group interview of female participants the message began to shape an understanding of how these young women worked feverishly to

demonstrate alternate police practices involving psychometrics designed to reduce the level of violence involved in situational events. During the research component of this study I regained a significant amount of respect for all those who stand in the face of danger to make Canada a safer place to live for everyone equally. Additionally, a new respect was developed by those police officers facing these dangers without being drawn into the vortex of violence that so often evolves in difficult circumstances, that is facing violence without reciprocation. The courage and self-control required to do this work was evident during the study. The participants that took part in this study should be more than applauded for demonstrating the courage to face the difficult circumstances their duties require of them.

Conclusion

The dynamics that impact the police use of force vary. The cultural context in which police do their work is important (Waddington et al., 2009) and so are the individual characteristics that define the officers' disposition. In my study, I discussed considerations such as political concerns, managerial or organizational interests, officer dispositions and gender influences. A global standard is not realistic because police do their work in a variety of different cultures and under conditions that vary and are not well or easily understood. In understanding a little more about police use of force in Canada this study was conducted in a manner that allowed police officers from various regions of the country to participate. Important to regional disparity across Canada is the influence of economic considerations that impact crime and public safety concerns. As a former British colony and in the political milieu of Parliamentary traditions, Canadian culture is partly expressed in the values associated to democratic principles of law, justice and ideals of fairness and equality. The police as an

institution represent the authority of government through the exercise of law enforcement that starts with an arrest and ends in a process of justice, specific to Canadian traditions. British colonialism implies that Canadian culture bears similarities to concerns about law and justice, most particular to that of Britain, Scotland and Wales. It was within these Canadianized cultural standards that my study was conducted. The study followed a format founded by the various groups that participated in the International Study described by Waddington et al. (2009) and Barrett et al. (2009).

The study participants were significantly concerned about public safety considerations when involved in potentially violent circumstances. Limitations on public safety appeared when officer safety considerations implied sufficient risk of injury or more to the officer. Participants indicated that the public could not be safe when the police officer was injured and therefore the primary consideration quickly became their own safety. The exception to the officer safety first claim was discussed by a senior group of female police supervisors in a focus group discussion who strongly indicated that when the subject vehicle drove away at high speed they would not pursue and that when the subject pointed his gun at them during the last phase of the scenario that they would not initiate a shooting situation, both for reasons of public safety. It was obvious from these comments that the participants in this focus group would give more significant thought to public safety and less thought to their own safety. I believe that the public expect police officers to do what they need to do in a crime control process but it seems illogical to instigate an exchange of gunfire in a busy public area.

In considering the differences in the gender-based responses I was reminded of the comments by Kakar (2003) and Garcia (2002) when they talked about differences in gender

socialization and what that might mean for the application of force in police centered situational circumstances. Do cultural socialization processes consider the varying skill differences that might contribute to the different ways that policewomen talked about use of force or respond when they do their work in real life circumstances? It is not clear that socialization considers any professional standards the children will follow as adults and therefore, if socialization has an impact it may not be the strongest impact. This question is for another discussion and study to explain.

Novak et al. (2011) in their research looked at gender arrest responses and found that male and female officers make different discretionary decisions in the course of making an arrest. Haar and Morash (1999) found that organizational influences impacted gender-based decisions in policing. Barrett et al. (2009), in his study while comparing use of force between urban, suburban and rural police, found that suburban and rural police did their work by using lesser levels of force relative to their urban colleagues. The difference in the demographics of the participants in that study was that the suburban and rural participants were much better educated than the urban participants (Barrett et al., 2009). One of the contributing factors in this study therefore could be the difference in formal education between the gender groups participating. The evidence that responds to this question is for another study to discover and interpret. Barrett et al. (2009), ended his study with the same conclusion. However, my comment would be that like Barrett et al. (2009), I did not specifically reach out in this study to determine demographic characteristics of each of the participants but it was obvious during the interviews with the female study participants that there was a strong indication that these participants were generally very well educated.

One of the two female focus groups was composed of senior supervisors, and most of the women in the individual interviews were senior supervisors. The male participants as a group were not as supervisor saturated. These differences in organizational responsibilities could contribute to differences in the study responses and might mitigate the pure gender influences implied by merely looking at the gender component rather than all the demographic characteristics of each participant.

The analysis concluded that there was sufficient data to indicate that there are continuities and variances in decisions about using force. Use of force decisions according to this study data are specific to the circumstances of the situation addressed at the time of the decision, specific to the individual officer(s) involved in the circumstances, the interests of law, organizational concerns and are dependent on the level of resistance displayed by the subject(s) in the circumstances. Variances in the decisions to use force were demonstrated in the gender-based responses that could be influenced by education, socialization, human physiology and other factors. Regardless of the influences, female responses in police decision-making reflected less violence and in that context influenced a safer work environment. The potential for injury in use of force events have appeared in the media recently and even though some may have been considered lawfully justified, public displays of dissatisfaction were demonstrated. In the context of this study, meaningful social change would be reflected in public policies that consider safety first, public, officer and subject safety, a consistent message learned from gender-based strategies.

References

- Adams, K., & Jennison, V., (2007). What we do not know about police use of TASERS™, *Policing*, 30(3), 447-465.
- Alpert, G.P., Macdonald, J.M., Dunham, R.G., (2005). Police suspicion and discretionary decision making during citizen stops, *Criminology*, 43(2), 407-434.
- Alpert, G.P., & Dunham, R.G., (2004). Understanding police use of force, officers, suspects, and reciprocity, *Cambridge, England: University of Cambridge Press*.
- Alpert, G.P., & Macdonald, J.M., (2001). Police use of force: an analysis of organizational characteristics, *Justice Quarterly*, 18(2), 393-409.
- Alpert, G.P., & Dunham, R.G., (1997), *Policing urban America*, Prospect Heights ILL Waveland Press Inc.
- Alpert, G.P., & Smith, W.C. (1994). How reasonable is the reasonable man: Police and excessive force, *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology*, 85, (2) 481-492, doi:10.2307/1144107
- Baker, D. (2009), Police confirmation of use of force in Australia: “to be or not to be?”, *Crime, Law, Social Change*, 52, 139-158, doi:10.1007/s10611-0089180-y.
- Barber, M.E., Foley, L.A., Jones, R. (1999), Evaluations of aggressive women: the effects of gender, socioeconomic status, and level of aggression, *Violence and Victims*, 14(4), 353-363.
- Barrett, K.J., Haberfeld, M., Walker, M.C. (2009), A comparative study of he attitudes of urban, suburban and rural police officers in New Jersey regarding the use

- of force, *Crime Law and Social Control*, 51, 159-179, doi:10.1007/s10611-0089179-4
- Bierie, D.M. (2012), Prison violence, gender, and perceptions: testing a missing link in discretion research, *American Journal of Criminal Justice*, 37, 209-228. doi: 10.1007/s12103-011-9123-5
- Blackburn, R. (2008), What is social inequality, *International Journal of Sociology and Social Policy*, 28, (7/8), 250-259, doi:10.1108/01443330810890664
- Blaney, E. (2010), Police officers' views on specialized intimate partner violence training, *Policing*, 33(2), 354-375.
- Bradway, J. (2009), Gender stress: differences in critical life events among law enforcement officers, *International Journal of Criminal Justice Sciences*, 4, (1), 1-12.
- Brown, J. (1998), Aspects of discriminatory treatment of women police officers serving in forces in England and Wales, *British Journal of Criminology*, 38(2), 265-282. doi:10.1093/oxfordjournals.bjc.a014235
- Brown, J., Sargent, S. (1995), Policewomen and firearms in the British police service, *Policing*, 18(2), 1-9.
- Burke, R.J., & Mikkelsen, A. (2005), Burnout, job stress and attitudes towards the use of force by Norwegian police officers, *Policing*, 28(2), 269-278.
- Burke, R.J., Richardsen, A.M., Martinssen, M. (2006), Gender differences in policing: Reasons for optimism? , *Policing*, 29(3), 513-521.

- Burns, R.G., & Crawford, C.E. (2002). Policing and violence, *Prentice Hall, New Jersey*, isbn:0-13—28437-8
- Cancino, J.M. (2001). Walking among giants 50 years later: an exploratory analysis of patrol officer use of violence, *Policing*, 24(2), 144-161.
- Carroll, S., Pereira, J., Kovath, J. (2004), Judging police misconduct: street-level versus professional policing, *Law and Society Review*, 38(4), 665-710.
- Chaiyavej, S., & Morash, M. (2008), Dynamics of sexual harassment for policewomen working alongside men, *Policing*, 31(3), 485-498.
- Chaiyavej, S., & Morash, M. (2009), Reasons for policewomen's assertive and passive reactions to sexual harassment, *Police Quarterly*, 12(1), 63-84. doi:10.1177/1098611108327309
- Charmaz, K. (2006), Constructing grounded theory - a practical guide through qualitative analysis, *Sage Publications, Thousand Oaks, California*.
- Charmaz, K. (2014), Constructing grounded theory (introducing qualitative methods series), *Sage Publications, Thousand Oaks, California*.
- Cockcroft, T., Beattie, I. (2009), Shifting cultures: managerialism and the rise of "performance", *Policing*, 32(3), 526-540. doi:10.1108/13639510910981644
- Collins, R. (2009), Micro and macro causes of violence, *International Journal of Conflict and Violence*, 3(1), 9-22.
- Collins, S.C. (2004), Sexual harassment and police discipline: who is policing the police?, *Policing*, 27(4), 512-538.

- Creswell, J.W. (2007), *Qualitative inquiry & research design: Choosing among five approaches*, Sage Publications, Thousand Oaks, California.
- Creswell, J. W. (2009), *Research design: qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches*, Sage Publications, Thousand Oaks, California.
- Creswell, J.W. (2014), *Research Design: qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches*, Sage Publications, Thousand Oaks, California.
- Criminal Code of Canada, R.S.C., 1985, c. C-146 (last amended 2013-01-29) (Retrieved From, <http://yourlaws.ca/criminal-code-canada/321>)
- Crow, M.M., Lee, C.B., Joo, J.J. (2012), Organizational justice and organizational commitment among South Korean police officers, *Policing*, 35(2), 402-423.
- De Guzman, M.C., & Frank, J. (2004), Policewomen and their problems: the Philippine context, *Policing*, 27(3), 396-412.
- De Haas, S. (2009), Sexual harassment and health among male and female police officers, *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 14(4), 390-401.
- Dick, P., & Jankowicz, D. (2001), A social constructionist account of police culture and its influence on the representation and progression of female officers: a repertory grid analysis in a UK police force, *Policing*, 24(2), 181-199.
- Durkheim, E. (1938), *The rules of sociological method and selected texts on sociology and its method*, Chicago, IL: The Free Press.
- Durkheim, E. (2014), *The division of labor in society*, New York, NY: The Free Press
Subsidiary Rights Department.
- Engel, R.S., & Smith M.R. (2009), *Perceptual distortion and reasonableness during*

- police shootings: law, legitimacy, and future research, *Criminology and Public Policy*, 8(1), 141-151.
- Feemster, S.L. (2010), Addressing the urgent need for multi-dimensional training in law enforcement, *Forensic Examiner*, 19(3), 44-49.
- Feminist News (2000), Gender differences in police brutality lawsuits: men cost more, www.feminist.org/news September 18, 2000.
- Foster, K. (2006), Gender and excessive force complaints, *Law and Order*, 54, (8), 95-99
- Frankfort-Nachmias, C., & Nachmias, D. (2008), Research methods in the social sciences, *Worth Publishers, New York*.
- Fuchs, T. (2005), Delusional mood and delusional perception – a phenomenological analysis, *Psychopathology*, 38, 133-139, doi:10.1159/000085843.
- Gabaldon, L.G. (2009), Uncertainty and the use of force among Venezuelan police officers, *Crime Law and Social Change*, 52, 207-223, doi:10.1007/S10611 009 9187-Z.
- Garcia, V. (2003), Difference in the police department: women, policing and doing gender, *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice*, 19(3), 330-344.
doi:10-1177/1043986203254530.
- Garner, J.H., Maxwell, C.D., Heraux, C.G. (2002), Characteristics associated with the prevalence and severity of force used by police, *Justice Quarterly*, 19(4), 705-746.
- Glaser, B.G., & Strauss, A.L. (2006), The discovery of grounded theory: strategies for qualitative research, *Aldine Transaction, New Brunswick, U.S.A.*

- Haar, R.N., & Morash, M. (1999), Gender, race and strategies of coping with occupational stress in policing, *Justice Quarterly*, 16(2), 303-336.
- Hamberger, L. (2005), Men's and women's use of intimate partner violence in clinical samples: toward a gender sensitive analysis, *Violence and Victims*, 20(2), 131-151
- Hein, L.D. (2010), A police officer's level of formal education and use of force, Dissertation Northern Arizona University UMI Number: 3425546.
- Hodgson, J.F. (2001), Police violence in Canada and the USA: analysis and management, *Policing*, 24(4), 520-549.
- Horne, P. (2012), Policewomen: Their first century and the new era, *The Police Chief*, 73(9), 10 pages.
- Janesick, V.J. (2011), *Stretching exercises for qualitative researchers*, Sage Publications, Thousand Oaks, California.
- Kakar, S. (2002), Gender and police officers' perceptions of their job performance: an analysis of the relationship between gender and perceptions of job performance, *Criminal Justice Police Review*, 13, 238-256, doi:10.1177/0887403402013003003
- Kenny, D.J., & McNamara, R.P. (1999), *Police and policing contemporary issues*, Praeger Publishers, Westport, CT.
- Kinnaird, B. A. (2003), *Use of force expert guidance for decisive force responses*, Looseleaf Law Publications, U.S.A.

- Klinger, D.A., & Brunson, R.K. (2009), Police officers' perceptual distortions during lethal force situations: informing the reasonableness standard, *Criminology and Public Policy*, 8(1), 117-138.
- Klukkert, A., Ohlemacher, T., Feltes, T. (2009), Torn between two targets: German police officers talk about the use of force, *Crime, Law and Social Change*, 5(2), 181-206.
- Krueger, R.A., (1994), Focus groups, a practical guide for applied research, *Sage Publications, Thousand Oaks, California*.
- Kuhns, J.B. & Knutsson, J. (2010), Police use of force a global perspective, *Praeger, Santa Barbara, Ca*.
- Labaky, E. (2013), Women in policing: their disillusion phase at work, *University of Ottawa, Postdoctoral Studies Masters Thesis, Ottawa, Canada*
- Lan-Ying, H., & Cao, L. (2008), Exploring sexual harassment in a police department in Taiwan, *Policing*, 31(2), 324-340.
- Lee, H., Jang, H., Ilhong, L., Lim, H., Tushaus, D.W. (2010), An examination of police use of force utilizing police training and neighborhood contextual factors: a multilevel analysis, *Policing*, 33(4), 681-702.
- Lonsway, K., More, M., Harrington, P., Smeal, E., Spillar, K. (2003), Hiring and retaining more women: the advantages to law enforcement agencies, *National Center for Women in Policing*, www.womenandpolicing.com, p.1-16

Lonsway, K., Wood, M., Fickling, M., Moore, M., Harrington, P., Smeal, E., Spillar, K.

(2002), Men, women and police excessive force: a tale of two genders,

Published on the Web at:

http://www.womenandpolicing.org/PDF/2002_Excessive_Force.pdf

Maguire, E.R., & Johnson, D. (2010), Measuring public perceptions of the police,

Policing, 33(4), 703-730, doi:10.1108/13639511011085097.

Marche, G.E., (2009), Integrity, culture, and scale: an empirical test of the big bad police

agency, *Crime, Law and Social Change*, 51, 463-486, doi:10.1007/s10611-008

9184-7.

Maxwell, J.A. (2005), *Qualitative research design, an interactive approach*, Sage

Publications, Thousand Oaks, California.

McCarty, W.P., Jihong, S.Z., Garland, B.E. (2007), Occupational stress and burnout

between male and female police officers: are there any gender differences,

Policing, 30(4), 672-691.

Miles, M.B., & Huberman, A.M. (1994), *Qualitative data analysis*, Sage Publications,

Thousand Oaks, California.

Morash, M., Dae-Hoon, K., Haarr, R. (2006), Gender differences in the predictors of

police stress, *Policing*, 29(3), 541-563.

Myrstol, B.A., & Hawk-Tourtlot, S.R. (2011), In search of respect: Examining arrestee

satisfaction with police, *American Journal of Criminal Justice*, 36, 371-391,

doi:10.1007/S12103-011-9111-9.

- Nieuwenhuys, A., Canal-Bruland, R., Oudejans, R.D. (2012), The effects of threat on police officers' shooting behavior: anxiety, action, specificity, and affective influences on perception, *Applied Cognitive Psychology*, 26(4), 608-615.
- Novak, K.J., Brown, R.A., Frank, J. (2011), Women on patrol: an analysis of differences in officer arrest behavior, *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies and Management*, 34(4), 566-587, doi:10.1108/13639511111180216.
- Patton, M.Q. (2002), *Qualitative research and evaluation methods*, Sage Publications, Thousand Oaks, California.
- Paoline III, E.A., & Terrill, W. (2005), The impact of police culture on traffic stop searches: an analysis of attitudes and behavior, *Policing*, 28(3), 455-472.
- Paoline, E.A., & Terrill, W. (2007), Police education, experience, and the use of force, *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 34(2), 179-196.
- Paoline III, E.A., & Terrill, W. (2011), List to me! Police officers' views of appropriate use of force, *Journal of Crime and Justice*, 34(3), 178-189.
- Rabe-Hemp, C., & Schuck, A.M. (2007), Violence against police officers: are female officers at greater risk?, *Police Quarterly*, 10, 411-428, doi:10.1177/1098611107304326.
- Rabe-Hemp, C. (2008), Survival in an "all boys club": policewomen and their fight for acceptance, *Policing*, 31(2), 251-270.
- Reynolds, P.D. (2007), *A primer in theory construction*, Pearson, Allyn and Bacon Publications, Boston, MA, U.S.A., isbn:0-205-50128-1.

- Rubin, H.J., & Rubin, I.S. (2012), *Qualitative Interviewing, the art of hearing*, Sage Publications Thousand, Oaks, California.
- Salo, I., & Alwood, C.M. (2011), Decision-making styles, stress and gender among investigators, *Policing*, 34(1), 97-119.
- Saldana, J. (2013), *The coding manual for qualitative researchers*, Sage Publications, Thousand Oaks, California.
- Seidman, I. (2006), *Interviewing as qualitative research*, Teachers College Press, Columbia University, New York.
- Seidman, I. (2012), *Interviewing as qualitative research: a guide for researchers in education and the social sciences*, Teachers College Press, New York, N.Y.
- Sims, B., Scarborough, K.E., Ahmad, J. (2003), The relationship between police officers' attitudes toward women and perceptions of police models, *Police Quarterly*, 6, 278-297, doi:10.1177/10986111032544315.
- Santos, A., Leather, P., Dunn, J., Zarola, A. (2009), Gender differences in exposure to co-worker and public-initiated violence: assessing the impact of work-related violence and aggression in police work, *Work and Stress*, 23(2), 137-154, doi:10.1080/02678370903087934.
- Seron, C., Pereira, J., Kovath, J. (2004), Judging police misconduct: "street-level" versus professional policing, *Law & Society Review*, 38(4), 665-710.
- Skeem, J., Schubert, C., Stowman, S., Beeson, S., Mulvey, E., Gardner, W., Lidz, C. (2005), Gender and risk assessment accuracy: understanding women's violence

- potential, *Law and Human Behavior*, 29(2), 173-186, doi:10-1007/s10979-0053401-z.
- Sklansky, D. (2006), Not your father's police department: making sense of the new demographics of law enforcement, *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology*, 96(3), 1209-1220.
- Skolnick, J.H., (2011), Justice without trial – law enforcement in democratic society, *Quid Pro Books, New Orleans, Louisiana*.
- Slovic, P. (1999), Trust, emotion, sex, politics, and science: surveying the risk assessment battlefield, *Risk Analysis*, 19(4), 689-701.
doi:10.1023/A:1007041821623.
- Smith, B. (2003), The impact of police officer diversity on police-caused homicides, *Policy Studies Journal*, 31(2), 147-162. doi:10.1111/1541-0072.t01-1-00009.
- Smith, M. R., Makarios, M., Alpert, G.P. (2006), Differential suspicion: theory specification and gender effects in the traffic stop context, *Justice Quarterly*, 23(2), 271-295.
- Swan, S.C., Gambone, L.J., Fields, A.M., Tami, P., Snow, D.L. (2005), Women who use violence in intimate relationships: the role of anger, victimization and symptoms of posttraumatic stress and depression, *Violence and Victims*, 20(3), 267-285.
- Teasdale, B., Silver, E., Monahan, J. (2006), Gender, threat, control-override delusions and violence, *Law and Human Behaviour*, 30, 649-658.
doi:10.1007/s10979-06-9044-x

- Terpstra, J., & Trommel, W. (2009), Police, managerialization and presentational strategies, *Policing*, Bradford, 32(1) 128-145.
- Terrill, W., Paoline, E.A., Manning, P.K. (2003), Police culture and coercion, *Criminology*, 41(4), 1003-1034.
- Terrill, W. (2005), Police use of force: a transactional approach, *Justice Quarterly*, 11(1), 107-138.
- Terrill, W., & Paoline III, E.A. (2013), Less lethal force policy and police officer perceptions: a multisite examination, *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, online Sage Publications, doi:10.1177/0093854813485074.
- Vaughan, D. (1998), Rational choice, situated action, and the social control of organizations, *Law and Society Review*, Criminal Justice Periodicals, 32, (1), 23-61, doi: 10.2307/827748.
- Waddington, P.A.J., Adang, O., Baker, D., Birkbeck, C., Feltes, T., Gabaldon, L.G. Machado, E.P., Stenning, P. (2009), Singing the same tune - International continuities and discontinuities in how police talk about using force, *Crime Law and Social Change*, 52, 111-138, doi:10.1007/S10611-008-9176-7.
- Waddington, P.A.J., Kleinig, J., Wright, M. (2013), Professional police practice, *Oxford University Press, Oxford U.K.*
- Welsh, S. (1999), Gender and sexual harassment, *Annual Review of Sociology*, 25, 169-190, doi:10.1146/annurev.soc.25.1.169.
- Westley, W. (1970), Violence and the police: a sociological study of law, custom, and morality, *Boston: MIT Press.*

- White, M.D. (2002), Identifying situational predictors of police shootings using multivariate analysis, *Policing*, 25(4), 726-751.
- Wilson, S., & Buckler, K. (2010), The debate over police reform: examining minority support for citizen oversight and resistance by police unions, *American Journal of Criminal Justice*, 35, 184-197, doi:10.1007/s12103-010 9079-x.
- Woodington, W. (2010), The cognitive foundations of formal equality: Incorporating gender schema theory to eliminate sex discrimination toward women in the legal profession, *Law and Psychology Review*, 34, 135-152.
- Zanin, B., (2009), *Gazette - RCMP use of force and the law*, *The Gazette*, Vol. 70(4) <http://www.rcmp-grc.gc.ca/gazette/vol70n4/force-eng.htm>

Appendix “A” – Progressive Study Scenario and Application Method (Focus Group Interviews)

The scenario to be used for the focus group interviews reads as follows;

Part 1 - It is dusk on a warm mid-summer evening with lots of people out and about in public. Constable Wong and Constable Wilson are on routine mobile patrol in a ‘rough’ part of town. They see a black BMW model 318, with an “N” sticker and blacked out windows and booming to the sound of a stereo system. The car engine is running. The car is parked in a manner that is causing a minor obstruction to passing traffic. The officers decide to pull over and have a word with the occupants of the car.

Constable Wong alights from the patrol car and walks over to the car. She taps on the front passenger window and slowly it is lowered a few inches. In the car are two young males, one of whom – Dominic “Dave” Atwal – Constable Wong recognizes right away as a local petty criminal. There is the distinct odor of cannabis smoke from within the car.

Q.1 – What do you think is likely to happen next?

Q.2 – What is the officer likely to do?

Q.3 – Why? Is she justified in her actions?

Q.4 – What else might she do now or should have done?

Part 2 – The occupants in the car refuse to comply with the officer’s requests that they step out of the car and provide driving documents. They challenge her authority to make this request and accuse her of picking on them because of race. This conversation is conducted loudly and with frequent use of obscenities.

Q.5 – What do you think happens next?

Q.6 – How would the officers act?

Q.7 – Why? Are they justified?

Part 3 – In the course of this conversation the driver suddenly drives away at high speed.

Q.8 – How are the officers likely to respond?

Q.9 – How appropriate is that?

Part 4 – Meanwhile, Constable Wilson has been running a CPIC, PRIME and other checks and as the car pulls away is informed that the car is suspected of involvement in a drugs-related shooting incident. The subject driver has a warning signal for possession of weapons on the CPIC Alert system.

The officers follow the car and soon other units are being deployed to the pursuit. There is no traffic car readily available, but one of the vehicles that will respond to the call for assistance is a tactical weapons response unit and this vehicle gets involved. The pursuit continues for some distance with the BMW failing to stop at traffic lights and nearly colliding with other vehicles. As it attempts to negotiate a left turn, the driver loses control, collides with another vehicle and comes to rest in a ditch. The occupants jump from the car and begin to run into a housing development.

Q.10 – What is likely to happen now?

Q.11 – How in your view should the officers respond?

Part 5 - The tactical weapons team officers pursue the occupants of the car on foot towards a shopping area. As they do so they see the subject holding what appears to be a handgun.

Q.12 – What do you think will happen next?

Q.13 – What actions would be appropriate and inappropriate?

The focus group interviews will terminate when the groups have each exhausted the discussion and the discussions become repetitive in terms of supporting information presented. I, as the researcher will wind down these interviews by thanking the participants, reaffirm the concepts of confidentiality, privacy and anonymity. A request for any final comments to wind up the interviews will be made prior to formally ending the interviews and shutting off the recording equipment.

In summary, this instrument will be used to guide the focus groups through a thought process that is progressive in terms of citizen resistance levels. In this scenario the police officers recognize a potentially hazardous traffic situation and in their attempt to neutralize the hazard, they are met with a significant amount of resistance from the occupants of the subject vehicle. It is important for the interviewer to ensure that during these focus group interviews the participants do most of the talking. The interviewer should mostly use the scripted prompts to keep the dialogue moving forward but not offer opinions that might set a different direction for the discussion or demonstrate interviewer biases. It is the opinions of the officers in the focus groups that are important to the data collection regarding this method of data generation and collection.

The participant's written permission will be obtained to capture the recorded data. The confidential management of the data will be discussed with the participants prior to obtaining their permission.

Appendix “B” – In-depth Individual Interviews

I intend to structure the research interview questionnaire based on the research questions that were designed to guide this research. The questionnaire will appear as it does in the following format:

Research Question 1: What are the different ways in which police officers talk about or justify the application of physical force?

Interview Question 1.1: Tell me about a time when you were required to arrest a subject who decided that he or she were going to resist the arrest. What happened and how did you respond?

Interview Question 1.2: What was the crime that this person was arrested for?

Interview Question 1.3: How did the person’s behaviour make you feel?

Interview Question 1.4: What was the public safety threat you were focused on during this incident?

Interview Question 1.5: When you went to arrest this person, what did you say to make that person aware that he/she was being arrested?

Interview Question 1.6: What conversation did you have with this person prior to arresting him/her?

Interview Question 1.7: How did that person respond when you advised him/her about your intention to arrest?

Interview Question 1.8: How did you respond to what that person said to you?

Interview Question 1.9: How did you feel about that response?

Interview Question 1.10: What did the person specifically do to cause you to use force to complete the arrest?

Interview Question 1.11: How did you feel about what they did?

Interview Question 1.12: Could this event have been resolved without using the powers of arrest? What would that have looked like?

Research Question 2:

What are the different ways in which police officers are critical of the application of physical force?

Interview Question 2.1: Tell me about a time when you were working with a colleague who decided to arrest a person with physical force or to intervene in a situation where force was required that you thought might have been handled better. What happened and how did you respond?

Interview Question 2.2: What was the crime this person was being arrested for?

Interview Question 2.3: What specifically was the justification for using force to make this arrest?

Interview Question 2.4: What in this circumstance did you not agree with?

Interview question 2.5: How did that make you feel?

Interview Question 2.6: What did you do or say to help mitigate any consequences of this event?

Interview Question 2.7: What other ways could this event have been resolved?

I anticipate that the responses to these questions will cover the entire list of research questions that are driving this research. The research questions 1 and 2 are the primary

questions focusing this research. The interviews will be audio recorded to account for all the conversation within the interviews. Written permission to record each session will be obtained from the participants

Appendix "C" – Letter of Cooperation

Cooperation Letter

Saskatoon Police Service
76 – 25th Street East
Saskatoon, Saskatchewan
Canada, S7K 3R6
(306) 975-8300
Attention: Chief Clive Weighill

Date: 15 July 2014

Dear Mr. Orville A. Nickel,

The Saskatoon Police Service is pleased to accept your offer to conduct the study entitled, Critical Factors in Police Use of Force Decisions. I understand that you will require access to serving police members of our department for purposes of focus group interviews and/or structured individual interviews.

I further understand that you will be conducting this study under the guidance of the Walden University principles of ethical research as it applies to human research subjects. I expect that your research will conform to the standards of confidentiality both for the police members and the general public as set out in the university researcher's ethical guidelines.

The participation of individuals in this study will be voluntary and at their own discretion. There will be no influence on the Police Service members whether they should or should not participate from senior management or other sources.

I understand Saskatoon Police Service responsibilities entail; providing access to study participants, an assigned coordinator within the Police Service to help search for volunteer participants, access to interview, boardroom and/or training room facilities within the Service as available at the time of the actual focus group discussions or individual interviews where these activities may be conducted. In the event that one of the participants is on duty at the time of the interview(s) his or her participation will be at the discretion of the member's supervisor. The Saskatoon Police Service reserves the right to withdraw from the study at any time as required by changing circumstances.

I confirm that I am authorized to approve research in this setting. I understand that the data collected will remain entirely confidential and may not be provided to anyone outside of the research team without permission from the Walden University Internal Review Board and the Saskatoon Police Service.

It is agreed the Saskatoon Police Service will receive a copy of the study when completed.

Sincerely,



Clive Weighill
Chief of Police
Saskatoon Police Service
Saskatoon, Saskatchewan, Canada

Appendix “D” - Consent Form

Critical Factors in Police Use of Force Decisions

You are invited to take part in a research study that will focus on critical decision factors in police use of force circumstances. The researcher is inviting members of the Canadian police agencies to be in the study. This form is part of a process called “informed consent” to allow you to understand this study before deciding whether to take part.

This study is being conducted by a researcher named Orville Nickel, who is a former member of the RCMP, currently undertaking doctoral studies at Walden University in the Human Services – Criminal Justice program.

Background Information:

The purpose of this study is to gain a comprehensive understanding of the decision making processes involved when police officers are required to respond to a difficult circumstance in the course of their duties that might become confrontational or ultimately violent. It is important to this research to learn about the points within potentially violent circumstances how officers arrive at the decision to use physical force. The study results may impact officer safety issues and may help police officers to be better equipped to identify the nature of violent circumstances and prescribe useful strategies to mitigate subject aggression and violence.

Procedures:

If you agree to be in this study you will be asked to:

- Participate in a focus group interview setting wherein a group of participants will be asked to engage in a discussion relating to a progressive scenario developed by researchers that will focus on an operational event that most members will easily identify with and be able to contribute their expertise to the discussion.
- Participate in an individual interview wherein the researcher will ask a series of questions regarding the topic described above and explore your responses in some depth.
- You will only be asked to participate in a focus group interview or an individual interview but not both. This is to limit the amount of personal time required to participate in this study. Your time is valuable and we appreciate your willingness to participate but we also want to be respectful of your needs and we will try not to ask too much from you in terms of your time.
- The interviews will last for approximately one hour and they will be conducted in a place of your convenience for the individual interviews. The focus group interviews will be held in a convenient location such as your office boardroom or in a training room if convenient to and with the permission of your Officer Commanding.

Voluntary Nature of the Study:

This study is voluntary. Everyone will respect your decision of whether or not you choose to be in the study. No one within your agency will treat you differently if you decide not to be in the study. If you decide to join the study now, you can still change your mind later. You may stop at any time.

Risk and Benefits of Being in the Study:

Being in this type of a study involves some risk of the minor discomforts that can be encountered in daily life, such as stimulating memories of difficult circumstances you have had to deal with in your past policing service, or the differences in opinion others might have relative to your opinions. The researcher is experienced and is present to mitigate potential risks as much as possible and to maintain a professional environment wherein all participants can comfortably take part.

The study is designed to help identify decision factors that contribute to the use of force by police officers. Through this effort the researchers hope to contribute to a safer workplace for police officers, enhance matters of public safety and situational controls.

Payment:

There is no payment offered for your participation in this study. The researcher and Walden University are grateful for your desire to participant.

Privacy:

Any information you provide will be kept strictly confidential. The researcher will not use your personal information for any purposes outside of this research project. Also, the researcher will not include your name or anything else that could identify you in the study reports. Data will be kept secure on electronic storage devices such as “thumb drives” that are stored separately from desktops or lap top devices, locked in an appropriate storage location such as a locked filing cabinet in my office. The data will be kept for a period of at least 5 years, as required by the University.

Contacts and Questions:

You may ask any questions you have now. Or if you have questions later, you may contact the researcher via email at Orville.Nickel@waldenu.edu or by phone at 604-551-5119. If you want to talk privately about your rights as a participant, you can call Dr. Leilani Endicott. She is the Walden University representative who can discuss this with you. Her phone number is, 1-612-312-1210. Walden University's approval number for this study is IRB 10-10-14-0175192. This approval expires on the following date; October 9, 2015.

The researcher will give you a copy of this form to keep. Please keep this consent form for your records.

Statement of Consent:

I have read the above information and I feel I understand the study well enough to make a decision about my involvement. By signing below, I consent. I understand that I am agreeing to the terms described above.

Printed Name of Participant _____

Date of Consent _____

Participant's Signature _____

Researcher's Signature _____

Appendix "E" - Confidentiality Agreement

Critical Factors in Police Use of Force Decisions

Name of Person Signing: _____

During the course of my activity in collecting data for this research: "Critical Factors in Police use of Force Decisions", I will have access to information, which is confidential and should not be disclosed. I acknowledge that the information must remain confidential, and that improper disclosure of confidential information can be damaging to the participant.

By signing this Confidentiality Agreement I acknowledge and agree that:

1. I will not disclose or discuss any confidential information with others, including friends or family.
2. I will not in any way divulge, copy, release, sell, loan, alter or destroy any confidential information except as properly authorized.
3. I will not discuss confidential information where others can overhear the conversation. I understand that it is not acceptable to discuss confidential information even if the participant's name is not used.
4. I will not make any unauthorized transmissions, inquiries, modifications or purging of confidential information.
5. I agree that my obligations under this agreement will continue after termination of the project.
6. I understand that violation of this agreement will have legal implications.
7. I will only access or use systems or devices I'm officially authorized to access and I will not demonstrate the operation or function of systems or devices to unauthorized individuals.

By signing this document, I acknowledge that I have read the agreement and I agree to comply with all the terms and conditions stated above.

Signed: _____

Date: _____

Appendix “F” - Coding

In grounded research coding is an important part of the analytic process within the qualitative interviewing structure. The data needs to be coded so that the researcher can facilitate the retrieval of what is said on each topic by the different participants (Rubin & Rubin, 2012). I hope to use the computer program NVIVO 10 for Mac to help the coding component of my analysis. The developer of the software is unsure how quickly the Mac version of the software will be available. Alternatively, I will use an Excel spreadsheet to list the prominent codes along with the salient passages.

Charmaz, (2012), indicated that grounded theory coding generates the bones of the analysis. Theoretical integration will assemble these bones and build them into a working skeleton. Therefore, coding helps to shape an analytic framework from which the analysis is structured. It becomes the pivotal link between collecting data and developing an emergent theory to explain these data. In this phase of the analysis we begin to determine what the data means (Charmaz, 2012).

Rubin and Rubin (2012) indicated that the researcher should start his or her coding based on the research questions that were asked. In my study I am interested in the police officers' decision-making processes when faced with a difficult situation. Therefore I believe that I will probably start by looking at how the officers determine their authority to be involved in a disputed situation. The next steps could possibly be linked to the alternative resolution processes that the study participants search within their own minds. The decisions that arrive at a strategy to resolve the situational circumstances is the

ultimate point of interest for my study but only the participants know what these considerations will be, based on the circumstances presented.

The experts in conducting qualitative focus group interviews such as Charmaz (2012), Rubin & Rubin (2012) and Creswell (2009) all tell us that what is really important in the study processes is to look for the concepts and themes that are of interest to the participants and to look for what they frequently mention on their own and to which they give special emphasis.

The coding practices are likely to vary as the analysis of the data progresses. In some places in the interview transcripts the coding is likely to proceed line by line and at other times it might be incident by incident. The data will determine how the process will progress. Charmaz (2012) indicated that coding is the first part of the adventure that enables the researcher to make the leap from concrete events to theoretical insights and possibilities. Without having the data in front of me it is hard to determine the steps the process will take, exactly. The adventure, however, is soon to begin.

Coding is crucial to analysis. Coding is about linking ideas and takes the researcher from the data to the idea and from the idea to other data that speaks about the same idea (Saldana, 2013). Some coding terms I expect to investigate will reflect terms such as, “resistance”, “situational circumstances”, “perception”, “body language”, “facial expressions”, “verbalization” and other terms specific to the individual participants and their specific experiences. My challenges will be to remain sensitive to the uniqueness of each participant’s experiences and feelings of threat and risks assessed.

Appendix "G" - Invitation to Participate

To: Participant's Name

Date:

Dear Participant's Name,

Re: Structured Research Study Participation

You have consented to voluntarily participate in a Walden University study entitled Critical Factors in Police Use of Force Decisions. This study will entail two components. Firstly, there will be a number of focus group interviews, one of which you have kindly volunteered to participate in. Secondly, the study will entail a number of semi-structured in-depth individual interviews.

These focus group interviews will be conducted to enhance the information currently available on the topic of police use of force. The idea is that with more information available on how police officers arrive at their decisions to use force, the safer the entire process of use of force management will be. This study will contribute by enhancing the information currently known on the topic by adding another dimension of information that currently is not clear.

The idea of the study is to create an environment that enhances safety for officers, citizens and the general public through enhancing the confrontation management methods for police officers locally as well as in a larger geographic context.

Your participation in this study is appreciated and if you have any questions please do not hesitate to contact me at your convenience. Thank you and I look forward to meeting with you soon.

Regards,

Orville A. Nickel
Doctoral Student
Walden University
(604) 551-5119
Orville.Nickel@waldenu.edu

Appendix H: Table of Cases and Legal References

CanLII – Constitution Act 1982, Schedule B to the Canada Act

(Retrieved from www.CanLii.org/en/ca/Const1982.html)

Chartier v. Greaves, (2001), O.J. No. 634, (QL), (S.C.J.), at paragraph 59

Cluett v. The Queen, 1985 Canll 52 (SCC) [1985] 2 S.C.R., 216 (Retrieved from

www.canlii.org/en/ca/scc/doc/1985canlii52/1985canlii52.html)

Graham v. Connor, (1989), 490 U.S., 386 (U.S. Supreme Court Cases)

(Retrieved from Justica US Supreme Court Center at

www.supreme.justica.com/cases/federal/us/490/386/case.html)

Holgate-Mohammed v. Duke, (1984) A.C., 437 (cited in R. v. Asante-Mensah)

R. v. Asante-Mensah, (2003), 2 S.C.R., 3, [2003], SCC 38 (Retrieved from

www.canlii.org)

R. v. Bottrell, 1981, CanLII 352 (BC CA) (Retrieved from <http://canlii.ca/t/231z7>)

R. v. Ferguson, 2008, SCC6, [2008] 1 SCR 96 (Retrieved from www.canlii.org)

R. v. Gangl, (2010), ABPC 105, Docket 071568778P1, (Retrieved from

www2.albertacourts.ab.ca/adb/2003-/pc/criminal/2010abpc0105.pdf)

R. v. Khamis, 2010, ONCJ 344 (Retrieved from www.canlii.org)

R. v. Nasogaluak, 2010, SCC 6, [2010] 1 S.C.R. 206 (Retrieved from www.canlii.org)

Tennessee v. Garner, (1985), 471 U.S. 1 (Retrieved from Justica US Supreme Court

Center at www.supreme.justica.com/cases/federal/us/471/case.htm)

Wilson v. Durham Regional Police, 2011, ONSC 3419 (Retrieved from

www.canlii.org).