

Police Forum

Volume 26 Number 3

December 2016

From the Editor

Just in time for you to enjoy over your holiday break, we have 2016's final issue of *Police Forum*. You will find this issue to be a timely one in its coverage of police use of force. You might also find some controversy in the essays and Academic Pontifications included herein. The extensive police experience and advanced academic credentials of our authors give us an applicable and digestible newsletter, which is an important point of distinction for this outlet.

Both essays in this issue reference PERF's recent use of force guidelines and analyze gaps between the training and application of force where the "rubber meets the road." The lead essay argues for a new approach to police use of force training. It offers a dynamic way of training officers that coincides with the equally dynamic use of force situations in which police may find themselves. The second essay critiques PERF's force principle of "proportionality" and highlights the disconnect between what appears to be racially-biased uses of force and the process of police enculturation that feeds "objective biases."

This issue also includes entries in the Academic Pontification section. Rutgers University post-doctoral fellow Madeleine Novich explains how supporters of the Black Lives Matter movement and police could and should work together for more just policing. Then, former NYPD captain James Albrecht's gives his perspective on the "war on cops" and the "Ferguson effect."

Please take a look at page 25 to read good news from our members (including policing blogs of note) and to meet two more members of the Police Section executive board. I encourage you to submit your policing articles for consideration, and also hope that you will continue to submit any police/policing-related announcements, essays, book reviews, white papers, job openings, etc. We have a varied and large readership that will benefit from your additions. You may email your submissions to acjspoliceforum@gmail.com.

Lastly, regarding our efforts to create a peer-reviewed section in *Police Forum*—thank you to those who have agreed to join the editorial board and to those who have shown great interest in submitting for peer-review. We continue to work on getting approval for and implementing a refereed section. Contact me at Michael.jenkins@scranton.edu if you would like to discuss this or anything else.

Enjoy a peaceful holiday season, a warm beverage, and a happy reading of *Police Forum*!
Michael J. Jenkins
Editor, *Police Forum*

From the Chair

Season's greetings! I would like to extend my best wishes to everyone and send my personal wish for a great and prosperous New Year. As we approach 2017, the police section will see a new chair taking over at our next meeting. Dr. Steve Morreale will be coming on-board and has a host of great ideas and a huge amount of energy. I'd like to take this opportunity to officially wish Steve the best of luck in the chair's position.

Going into the new year we are faced with the continuous improvement of policing in America. From the way we train officers, to police interactions with their communities, and the constant effort to achieve transparency and legitimacy, it is incumbent on us as researchers and practitioners to keep things moving forward. Researcher-practitioner partnerships are more important than ever to keep our inquiries relevant and vital. It is imperative that we conduct research that has application. Policing is a constant sociological experiment and such an integral part of American communities that we cannot afford to get it wrong.

To this end, we had hoped to have begun publishing this newsletter with a peer reviewed article section. Our communication with the executive board of ACJS over the next few months should allow *Police Forum* to start publishing peer-reviewed articles in 2017. Thank you for your continued support in this area.

For those of our members that are academics, please enjoy the winter break. For those of us that are on the job, enjoy the holidays and stay safe.

John
Chair, ACJS Police Section

Police Use of Force: Transitioning Policy into Practice

Steven F. Hundersmarck, Ph.D.
Ferris State University

Gregory Vanderkooi, Ph.D.
Ferris State University

Michael Vasicek, Ed.D.
Ferris State University

Abstract

There has been much debate over the use of force in police work. As a result of increased scrutiny by the public and the federal government, police agencies have responded by developing more comprehensive force policies. Despite the call for new policies, little development and innovation has occurred in addressing training. The authors argue that voluminous policies coupled with static training may further confuse use of force decisions by police officers. Police training must involve problem-based learning scenarios that involve assessment of situations even before a use of force decision is made.

The Problem

Police administrators have adopted more complex use of force policies in response to high profile events and the ever-evolving use of force paradigm. The policies are continually becoming more complex to try and cover the many force situations that officers may encounter on the street. Police officers increasingly have more use of force options available to them, which also add to the intricate nature of policies. In an attempt to regulate and identify every type of force situation, use of force policies have continued to become more complex. Police departments that provide inadequate training methods will only exacerbate use of force problems when they adopt a comprehensive policy. Police departments must understand how learning occurs and how to use such learning to develop a policy and training that will assist officers in use of force situations. A properly trained officer is not trained on policy. A properly trained officer is a problem solver who can use policy to solve complex problems on the street.

Defining and Responding to Use of Force

Police use of force has historically been hard to define in concept and in practice. Terrill, Paoline and Ingram (2011) noted the differentiation of use of force policies in randomly selected police agencies across the United States. The authors concluded that of the agencies that had a use of force policy, “123 different permutations [of force levels] were detected, ranging from 3 to 9

different levels” (p. 11). Traditionally force policies consist of verbiage that outlines force decisions accompanied by a force continuum model. There has been great variation in both the policy and the use of force continuum. Currently the focus is on changing both.

Force continuums are used as a visual representation for officers to understand and apply to use of force situations. Recently there has been a call for change in the design of force continuums. A report entitled, *RE-Engineering Training on Police Use of Force* (2015) by the Police Executive Research Forum (PERF) calls for a move away from use of force continuums “where levels of resistance are matched with specific police tactics and weapons” (p. 9). The report notes that existing continuums are outdated and use of force cannot be “measured in such a mechanical way” (p. 9). The report instead calls for officers to be trained to make good decisions based on all the options available to them including de-escalation (2015). This model known as the CAPRA model (Client, Acquiring and Analyzing, Partnerships, Response, Assessment) was initially implemented by the Canadian Mounted Police. The new model adds more responsibility and decision-making for the individual officer. The officer is required in the model to evaluate multiple criteria when making use of force decisions (Royal Canadian Mounted Police, 2016). The importance of evaluative skills in the model highlights the need for more training in decision-making and problem solving.

At the same time we are expecting officers to make more decisions in the force continuum we are also restricting their actions in use of force policies. There has been continued pressure on police agencies to adopt more comprehensive policies. The President’s Task Force on Policing in the 21st Century (2015) recommended that “Law Enforcement agencies should have comprehensive policies on the use of force that include training, investigations, prosecutions, data collection, and information sharing” (p. 20). The result has been more comprehensive policies that attempt to identify all use of force contingencies. In Seattle, Washington a new use of force policy was adopted which consisted of a 10-page policy accompanied by 70 pages of procedural manuals. The policy replaced an antiquated five-page manual (Miletich, & Carter, 2013). Likewise the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department made comprehensive changes to their use of force policy. The new 33-page policy, “describes the parameters for using force but also provides a use of force model, standard definitions of terms, and much prose that adds context and justification for the policy” (Stewart, Rodriguez-King, & Rickman, 2012, p.11).

In a lawsuit filed in response to the new use of force policy in Seattle, officers claimed that the changes in the policy created “hesitation and paralysis” among officers, stripping them of their constitutional and legal right to make reasonable, split-second judgments in the line of duty (Miletich, Sullivan & Carter, 2014). The onus has been placed on the officer. While the new force continuums places more decision-making on the officer, the policies that frame the force continuum are more restrictive. Under this arrangement, appropriate training for officers is even more vital.

Transfer of Learning

Police departments spend much time addressing use of force in their policy decisions yet spend little time contemplating how officers will transfer policy into action. Many police departments still rely on a theory of transfer of learning that negates the learning styles and the contexts in which an officer must apply the policy. Adopting written policies that attempt to identify every use of force contingency that an officer has to memorize and transfer to field situations is consistent with a behaviorist philosophy of learning. This type of transfer is more conducive to classroom learning with subject matter that can be incrementally learned and applied. Transfer of this nature is more difficult when applying a written policy to a use of force situation in the field without training.

One method of improving transfer is to develop a structure of training that facilitates the understanding of general principles or concepts (Marton, 2006). The knowledge gained from the cognitive school of thought is that students need time to organize information into concepts before they can properly transfer knowledge between situations. Policy should not be structured as an unrelated set of rules or guidelines. An unstructured 80-page policy is more likely to confuse an officer and result in a wrong action than is a deficient five-page policy. The most important concepts in police policy should be identified. They may include: use of distance, time, de-escalation/escalation of force, use of cover/concealment/obstructions and the use of communication during the incident. Training should include the concepts that bridge the progressive force levels. Unstructured training and use of scenarios does not guarantee transfer.

Another theory of transfer—situated learning—investigates how learning is transferred between different learning environments. As noted by Wenger (2010) “Learning is not just acquiring skills and information; it is becoming a certain person, a knower in a context where what it means to know is negotiated with respect to the regime of competence of a community” (p. 181). Learning in a community of practice (Wenger, 2010) is a product of an individual’s interaction in a community. As individuals interact in the larger community and learn the practice of the community, they adapt their learning to that community.

A police department is its own community and operates within a larger community context. The larger community in which the officers serve will have an influence on use of force learning as will the informal community of officers within the police department. Communities have varying levels of tolerance for their police departments’ applications of force. Similarly, police agencies may have their own informal codes shared amongst officers that determine the appropriateness of the use of force.

The transfer of learning from policy to practice is best utilized as part of a community of practice. To do this, departments must take steps to ensure learning goes beyond the policy book. To be effective, the transfer of learning into action takes place across different contexts and must be embedded into practice. If learning is static and is restricted to policy it will be bound to that context. To overcome the limitations of rote memorization, or a classroom based environment, police agencies must utilize advanced learning techniques that seep into the community of practice and that comprises the police department and larger community. Problem-based learning

uses all three theories of learning and is an ideal form of learning for adults who must enact their learning in dynamic ways.

Problem-Based Learning – Optimizing Transfer

We advocate for a Problem-Based Learning (PBL) model. According to Barrows (1996), problem-based learning is characterized by specific criteria: (1) learning is student-centered, (2) learning occurs in small student groups, (3) teachers are facilitators, (4) problems form the organizing focus and stimulus for learning, (5) problems are a vehicle for the development of problem-solving skills, and (6) new information is acquired through self-directed learning. (Vander Kooi & Bierlein-Palmer, 2015; Cleveland & Saville, 2004).

In problem-based learning instructors must carefully construct use of force situations to be used in training. Trainers are also used as “facilitators rather than disseminators,” (Wilkerson and Gijsselaers, 1996). The focus is getting learners to work together to solve problems instead of solving problems for them. The trainer is responsible for bringing resources to learners who solve problems. In problem-based learning most of the work is done in the initial set up and construction of the ill-structured problems. Once the lesson has begun the instructor monitors and guides the instruction as needed. The role of the instructor is based on skill and knowledge. The instructor must also take on the role of problem-solving facilitator throughout the exercise.

Training in groups is essential in problem-based learning. Group-work helps develop learning communities. This is absolutely essential in bridging a written policy to use on the street. Groups of officers actively engaged in problem-solving will be more likely to incorporate the learning into their practice on the street if they are engaged as representative practitioners in solving a problem. Group of learners will also be more likely to understand the affordances and limitations they encounter in practice. Group-work is also motivating for learners and is more conducive for members to participate than in a classroom or lecture environment. The instructor at this stage of the learning process must monitor and guide group-work as needed to keep the group on task.

It should be noted that scenario-based learning is not the same as problem-based learning (Queen, 2016). Scenario-based learning may be a part of problem-based learning if utilized correctly. Like other forms of instruction, scenario-based teaching does not guarantee transfer. Scenario-based learning may not incorporate constructivist or situated learning principles if provided piecemeal to learners. Police officers who go through use of force scenarios that address a single element of force with no instruction in underlying concepts will not transfer it beyond the single context of training.

Conclusions

Police agencies and policy writers have depended on policies to guide the actions of officers while neglecting to understand theories of transfer of learning. Agencies that rely on policy alone do a disservice to their officers and the larger community they serve. Handing an officer a highly

technical 80-page manual without the adequate training and supervision will assure that an officer will be unable to convert the policy into proper action on the street. Likewise adopting a force continuum that places more decision-making on the officer without training that officer to do so adequately will lead to lawsuits, injury or death to the officer or a citizen. Agencies should also be aware of the larger community that they serve and the community of practice for officers on the street. Training and policy should encompass both. Policies that grant officers the leeway to apply universal concepts together with the flexibility practiced in problem-based learning will be more likely to result in proper action on the street.

Vander Kooi (2006) suggests, “The dynamics of policing strategies have changed. Police executives are requiring their police officers to become problem solvers” (p. 73). Cavanaugh (2001) proposes “that without the support of senior administrators, any attempts to change a pedagogical philosophy are doomed for failure” (p. 30). Administrators must gather buy-in at all levels of the organization to ensure a transition to a problem-based learning model. Otherwise, the simpler, more expedient traditional-lecture based model will endure. We need to provide the individuals that we train with the critical thinking and problem-solving tools in order to resolve the dynamic issues police officers face every day.

References

- Barrows, H. S. (1996). Problem-based learning in medicine and beyond: A brief overview. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning*, 68, 3-13.
- Cavanaugh, J. C. (2001). Make it so: Administrative support for problem-based learning. *The power of problem-based learning: A practical “how to” for teaching undergraduate courses in any discipline*. Sterling, VA: Stylus Publishing, LLC.
- Cleveland, G., & Saville, G. (2004). *Police Training Officer (PTO) Trainee Manual*. Retrieved from <http://ric-zai-inc.com/Publications/cops-w0247-pub.pdf>
- Marton, F. (2006). Sameness and difference in transfer. *The Journal of the Learning Sciences*, 15(4), 499-535.
- Miletich, S., & Carter, M. (2013, December 13). Judge OKs new Seattle police policy on use of force. Retrieved from <http://www.seattletimes.com>
- Miletich, S., Sullivan, J. & Carter, M. (2014, May 28) Seattle cops sue over DOJ reforms Retrieved from <http://www.seattletimes.com>
- President’s Task Force on 21st Century Policing. (2015). *Final report of the President’s Task Force on 21st Century Policing*. Washington, DC: Office of Community Oriented Policing Services
- Police Executive Research Forum (2015). *Re-engineering Training On Police Use of Force*. Washington D.C.
- Queen, C.R. (2016) *Effectiveness of Problem-Based Learning Strategies Within Police Training Academies and Correlates With Licensing Exam Outcomes*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Western Michigan University, Kalamazoo, Michigan
- Royal Canadian Mounted Police (2016). *Incident Management Intervention Model*. Retrieved from <http://www.rcmp-grc.gc.ca/ccaps-spcca/cew-ai/imim-migi-eng.htm> on 3-23-2016
- Stewart, J. K., Fachner, G, Rodriguez-King, D., & Rickman, S. (2012). *Collaborative Reform*

- Process: A Review of Officer-Involved Shootings in the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department* (Washington, DC: Office of Community Oriented Policing Services, 2012).
- Terrill, W., Paoline, E. & Ingram, J. (2012). *Final Technical Report Draft: Assessing Police Use of Force Policy and Outcomes*. Unpublished report submitted to U.S Department of Justice. Retrieved February 4th, 2012 from <https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/nij/grants/237794.pdf>.
- Vander Kooi, G. P. (2006) *Problem-Based Learning: An Attitudinal Study Of Police Academy Students*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Western Michigan University, Kalamazoo, Michigan
- Wenger, E. "Communities of practice and social learning systems: the career of a concept." *Social learning systems and communities of practice*. Springer London, 2010. 179-198.
- Wilkerson, L., & Gijsselaers, W. H. (1996). "Concluding comments." In L. Wilkerson & W. H. Gijsselaers (Eds.), *Bringing problem-based learning to higher education: Theory and practice* (pp. 101-104). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

About the authors . . .

Steven F. Hundersmarck Ph.D. is the Interim Director and Assistant Professor of Criminal Justice at Ferris State University. Steve graduated with his doctorate degree from Michigan State University. He has been a professor since 2005. Steve has written numerous articles on police officer training and learning. Prior to teaching Steve was a police officer for over 20 years in Texas and Michigan. He rose through the ranks from police officer to chief of police.

Dr. Gregory P. Vander Kooi is a Professor at Ferris State University, College of Education and Human Services, Department of Criminal Justice in Big Rapids MI. His current responsibilities include faculty member, Deputy Director of the Ferris State University's Law Enforcement academy and the Graduate Coordinator of Criminal Justice Masters program. As a retired Michigan State Police Post Commander, he is acutely aware of the training needs for both recruit schools and in-service trainings. Dr. Vander Kooi earned his Ph.D. from Western Michigan University in Educational Leadership with a focus on adult learning strategies.

Michael S. Vasicek, Ed.D. is an Assistant Professor of Criminal Justice at Ferris State University. Mike received his doctoral degree from Wayne State University following his 32 year law enforcement career, where he retired as Undersheriff. He teaches undergraduate and graduate courses in criminal justice. Mike has co-authored numerous articles with colleagues on police training, problem-based learning, and community-oriented policing.

Police Culture and the Use of Force

Dr. Patrick J. Solar, Ph.D.
University of Wisconsin – Platteville

Abstract

New technology exposes police use of force to public view, and much of what people view does not please them. As a result, there are moves toward holding police to a higher use of force standard. However, a fundamental understanding of the police subculture as it relates to the use of force is missing from the discussion.

The police have a unique culture that few individuals from outside the occupation understand. This subculture drives the behavior of the police, especially with regard to the use of force, much more powerfully than the law itself. Deeply embedded in the police subculture is the idea that effective cops control their assigned territories. This idea takes the form of a moral imperative in the socialization of a police officer: cops do what they must to control their turf in face-to-face encounters with the public.

Police are authorized with the coercive power of the law and are the only members of society who are legally authorized to use force and violence against citizens. At the same time, however, police use of force must conform with the standard of objective reasonableness. This is a standard that fails to consider the subjective feelings, experiences, and point-of-view of individuals and groups. This essay explores the resulting dilemma, which can be characterized as one of competing realities, with one reality governed by objective reasonableness and the other governed by passion.

Introduction

The use of force, especially deadly force, by the police is governed not only by the law but also by the values, motivations, and social forces unique to the policing subculture. This article explores common aspects of the police subculture that have a greater influence than the law on officer decision-making in use of force situations.

With the advent of new technology, many police actions are open to public scrutiny, and the public is concerned (at times outraged) by what they see. The bodily violence of lawful use of deadly force incidents is often indistinguishable from unlawful ones. As a result of the increased access to images of police uses of force, officers now face more restrictive requirements. One example is the principle of proportionality, which considers how the general public is likely to view the use of force incident. Recent guidelines released by the Police Executive Research Forum (2016) help departments define whether a response is proportional. It suggests police

consider whether the use of force “was appropriate to the entire situation and to the severity of the threat posed to [the officer] or to the public.” (Police Executive Research Forum, 2016).

The implication is that force deemed to be non-proportional to the threat is unacceptable. This “higher standard” may go a long way toward building trust between communities and police; however, it neglects certain realities of American law enforcement as well as the unique culture of the police regarding use of force. The following statement from a police officer illustrates what change advocates are up against:

I don’t know what the job is like where you’re from Lieutenant, but on my beat you have to let these people know who is in charge. You can’t take any shit from anyone. You can’t show any weakness as a cop. If you do you make the job dangerous for your partner and the next cop who has to deal with these people (Anonymous comment offered to the author during training session on community-oriented policing).

Within this statement, two distinct aspects of the traditional police subculture are illustrated: 1. the necessity of territorial control socialized into many officers and 2. the idea that the police commonly view themselves as existing in a perpetual “state of war” and must be ready and willing to use force, even excessive force, when challenged.

What is “Culture”?

Culture is the way of life shared by members of a society. It includes language, values, symbolic meanings, technology, and material objects (Brinkerhoff, 1998). Specific examples in policing include the uniform, badge, gun, and squad car as well as the unique language (such as, coded communications, acronyms, euphemisms) that are rarely understood by those outside of the police subculture. Organizational arrangements, such as rank, specialized positions and status indicators, are also powerful symbols of the “cop” culture as well as the stories characterizing what is really means to be a “cop’s cop.” These stories are passed from officer to officer and teach young recruits how they are expected to respond, creating a sense of lore and engraining core police values.

Any effort to change the police should recognize the profound influences of the police subculture, which is much more powerful than the law, ethical guidelines, training, discipline and even leadership. An important element of the police subculture is the need to maintain a façade of strength, independence, and invincibility. These characteristics are reinforced through socialization that begins when a police recruit receives their badge (Malmin, 2012). The recruits’ new roles as authority figures transform them, and they immediately begin looking for affirmation, acceptance, and role models. Popular culture supports a view of the police that is consistent with these general attributes of strength, independence, and invincibility. Recruits and veteran officers alike can find themselves at the center of a highly charged political environment that views behaviors associated with these attributes as racist, unfair and unjust.

Traditional Police Culture-Territory Control

Deeply embedded in the police subculture is the idea that effective cops control their assigned territories. This idea takes the form of a moral imperative in the socialization of a police officer: cops do what they must to control their turf in face-to-face encounters with the public (VanMaanen, 1978; Manning, 1978). This typically results in using more force than necessary in any given situation (i.e., if the suspect uses his fists, the cop uses his or her baton; if the suspect uses a knife, the cop uses a gun). The idea is to minimize potential resistance through the use of overwhelming force. Socialization into this cultural aspect of policing takes the form of locker-room stories shared and repeated by veteran cops. These stories become part of the police canon and establishment. The militarization of the police speaks to this cultural aspect; again, the cultural belief is that overt display of overwhelming force potential is useful in minimizing resistance. To the cop, it is “their” territory and “it exists to be controlled. To do less is to fail utterly” (Crank, 2004, p. 81):

In the heart of every cop is a sense of morality, of varying weakness in individual officers, but always present. Indeed, one of the most common reasons police applicants give for wanting to join the profession is to help others. Cop culture works in large part because cops start out with a common residue of moral values. Police occupational experiences that help to forge their culture are not suitable for everyone. These unique and shared experiences unify cops with a shared perception of doing justice. Assigned to a territory for which they are responsible, they take on a shared and powerful vision of justice (Crank, p. 81).

A shared sense of morality is built upon territorial control. To not exert complete and total control of the physical wellbeing of their territory is to fail as a police officer. Maintaining territorial control justifies the use of excessive force—defined as a level of force in excess of that which would be considered reasonable under the *Graham v. Connor* standard and also referred to as “street justice.” The use of excessive force is morally justified by the police subculture due to its deterrent effect in maintaining territorial control. From the viewpoint of the police subculture, to raise the standard for police use of force to a level greater than the objective reasonableness standard of *Graham v. Connor*, a standard that has been vaguely defined as “proportional,” is to completely ignore the deterrent effect of “street justice” (Sykes, 1995).

The Coercive Power of the Police

The police exist as a means to protect communities from the menacing aspects of an increasingly violent society. A quest for peace through peaceful means is at the very heart of the US democratic tradition. Nonetheless, the police are given the authority to use force when the need arises. This presents a profound dilemma: how can the public ever judge the use of force by police as acceptable when the activity itself is morally unacceptable? The legal system has established strict guidelines, based on reason, where police uses of force are perpetually reactive. It is the actions of citizens reasonably categorized as a danger to others, a danger to the police officer, or any action that is resistive to an arrest that authorizes the police to use force. The US

legal system then charges the police themselves with enforcing these rules. The courts have no direct concerns unless and until offended citizens seek redress (Bitner, 1970).

Prior to the development of technology that allows easy recording of police-citizen interactions, the use of force was a behind-the-scenes phenomenon only visible to individuals who are impacted by it directly—in stories told by others, in newspaper accounts, and in entertainment media. Our collective ignorance and baseline acceptance for police intervention ended in 1992 with the video recording of the Rodney King beating. This incident initiated a change in thinking about the police and how they should interact with the public, especially in use of force situations.

Police are the one-stop-shop for settling many disputes between citizens, particularly when one feels that an authoritarian or coercive presence is needed. Consider the teacher who does not know how to deal with an out-of-control child, a citizen who is offended by the neighbor's inoperable, junk vehicle, or a community that is bothered by the young people who hang-out on the corner drinking, smoking, making inappropriate comments, and being generally intimidating. "Calling the cops" means making use of the capacity and authority to overpower resistance to achieve a desired objective (Bittner, 1991).

Perhaps nowhere is this more profound than in the case of how to deal with the mentally ill. Mentally ill persons live quiet and unobtrusive lives but are perceived as to occasionally constitute a serious hazard to themselves and others. Why do those with superior knowledge and skill, when compared to the police, in areas such as psychiatry, social work and education call the cops when interactions do not go as planned? Because, as Bittner puts it, "on the periphery of the rationally ordered procedures of medical and social work practice lurk exigencies that call for the exercise of coercion" (Bitner, 1970, p. 43). There is a need for intervention that cannot be resisted because there lies a possibility, however remote, that to not intervene forcefully would result in great harm.

Society asks that cops deal with its most profound social problems by using whatever force is necessary to shelter citizens from the criminal and the uncivilized (Crank, 2004, p. 97), yet the public complains when the police do exactly what they are asked to do. Even cases of perfectly justified use of force are now questioned because "they just look bad" (Couper, 2016). Up to this point, society reconciled the offensive nature of routine violence on the part of the police by concealing what the police do (Bittner, 1970 as cited in Crank, 2004, p. 102). The ubiquity of video recording and online sharing technology makes this no longer possible.

The Righteousness of the Use of Force in the Police Subculture

To a police officer that feels compelled to employ force while engaging with an individual the question is not one of social justice but rather criminal justice. Those who resist the authority of the police are challenging the established rule of law and need to be corrected. It is the behavior, not the race, age, gender, sexual orientation, religious affiliation, or national origin that matters in the police subculture. The societal problem (i.e., a social justice issue) stems from the fact that

there are cultural differences related to race, age, gender, religion, national origin that conflict with those of the police:

The use of force is not a philosophical issue for the policeman. It is not a question of would or whether, but of when and how much. Therefore, the amount of force a policeman uses does not depend solely on himself but also on the character of the people he polices and the politics of his department. (Bittner as cited in Crank, 2004, p. 97)

This is not to say, however, that the decision to use force (and how much force to use) has nothing to do with demographic characteristics. It certainly does, but not in a manner the public may assume. The decision is often based on one's own objective bias, which is a product of traditional police subculture. Imagine two separate groups of "suspicious" looking young men gathered on an inner city street corner in a high crime neighborhood. The responding police officer has very limited information based on a dispatch record or his or her own observations. The officer must rely on stereotypes and even personal prejudice, based on their past experience, as tools of survival. One image is a group of males dressed in neat slacks and polo shirts standing next to a late model BMW looking like they are lost. The other image is of a group, on the same street corner, dressed in dirty blue jeans and hoodies, wearing ball caps on backwards and making aggressive/obscene gestures. When encountering these two situations, the police officer's behavior and perception, which impacts their decision to use force, are likely very different.

The question is why? Notice that race is not a factor here, but the reader's own implicit bias might have kicked-in as they picture each of these scenes in their mind. When one adds in the cultural socialization that occurs with a police officer one is better equipped to relate to the police subculture and the idea of objective bias (that is, a bias that is not merely the product of one's personal experiences, attitudes and point-of-view).

Danger in the Police Subculture

Danger is a constant companion in policing, but according to Kappler (1993) law enforcement is not a particularly dangerous occupation. Some dismiss danger as something that is overblown by the police themselves. To truly understand the element of danger within the police subculture one must experience it for oneself. One can begin as simply as requesting a ride-along with a local police department. During a ride-along, a citizen can note how the behavior of people changes as they observe police driving slowly down a residential street or watch the reaction of bystanders as the car approaches a bar fight or domestic dispute.

One might experience the apprehension, uncertainty, and fear that cops live with every day. The same people cops are sent to protect might also have negative views of police officers, further adding to these feelings. Simply being affiliated or associated with a cop in these brief moments may demonstrate the animosity that is directed at law officials regularly.

The uncertain nature of police work heightens the feelings of danger and fear in the police culture. There have been widely publicized cases of people actively seeking to injure, fight, or kill police officers. Current knowledge and training capacities make it difficult for police to determine who is actually a danger. Police often rely on objective bias to gain some measure of personal security when dealing with the multitude of daily ambiguous situations. It is a way for the cop to control his or her own fear:

Police officers, because their work requires them to be occupied continually with potential violence, develop a perceptual shorthand to identify certain kinds of people as symbolic assailants, that is, as persons who use gesture, language and attire that the police have come to recognize as a prelude to violence. (Skolnick, 2011, p. 42)

The original examples of the characteristics of “symbolic assailants” from Skolnick’s first edition, published in 1965, include “a youth dressed in a black leather jacket and motorcycle boots.” Today the clothing has changed but not the behavior as described by Skolnick: “A young man may suggest the threat of violence to the police by his manner of walking or ‘strutting,’ the insolence in the demeanor being registered by the police as a possible preamble to later attack” (Skolnick, 2011, p. 43).

Because police officers have been cast in such a negative light, in many urban areas, police experience disrespectful treatment. As a result, police perceive many citizens as a symbolic assailant. There is little comfort in the knowledge that the truly dangerous—those who will actually kill an officer if they get the chance—rarely communicate the threat openly, like the symbolic assailant. The truly dangerous will be the quiet ones; the symbolic assailant, on the other hand, may attack or resist but will merely be showing-off for his or her friends. If the symbolic assailant happens to badly injure or kill an officer, the result is usually the result of luck or accident.

The common theme of danger is a tremendously powerful cultural element, a stimulus for cultural identity (VanMaanen, 1973). Through training and socialization, danger—and the fear strongly linked to it—is controlled for by the use of force. Force is not an analytical construct for cops—it is a way to deal with fear (Rubinstein, 1973). The police socialization process weeds out those who are unable or unwilling to use force. Rookie cops, who are unable or unwilling to use force, are viewed as a danger to themselves and others who work with them. If they make it through probation they will soon find themselves isolated from their fellow cops. This makes the use of force a powerful stimulus for socialization and acceptance into the police subculture. Crank (2004) notes that officers who use as much force as they can get away with, as opposed to what is reasonably necessary, are described as a “cop’s cop” in traditional police subculture (p. 106).

In the context of racial disparities in police contacts, the concept of the symbolic assailant gains strength:

The patrolman believes with considerable justification that teenagers, Negroes, and lower income persons commit a disproportionate share of all reported crimes; being in those population categories at all makes one, statistically, more suspect

than other persons but to be in those categories and to behave unconventionally is to make oneself a prime suspect. (Wilson, 1968)

When suspect descriptions are broadcasted over a police scanner to units in an urban area, the suspects are often described as being in the ages of 14 to 20. More often than not, a racial description of black or Hispanic is also included. These descriptions are merely relayed by the dispatch center based on caller, victim, and witness descriptions. They are not a product of police bias. Now consider a black teenager who engages in what Wilson refers to as “unconventional” behavior. This reflects Skolnick’s “insolence in behavior” and translates into hostile, disrespectful, antagonistic, and even threatening behavior directed at the police, making them prime targets for police attention. This is what can be considered objective bias on the part of the police. It is not based primarily on race, as there are actually many more young male whites who behave in a hostile, disrespectful, antagonistic, and threatening manner toward the police and are equally viewed as symbolic assailants. Given the context of the police subculture it is not reasonable to fault the police for bias that is a product of their socialization, training, experiences, and available information; police are merely responding as any rational human being would.

However, there are also many who do not display the “insolence in behavior” that is characteristic of the symbolic assailant. Treating them as such reflects subjective bias on the part of a police officer. Intentional acts that are a product of subjective bias, i.e., behavior that rises to the level of “objectively offensive,” should be condemned for it is this kind of behavior that undermines public trust and police legitimacy.

The victims of historic marginalization, predominantly African Americans, also have a right to their own sense of objective bias regarding the police. Cops routinely display what can easily be interpreted as “insolence of behavior” with regard to citizens. This manifestation of what Skolnick calls the symbolic assailant can also be applied to the police themselves, when viewed through the perspective of a black, male teenager in communities traditionally experiencing poor police-community relations. Given these experiences and the consequent subculture, it is also not reasonable to fault them for this bias, as it too is a product of their socialization. A compassionate, cooperative, and service-oriented police department recognizes their own biases as well as the lens through which their constituents view them.

Objective vs. Subjective Views

The police function in a world governed by the law; the law in-turn is governed by the world of fact and objective reason. The law governing use of force is a prime example. In the case of *Graham v. Connor*, 490 U.S.386 (1989), the Supreme Court ruled that a police officer’s use of force in a given situation (context) is to be judged by the “objectively reasonable” standard. In the language of the court this means: “In light of the facts and circumstances confronting the officer at that time, without regard to any potential underlying intent or motivation.” Our subjective feelings, attitudes, experiences and point-of-view are not to be considered. When an officer reasonably feels they, or someone else, is threatened with death or great bodily harm, the

law allows that officer to use deadly force. The fact that the weapon was actually a non-lethal BB gun is irrelevant under the law. The police subculture or administrative policy may even punish an officer in such a situation for not doing so.

Subjective information is based on personal opinions, interpretations, points of view, emotions and judgment, whereas objective information or analysis is fact-based, measurable and observable. The Police Executive Research Forum proportionality principle ignores fundamental aspects of the law and the police subculture. This new standard ignores the objective perspectives of the officer. A cop faced with an imminent threat must now consider the subjective viewpoint of an unspecified general public. In at least one instance, this push towards a higher use of force standard resulted in a cop second-guessing how to act in a life-threatening situation (ABC News, 2016).

Some argue that the police should “conform their uses of force, especially deadly force, with our wishes” (Couper, 2016, p.1). The incident about which Couper writes involved the arrest of a violently resisting black teenager. It was a shocking example of police using force in a way that complies with policy but that constitutes what has become known as a “lawful but awful” use of force. But here’s the rub, individuals’ wishes are subjective, based upon personal opinions, interpretations, points of view, emotions, and judgment. The police officer with a duty to arrest a belligerent and dangerous citizen is likely to have a different point of view. Others’ points of view are worth considering, too—the officer’s wife, friends, co-workers, and parents, to name a few. How about the crime victim? It is unlikely that a consensus would arise among the many stakeholders as to the proportionality of the use of force in this case. This raises a new question, whose subjective point-of-view takes precedence? The only fair, just, and reasonable, standard rests with the legal and objective reasoning of *Graham v. Connor*.

The Evolution of Police Use of Force

Places where the police subculture views the need to maintain territorial control through the use of coercion and force as a fundamental mandate are also likely to encounter lower levels of public trust. The targets of legitimate force are enemies to be dealt with through the use of coercion as in the state of war. Officers are to possess the virtues of valor, obedience, and esprit de corps (Bittner, 1991). In this environment police solidarity, characterized as an “us vs. them” mentality, is likely to thrive. This is the dark-side of policing.

On the other end of the spectrum is the view that compliance with the law is the goal; this is what Bittner (1991) refers to as the practical objective to be obtained by practical expediency: “The process involves prudence, economy, and considered judgment, from case to case. The enterprise as a whole is conceived as a public trust, the exercise of which is vested in individual practitioners who are personally responsible for their decisions and actions” (Bittner, 1991, p. 48). It is not, therefore, the police culture and its dysfunctional characteristics (the dark side) that should guide the modern police officer but rather the discretion of individual officers objectively measured on a case-by-case basis. If compliance with the law is the overall goal, police officers should be encouraged to employ tactics that promote voluntary compliance, minimize resistance

to the rule of law, and minimize resentment directed towards them. This is what Bittner refers to as “practical expediency,” and I refer to as “wise policing.”

Bittner (1970) also makes the point that these two patterns of police behavior are not compatible. Society should not expect that viewing the non-conforming public as enemies and legitimate targets of coercive force can exist alongside the view that the coercive use of force can be guided by prudence toward the ultimate goal of voluntary compliance:

Reflection suggests that the two patterns are profoundly incompatible. Remarkably, however, our police departments have not been deterred from attempting the reconciliation of the irreconcilable. Thus, our policemen are exposed to the demand of a conflicting nature in that their actions are supposed to reflect military prowess and professional acumen (Bittner, 1970, p. 47).

The advent of readily available imagery is now driving the evolution of the police subculture away from the warrior mentality. The question is whether or not the police are competent enough to employ the judgment required for what Bittner calls “professional acumen” (Bittner, 1970, p. 47) and whether society is prepared to undertake the risk, consisting of higher rates of crime and disorder, associated with this transition.

Conclusion

At the foundation of the police subculture rests the need to maintain territorial control through coercive means. This is not to say that the police can use means other than coercion to control territory but in the bureaucratic environment that is policing, coercion is viewed as the most efficient option. This concept of efficiency also helps one understand how police view the use of force (for example, where an officer may be encouraged to use as much force as they can get away with so as to provide a deterrent effect, rather than a level of force that is reasonably necessary).

Danger is a constant theme in policing and the impact of the resulting fear demands that officers quickly develop mechanisms to control it. The symbolic assailant provides a framework for society to understand how the police officer controls their own fear, by assuming that those who display insolent behavior are a potential threat. Those who take pleasure in intimidating the police through clothing choices such as “Fuck the Police” t-shirts, cocked hats and ultra-low-ride pants combined with body language clues, gestures, confrontation, and open threats will continue to be targeted for police attention; this is objectively reasonable.

Many claim that society has become hyper-sensitive to what individuals perceive as offensive conduct. Evaluating such a claim requires that an understanding of the difference between what someone believes to be true based on their own values, experiences, and point-of-view (subjective) and what is based on observable and measurable fact (objective). The former victimizes too many people, including the police.

Demands to change or improve policing most often reflect societal concerns about police use of force, and rightly so. However, forging ahead without a clear understanding of the police subculture, as offered by Crank (2004) and others, constitutes a profound injustice to the police themselves. Attempting to repair one injustice with another is patently unwise. The way forward requires defining the real problem in a way that both sides can agree on. This requires an open dialogue between the public and police officers. Conflict between the police and citizens is not new; it is part of the challenge of policing a democratic society.

References

- ABC News. (2016, October). Chicago Poice Officer Says She Feared Using Gun While Being Beaten. <http://abc7chicago.com/news/chicago-cop-says-she-feared-using-gun-while-being-beaten/1543015/>.
- Bitner, E. (1970). The Functions of the Police in Modern Society. National Institute of Mental Health.
- Bittner, E. (1991). Thinking about Police: Contempory Readings. In C. B. Klockars, *Thinking about Police: Contemporary Readings* (pp. 35-51). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Brinkerhoff, D. (1998). *Essentials of Sociology*. St. Paul: Wadsworth.
- Couper, D. (2016, August). A different way to look at the Genele Laird incident. *The CAP Times*, Madison Wisconsin .
- Crank, J. P. (2004). *Understanding Police Culture*, Second Edition. Routledge.
- Kappler, V. E. (1993). *The Mythology of Crime and Criminal Justice*, Second Edition. Prospect Heights, IL : Waveland Press.
- Klockars, C. B. (1991). *Thinking About Policing*, Second Edition. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Malmin, M. (2012). Changing Police Subculture. *FBI Law Enforcement Bulletin*.
- Manning, P. K. (1978). "Lying, Secrecy, and Social Control" In P. M. (ed) *Policing: A View From The Street* (pp. 238-254). Santa Monica, CA: Goodyear Publishing.
- Police Executive Research Forum. (2016). Use of Force: Taking Policing to a Higher Standard. Washington: PERF.
- Rubinstein, J. (1973). *City Police*. New York: Farrar, Strauss and Girox.
- Skolnick, J. H. (2011). *Justice Without Trial: Law Enforcement in Democratic Society*, Fourth Edition. New Orleans: Quid Pro Books.
- Sykes, G. (1995). Street Justice: A Moral Defense of Order Maintenance Policing. *Police and Society* <https://www.ncjrs.gov/App/Publications/abstract.aspx?ID=151407> , 139-154.
- VanMaanen, J. (1978). The Asshole. In P. M. VanMaanen, *Policing: A View From The Street*. Santa Monica, CA: Goodyear Publishing.
- VanMaanen, J. (1973). Observations on the Making of a Policeman. *Human Organization*, 32: 407-418.
- Wilson, J. Q. (1968). *Varieties of Police Behavior*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

About the author . . .

Dr. Patrick Solar has been a police officer for nearly 30 years, serving as a street officer, Detective, Sergeant, Lieutenant and Chief of Police. His education includes a Bachelor's Degree in Political Science from Northern Illinois University, a Master's degree in Public Administration, specializing in Municipal Finance & Planning, and a Doctorate in Political Philosophy, specializing in Organizational Development from the Northern Illinois University Graduate School. Solar is also a graduate of the FBI National Academy. Dr. Solar currently teaches courses in law enforcement as well as a new course titled Humanistic Policing at the University of Wisconsin–Platteville. He has written a number of articles related to management and the police function and is currently working on the development of a new process for police performance assessment reflecting the values of 21st century policing.

Academic Pontification

Losing Sides

Madeleine Novich, Ph.D.
Rutgers School of Criminal Justice

In 2015, *The Guardian* reported that US police officers killed 307 Black citizens and as of November 2016, 233 more have been added to the list. These deaths account for approximately 27 percent of the total police-related fatalities nation-wide despite Black people making up only 12.6 percent of the total population (Census.gov, 2014). Black men, women, and young adults have been shot, choked, tazed, and have died in custody. In many cases, the officers responsible for their deaths have not been penalized. These reports of police use of force, the many other unreported negative experiences with police, and the lack of justice in these cases spurred the creation of the Black Lives Matter (BLM) movement. This movement steadily gained traction and importance. Citizens of all creeds have been supporting their efforts. Yet some critics contend “all lives matter,” arguing we should not single out Black lives because everyone matters equally. This misses the point of the platform entirely.

Supporting the BLM movement does not mean that other lives are not as valuable, are less important, or less worthy of civic protection. The platform calls attention to what criminologists have argued for decades - that Black citizens are often victims of systemic racism and are disproportionately the recipients of police misconduct, abuse, and disrespect (Brunson, 2007; Fratello, Rengifo, & Trone, 2013; Gau & Brunson, 2007; Lopez, 2010). Instead of receiving equitable police treatment, Black individuals are more likely to experience racially motivated and harmful police behavior. This treatment includes verbal threats and/or physically aggressive behavior such as officers putting their hands on them, forcing them to the ground, being pushed up against a wall, having their arms twisted, having a weapon drawn, being sworn at, and/or being handcuffed too tightly, and, tragically, getting shot and killed. It is not surprising that these experiences have collectively contributed to feelings of anger, criminalization and distrust of law enforcement more generally (Fratello et al., 2013). For many Black citizens, these kinds of interactions have become normalized, internalized, and expected.

The BLM movement, justifiably, argues that this police behavior should not be accepted. Yet some mistake the BLM movement—which is simply fighting for equitable police treatment—as indicating an opposition to blue lives. In fact, one can support BLM and support police. As Trevor Noah from *The Daily Show* commented on the paradox, “It seems like it's pro-cop and anti-black, or pro-black and anti-cop, when in reality, you can be pro-cop and pro-black, which is what we should all be. It should be what we're aiming for.” BLM advocates are not disputing that officers are overwhelming good, hardworking professionals who have dedicated their lives protecting our nation’s citizens.

This begs the question—if we have upstanding officers and yet Black citizens are routinely treated comparatively worse, what is broken? While this is an extremely complicated question, some part of the problem, seems to be fear of the unknown Black person (Stjohn, and Healdmoore, 1995) in conjunction with what Critical Race Theorists have argued for decades, a systemically racist society. While many of the officers themselves may not be racists, they are charged with enforcing racist laws and policies—like stop-and-frisk and the war on drugs, and they are encouraged to enforce laws based on statistics that further perpetuate harmful and fear inducing stereotypes. These instructions come from institutions and precinct cultures that do not work at rectifying these behaviors and practices. However, instead of working together to fix the problem, we have claimed sides. It seems so obvious: we should be working together—BLM supporters, officers, advocates, policy makers and citizens –to reinforce what policing is all about—maintaining a safe society via practices of courtesy, professionalism and respect.

While this may seem like a daunting task, one important way to fight for change is to encourage the engagement of Black citizens and advocates who are at the forefront of these interactions. Their collective voices may be the key to understanding where, when, and how policing begins to fail them. By having citizens participate in police accountability, we can truly be collaborative in working toward better policing practices. While this is only one mechanism, each step together is a step forward. When society can unequivocally show that everyone, regardless of race, class, and creed, is being treated equally and has equivalent protection and safety under the law, can we confidently say “all lives matter.”

Bibliography

- United States Census Bureau (2016)
http://factfinder.census.gov/faces/tableservices/jsf/pages/productview.xhtml?pid=ACS_14_5YR_DP05&src=pt (accessed December, 2016).
- Brunson, R. (2007). "Police Don't Like Black People": African-American Young Men's Accumulated Police Experiences. *Criminology & Public Policy*, 6.1:71-101.
- Chevigny, P.,. (1995). *Edge of the knife: Police violence in the Americas* (No. 363.2097 C4). New York: New Press.
- Fratello, J., Rengifo, A., & Trone, J. (2013). Coming of Age with Stop and Frisk: Experiences, Self-Perceptions, and Public Safety Implications . Vera Institute of Justice Center on Youth Justice.
- Fyfe, J. J. (1988). Police use of deadly force: Research and reform. *Justice Quarterly*, 5(2), 165-205.
- Gau, J., & Brunson, R. (2007). Procedural Injustice, Lost Legitimacy, and Self-Help: Young Males' Adaptations to Perceived Unfairness in Urban Policing Tactics. *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice*, 132-150.
- Kleinig, J. (2014). Legitimate and Illegitimate Uses of Police Force. *Criminal Justice Ethics*, 33(2), 83-103.
- Lee, C. (2004). 'But I Thought He Had a Gun'-Race and Police Use of Deadly Force. *Hastings Race and Poverty Law Journal*.
- Lopez, C. E. (2010). Disorderly (mis) Conduct: The Problem with "Contempt of Cop" Arrests. *Issue Brief, American Constitution Society (Washington, DC)*.
- Stjohn, C., & Healdmoore, T. (1995). Fear of black strangers. *Social Science Research*, 24(3), 262-280.

About the author . . .

Madeleine Novich, Ph.D. is a post-doctoral fellow at Rutgers School of Criminal Justice, where she completed her Ph.D. Her research focuses on policing and perceptions of procedural justice and legitimacy among criminalized populations. She received the Rutgers University Women and Gender Studies Research Grant and the inaugural Division on Women and Crime Larry J. Siegel Graduate Fellowship. She has contributed to book chapters and her most recent peer-reviewed article can be found in *Drugs: education, prevention, and policy*. Madeleine is currently co-editing a special issue of *Race and Justice: An International Journal* focused on youth and policing. She was also recently awarded a grant from Civic Hall Labs and The Robert Wood Foundation to build a mobile platform that collects stories of police interactions.

But my Parents told me the Police were the ‘Good Guys’

James F. Albrecht
Pace University

As someone who proudly wore a police uniform for 25 years, I continue to wonder how and why the police are now portrayed as the ‘bad guys.’ Crime rates have plummeted; incarceration levels continue their descent; and the United States has become astonishingly safe. Proactive police policies and practices have played a major role in these impressive declines. Yet, many continue to portray law enforcement officers in America as a racially biased and abusive team of ‘bullies’ unworthy of citizen trust.

My personal experiences paint a different picture. The most heroic act I have observed was hundreds of police officers running into the burning World Trade Center towers to evacuate as many persons as possible regardless of how precarious the circumstances. I doubt any one of them thought about race, religion or ethnicity as they undertook those perilous measures. Throughout my career I have witnessed police in everyday activities serving their primary goals of ensuring public safety and maintaining peaceful communities.

I have worked in a variety of communities that cross the spectrum of violence, employment, social class, religion, ethnicity, and race. In each of these police assignments, my colleagues were reasonable and committed and possessed the same goals: get the job done properly and get home safely at the end of the day. In addition, each of the law enforcement officials I have witnessed across the country seems to have that same level of dedication and concern. I have never once heard a police supervisor or agency official advocate abusive, unconstitutional, or unprofessional conduct. Yet, certain elements of the media and many community advocates regularly take the position that the police are the real ‘bad guys,’ while routinely vindicating serious career criminals.

Let us examine the proactive approaches implemented by the New York City Police Department and other law enforcement agencies across the United States over the last two decades. As the NYPD’s Police Commissioner, William Bratton advocated a leadership model that held local police commanders accountable for reducing crime and disorder in their areas. By evaluating crime trends and deploying resources where the crimes and community concerns were located, the police could make a difference. Bratton introduced the “Broken Windows” doctrine, which permitted police personnel to address low-level violators and serious criminals alike. The goal was obvious—if the police could keep the criminals and chronic violators off of the streets, the communities would become safer and the neighborhood quality of life would improve. The results were almost immediate. Crime rates declined sharply throughout the city and continue to do so today.

Comparable results are observed in other areas that have implemented those policies. Placing more police resources in the specific neighborhoods where street violence and serious crime are

more prevalent deters crime and improves the quality of life in affected communities. It is common sense to deploy cops where the big problems and community complaints exist. These urban hot spots—the most crime ridden and violent neighborhoods—are in impoverished communities, many of which are highly populated by African-Americans and other minority groups. These are the same areas that have been most positively impacted by effective policing practices. And yet, today’s police officers continue to be regularly portrayed as the ‘bad guys’ and as acting with racially biased malice.

The hard working and committed members of US law enforcement agencies experience the true negative consequences of this unjustified criticism. Firstly, the noteworthy successes of the dramatic national crime reduction have come under scrutiny. Secondly, police officers may be prone to hesitate in taking proper legal action out of fear their lawful actions could lead to unwarranted punishment. This ‘Ferguson effect’ is now apparent in some of America’s largest cities, where many officers have stopped making arrests and proactively engaging criminal suspects in fear that they will be unjustifiably chastised and possibly prosecuted for taking lawful police action, based mainly on the fact that the suspect was African-American or a member of another minority group.

Today’s police officers have been forced every day to ask themselves: are the sacrifices we make worth it; are we really the ‘bad guys’ or merely the victims of the uninformed, the manipulative, and the opportunistic? How has a vocation that is so honorable now been turned into one where the public questions police integrity and professionalism? And should society allow those with selfish agendas to ‘handcuff’ the police and cause them to hesitate in countering crime, disorder, and suspicious illegal behavior?

Everyone is entitled to their opinion, but I will continue to acknowledge and appreciate the hard work and commitment of law enforcement officers across America. I still believe what my parents taught me—America’s police officers are the ‘good guys’ who should be acknowledged and respected as true American heroes.

About the author . . .

James F. Albrecht is a retired NYPD Captain who has worked on global police reform projects for the United Nations, the US State Department, and the International Association of Chiefs of Police. He presently is a professor of criminal justice at Pace University in New York and his books include: ‘*Policing Major Events: Perspectives from around the World*’ and ‘*Police Reserves and Volunteers: Enhancing Organizational Effectiveness and Public Trust.*’

Good News

Gary Cordner, Ph.D. maintains and regularly updates blogs on modern policing (<https://gcordner.wordpress.com>) and on world policing (<https://worldpolicing.wordpress.com>).

Michael J. Jenkins, Ph.D. has received a Fulbright Award to conduct research with the Metropolitan Police Department in the Spring of 2017.

Konstantinos Papazoglou announces the publication of his new book *Listening to their Voices of Bravery and Heroism* (Nova Science, 2016).

Follow the ACJS Police Section on Facebook (<https://www.facebook.com/ACJS.Police>).

Meet Members of your Police Section Executive Board

Last issue introduced you to our Police Section chair, vice-chair, secretary, and executive counselor. The current issue includes biographies of another executive counselor and our section historian.

Phillip Kopp, Executive Counselor

Dr. Phillip M. Kopp is an Assistant Professor of criminal justice at California State University, Fullerton. He received his Ph.D. from the City University of New York in 2014. His dissertation, funded under a NIJ grant for the Analysis of Existing Data, investigated the incidence of violence that occurred during the crime of burglary using ten years of data from the National Crime Victimization Survey, Uniform Crime Report, and National Incident Based Reporting System. Additionally, his master's thesis exploring the stereotypes of police present in prime-time network television. Currently, he is working with police agencies in Southern California to evaluate their body-worn camera initiatives, and evaluate a use-of-force program that reengineers how police use force.

Lucy Hochstein, Historian

Dr. Lucy Hochstein is a professor of criminal justice at Radford University. She holds masters and doctoral degrees from Washington State University and a bachelors degree from Seattle University. Dr. Hochstein's research interests include elder abuse, identity theft, evaluation research, cooperative community programs between criminal justice agencies and non-profit organizations, and collaborative domestic violence programming. She currently serves as a passionate documentarian of our ACJS Police Section history.

Call for Papers, Authors, Applicants?

If you are working on a project and need authors for book chapters or encyclopedia entries, let us know. We'll include that call in the *Police Forum* for free.

Or, if you are hosting a conference or seminar and need participants, let us know that too. We'll be happy to help spread the word for free.

Or, if you have a job opportunity—particularly of interest to those teaching or researching in areas related to policing—we'd love to help you announce that position...and yes, we'll do it **FOR FREE!**

Send any announcements that you would like to have included in the next issue of the *Police Forum* to acjspoliceforum@gmail.com

ARE YOU AN ACJS LIFETIME MEMBER?

Please remember that you still must pay the Police Section dues annually to remain a member of the Police Section. Membership is \$37 per year and includes a subscription to *Police Quarterly*. Payment of dues is made to ACJS. Thanks!!!

Submission Guidelines for the *Police Forum*

Format Criteria

The format criteria for all submissions are as follows: reasonable length (less than 30 pages), double-spaced, and in a font similar to 12 pt Times New Roman. All submissions should be in Word format. All charts, graphs, pictures, etc. must be one page or smaller and contained within standard margins. Please attach these at the end of the submission as appendices. Due to formatting limitations all appendices must be in a Word, Excel or similar format - PDF's cannot be used.

Feature Articles

Feature Articles can be quantitative or qualitative. Tables, figures and charts should be kept to a minimum and should be inserted at the end of the document with an appropriate reference to placement location within the text. The page limits are flexible, however the editors reserve the right to edit excessively long manuscripts.

Practitioners Corner

Articles written from the perspective of persons currently or formerly working in the field, expressing personal observations or experiences concerning a particular area or issue. Page limits are flexible, however long articles may be edited for length.

Academic Pontification

Articles for this area should focus on making an argument, presenting a line of thought, or formulating a new conceptual idea in policing.

Point/Counterpoint

Authors are encouraged to work with another person to develop a point/counterpoint piece. The initial argument should be between 2 and 5 pages. The initial argument should contain roughly 3 to 5 main points. Following exchange of articles between debating authors, a 1 to 3-page rejoinder/ rebuttal will be submitted.

Submission Guidelines – cont.

Research Notes

Research notes should describe a work in progress, a thumbnail outline of a research project, a conceptual methodological piece, or any other article relating to research methods or research findings in policing.

Reviews

Book reviews on any work relating to policing. Reviews of Internet sites or subjects concerning policing on the Internet are also welcome.

Policing in the News

News items of interest to the police section are welcomed in any form.

Legal News in Policing

Reviews of court cases, legal issues, lawsuits, and legal liability in policing are welcomed submissions.

Letters to the Editor

Questions, comments or suggestions pertaining to a given Criminal Justice topic, article or research.

This Date in History

Submissions on prior hot topics, research or research methods in Criminal Justice from the past.

Good News

Submissions relating to professional and personal good news for our members - promotions, new jobs, marriages, etc.

How to Submit

Submissions may be made electronically by sending copy in a Word format to acjspoliceforum@gmail.com.

Disclaimer

The editor(s) of this publication reserve the right to edit any submissions for length, clarity or other issues.

ACJS 54th Annual Meeting

“Linking Teaching, Practice, and Research”

March 21-March 25, 2017

Pre-Registration Deadline: January 15, 2017

After this date, all remaining registrations will be conducted onsite.

Annual meeting information, including the call for presentations and the conference program (when available), can be found at:

http://www.acjs.org/pubs/167_668_2915.cfm

Requested Submission Deadline: September 15, 2016

Final Submission Deadline: September 30, 2016

2017 Hotel Accommodations

The ACJS block of rooms is available at:

Kansas City Marriott Downtown

300 West 12th Street
Kansas City, MO 64105

The hotel group rate for the ACJS Annual Meeting will be:

Single Occupancy	\$139.00 plus applicable taxes
Double Occupancy	\$139.00 plus applicable taxes
Triple Occupancy	\$149.00 plus applicable taxes
Quadruple Occupancy	\$159.00 plus applicable taxes
Club Level	Add \$30 per night

The above occupancy rates are available only until March 1, 2017, subject to available space in the ACJS room block.

It is preferred that you reserve your hotel accommodations through the online reservation system which provides more detailed information about the hotel. [Click here](#) to reserve your guest room.

Business Meeting Minutes

NOTE: The minutes below are to be considered and approved, with corrections, at the Police Section Business meeting in Kansas City, MO during the 2017 ACJS Annual Meeting.

MINUTES

ACJS Police Section General Business Meeting

Denver, CO

April 1, 2016

Meeting called to order at 1708. Approximately 30 in attendance.

The police section is the largest section in ACJS and we are going to aim to grow some this year. There was no quorum, but there was news from the executive board meeting about what will happen in the coming year and what happened in the previous year. Then the presentation of the O.W. Wilson award.

Jeff Bumgarner of the Forum is stepping down as editor. *The Forum* was able to publish 3 issues with 5 articles last year, and we will be soliciting for a new editor for Forum during next month to quickly choose one.

New exec board coming on, election results within next 10 days. New executive counselors, and vice-chair.

Two areas coming up: exploring with a couple publishers for a peer reviewed journal for police management and organization which is an area that is not necessarily explored in current journals. Give news within forum as it comes about. Talking with Barth and Lorenzo and have large carry-over in funds, want to explore starting series of research grants with practitioners and researchers (hopefully members) to explore areas of practical policing that are often overlooked.

Starting a mentorship program to link scholars with new student members.

Next year: Section will be sponsoring a series of roundtables and panels on policing see 15-20 panels/roundtables directly linked to section. There will be overarching theme in panels and will be soliciting opinions from the membership

Increase membership and revising by-laws. Section will be sponsoring a student paper competition and redoing Facebook page and start tweeting news.

Motion to accept minutes from 2015, seconded. Passed.

Honoring someone in field of policing with O.W. Wilson award.

O.W. Wilson Award winner: Dr. George Kelling. Michael Jenkins presented award to Dr. Kelling for many contributions to police research and practice. Dr. Kelling shaped the practice of police research and students and devoted 15 years of professional life to police research.

Dr. Kelling thanked section for being honored.

Adjourned at 1733.

Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences

Police Section

Executive Board

Chair

John DeCarlo
University of New Haven
JDeCarlo@newhaven.edu

Vice-Chair

Stephen Morreale
Worcester State University/Walden University

Immediate Past Chair

Charles Johnson
(deceased)

Secretary

Veronyka James
Virginia Union University
vjames@vuu.edu

Historian

Lucy Hochstein
Radford University
lhochstei@radford.edu

Executive Counselors

Carol Archbold
North Dakota State University, Fargo
Carol.archbold@ndsu.edu

Phillip Kopp
California State University, Fullerton
pkopp@exchange.fullerton.edu

Editor:

Michael J. Jenkins
University of Scranton
Michael.Jenkins@scranton.edu

<http://www.acjs.org/page/PoliceSection>

Membership: Join online at www.acjs.org

ISSN - 1061-1517