Journal of Criminal Justice 67 (2020) 101673

Contents lists available at ScienceDirect

Journal of Criminal Justice

journal homepage: www.elsevier.com/locate/jcrimjus

# Police use of force and suspect behavior: An inmate perspective

Mark Alden Morgan[a,*], Matthew William Logan[b], Tayte Marie Olma[c]

[a] Independent Researcher*
[b] Texas State University, School of Criminal Justice, USA
[c] University of Cincinnati, School of Criminal Justice, USA

ARTICLE INFO

*Keywords:*
Arrest
Focal concerns
Racial disparity
Resistance
Use of force

ABSTRACT

*Purpose:* Research regarding police use of force is primarily based on official or administrative data provided by criminal justice agencies. However, less is known about these incidents from the personal accounts of the suspects with whom the responding officer(s) interact.

*Methods:* We employ a focal concerns perspective and draw on distinct data—self-report inmate surveys—to examine the extent to which the use of force is influenced by several legal and extralegal variables pertaining to the situation and the suspect at the point of arrest. Multiple imputation generated a sample of 17,897 cases and generalized ordered logistic regression models evaluated outcomes across three types of force.

*Results:* Findings indicate that suspect resistance exerts the strongest effects on the odds of force being used. Specifically, suspects who engaged in aggressive resistance were nearly ten times more likely to receive any force and six times more likely to receive potentially lethal force. We also observed statistically significant differences in the application of force by suspect age, sex, race, and mental illness—above and beyond the effects of resistance.

*Conclusions:* Our findings comport with the extant literature and demonstrate the utility of offender self-report data as a means to further examine officer-suspect interactions.

## 1. Introduction

The term “force” is synonymous with the imposition of power and is generally defined as behaviors by individuals that intentionally threaten, attempt, or inflict physical harm on others (Garner, Schade, Hepburn, & Buchanan, 1995). Yet research suggests that the degree to which force is applied is not uniform across situations; instead, it significantly varies in both quality and magnitude, depending on the social context (Sung, 2002; Tedeschi & Felson, 1994). Certain instances, for example, warrant the use of more severe (i.e., lethal) types of force, as is common when certain individuals or parties represent an immediate mortal threat or danger to the safety of others (Duntley & Buss, 2005; Felson & Messner, 1996). Alternatively, many scenarios necessitate the use of non-lethal measures (e.g., physical restraint) as a means of gaining the cooperation or compliance of others, or “saving face” to protect one's reputation (Felson, 1996; Felson & Messner, 1996; Tedeschi & Felson, 1994).

The past several decades have witnessed a marked increase in the number of scientific studies devoted to understanding how, when, and why force is applied. Not surprisingly, police use of force (particularly within the United States) has generated substantial empirical interest across the social sciences (Alpert & Dunham, 2004; Shane, Lawton, & Swenson, 2017; Terrill, 2005; Terrill & Reisig, 2003; Worden, 2015). This trend is largely due to the fact that the capacity and discretion to exercise force has long been recognized as the defining role of police officers in American society (Bittner, 1970; Goldstein, 1960; Kelling, 1999; Klockars, 1985). An increased interest in coercive police actions also stems from the outcomes of several high-profile incidents involving minority suspects, including the recent deaths of Michael Brown, Walter Scott, Eric Garner, Philando Castile, Tamir Rice, and Alton Sterling. In each of these cases, the responding officers employed force that led to the individual's death. Such actions have drawn heavy criticism from advocates of criminal justice reform, who posit that institutional police practices are discriminatory and serve to unjustly or implicitly target minority suspects more so than their white counterparts (Fitzgerald & Carrington, 2011; Harris, 1997; Nix, Campbell, Byers, & Alpert, 2017). Conversely, other studies suggest that the decision to invoke force is primarily contingent upon several situational factors (e.g., suspect behavior), above and beyond the effects of individual characteristics such as race (Shane et al., 2017; Terrill & Mastrofski, 2002).

The goal of the current study is to address these two perspectives

* Corresponding author.
*E-mail addresses:* mark.morgan@ojp.usdoj.gov (M.A. Morgan), olmate@ucmail.uc.edu (T.M. Olma).

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcrimjus.2020.101673
Received 9 February 2020; Received in revised form 22 March 2020; Accepted 23 March 2020
Available online 02 April 2020
0047-2352/ Published by Elsevier Ltd.

and identify various predictors of police use of force, with a focus on the demographic, social, and legal histories of suspects. Although the research in this area is robust, we contribute to the literature by examining a unique group of individuals who have been omitted from traditional assessments: A nationally representative sample of incarcerated offenders residing in both state and federal correctional facilities. Specifically, we used inmate self-report data to assess the impact of various use of force predictors, which includes the actions of both the officer (i.e., level of force) and the suspect/inmate (i.e., degree of resistance) at the point of arrest.

It is important to emphasize that much, though not all, of the research examining the determinants of police use of force is based on official data sources conducted by, or in conjunction with, multiple criminal justice agencies such as the Phoenix Use of Force Project, the Police-Public Contact Survey, the Police Services Study, and the Project on Policing Neighborhoods (Bolger, 2015). On the one hand, studies based on data provided by such organizations are useful because they give insight into departmental initiatives and the subsequent decision-making processes which guide officers during the course of their work; on the other hand, these sources can be limited if they focus solely on the perceptions and actions of criminal justice agencies and their employees, and do not account for those of the citizens or suspects with whom the officers interact. Similar problems have been identified within the corrections literature regarding the use of official data sources to assess the relationship between prison staff and inmates. As Wooldredge (1994) explains, administrative prison data might be distorted or biased if inmate behaviors are reported selectively by correctional staff.

We submit that the same logic can be applied to officer-suspect interactions. As some scholars have pointed out, if police officers are more likely to target certain crimes (e.g., drug crimes), then their data might be more of a reflection of their own behavior and biased interpretations of the situation as opposed to the actual actions of the suspect (Gaston, 2019). Indeed, in some cases, this could also extend to the officer's own reported use of force. Self-report offender data is therefore useful because it provides specific information that may not be captured in official police reports/data or those based on participant observation. Although the use of self-report data is not unique to the study of police use of force, to our knowledge no research has yet examined this topic from a prison inmate perspective (Hickman, Piquero, & Garner, 2008). This is problematic for at least three reasons.

The first reason is congruent with the aims of convict criminologists, who maintain that the nation's prison population—which is disproportionately made up of minorities—are "invisible" inmates whose experiences have been omitted from traditional, mainstream criminological research (Richards, Faggiani, Roffers, Hendricksen, & Krueger, 2008). Thus, prior studies on police use of force, while useful, tend to ignore a crucial party in the process—suspects who are (1) the recipients of force and (2) have been incarcerated as a result of their encounter with the police. It is possible that their accounts of the situation differ from those of the responding officers, thus contributing to a "dark figure" of police-suspect interactions (Lawton & Lamboo, 2010). The second reason pertains more generally to the precipitous shift toward evidence-based practice in criminal justice research (Cullen, Myer, & Latessa, 2009)—a process predicated on the replication of results across time, space, and social context as a means of determining "what works" in improving various criminal justice outcomes (McNeeley & Warner, 2015). Inmate self-reports therefore provide further opportunity for scholars to determine if the observations made in other use of force studies are consistent across different samples. Finally, the third reason is that research exploring the decision to arrest—and by extension, use of force—has substantially declined in the past two decades, a time during which public concern over police (mis) conduct has arguably increased (Engel et al., 2019). To this end, the current study adds to the extant literature by (1) providing a quantitative assessment of an understudied population and (2) demonstrating the utility of prison data in examining police-suspect interactions.

## 2. Correlates of force

Much of the research on police use of lethal and non-lethal force has underscored the importance of various situational factors of the officer-citizen encounters, such as suspect demeanor (Worden & Shepard, 1996), as well as the demographic characteristics (e.g., race and sex) of both officers and suspects (Brown & Frank, 2006). Scholars have also examined the impact that various organizational characteristics have on the use of force, such as departmental policies which guide and direct officer behavior (Finn, Blackwell, Stalans, Studdard, & Dugan, 2004). Still others have assessed the effects of community or ecological-level variables, including neighborhood levels of disadvantage and perceived dangerousness (Kane, 2002).

### 2.1. Situational/encounter characteristics

Police work, which includes daily interactions with citizens, is considered to be "highly situational," with little predictability across contexts (Manzoni & Eisner, 2006; Terrill & Mastrofski, 2002). It has been argued, for example, that there is no "routine" police encounter and that the interactions between officers and citizens (including those involving the use of force) can vary significantly from one to the next, despite having similar characteristics (Eck, 2003). Irrespective of the highly contextualized nature of policing, research has consistently shown that officers are more likely to use force during encounters where: (1) there is evidence of criminal behavior, (2) the suspect possesses a weapon, (3) the suspect resists arrest, (4) there is an on-scene conflict between citizens, and (5) an actual arrest is being made (Johnson, 2011; McCluskey & Terrill, 2005; McCluskey, Terrill, & Paoline, 2005; Paoline & Terrill, 2004, 2007; Terrill & Mastrofski, 2002).

For instance, Rydberg and Terrill's (2010) logistic regression analyses of the Project on Policing Neighborhoods data found that officers responding to situations involving potential assaults, robberies, sexual attacks, and homicides were over two times more likely to use force, above and beyond the effects of other legally relevant variables such as the offenders' age, race, and sex. Similarly, Johnson's (2011a) examination of over 12,000 officer-citizen interactions from the Police Officers' Essential Physical Work Report showed that suspects who were in possession of a weapon at the point of arrest were significantly more likely to be met with force. Johnson also observed strong effects for suspect resistance in predicting coercive police actions, including whether they grappled with or struck the responding officer.

Indeed, considerable attention has been given to the role that suspect resistance plays in officers' decision to employ force. In particular, studies show that higher levels of suspect resistance and hostility generally correspond with more extreme measures of force (Crawford & Burns, 1998; Dorriety, 2005; Terrill, 2001; Terrill & Paoline III, 2013; Terrill & Reisig, 2003). This research is also demonstrative of the conceptualization and measurement of the "use of force continuum," which is based on the recognition that the extent to which police use force is proportionate to the actions of the suspect with whom they interact (Terrill, Alpert, Dunham, & Smith, 2003).

### 2.2. Suspect characteristics

A plethora of studies also highlight the significance of the suspects' social and demographic histories when predicting use of force. Among others, these include measures of the suspects' socioeconomic status (SES), sex, substance abuse, mental illness, and race. Research generally suggests that suspects who (1) are male, (2) score lower on measures of SES, and (3) have a history of substance abuse or mental illness are more likely to have force used against them (Crawford & Burns, 1998; Engel, Sobol, & Worden, 2000; Johnson, 2011b; Lawton, 2007;

McCluskey & Terrill, 2005; Paoline & Terrill, 2007; Rydberg & Terrill, 2010; Terrill & Mastrofski, 2002). However, the effects of suspect race on police use of force are mixed. Some studies show that the odds of minority suspects, particularly black males, being recipients of force (including lethal force) are greater than their white counterparts (Fyfe, 1982; Gau, Mosher, & Pratt, 2010; Jacobs & O'Brien, 1998; Lee, 2004); other research indicates that the relationship between suspect race and use of force is more nuanced and oftentimes contingent upon the presence of other variables (Lee, Vaughn, & Lim, 2014; Worden, 2015). For example, Garner, Maxwell, and Heraux's (2002) analysis of police use of physical force, based on over 7500 reported incidents across six jurisdictions, found that although race significantly predicted force in situations characterized by compliance, the effect attenuated fully after controlling for measures of suspect resistance.

### 2.3. Officer and community characteristics

Similar to the effects exerted by the suspects' characteristics, the extant research suggests that the characteristics of the arresting officer may factor into whether, and to what degree, force is applied. Several studies, for example, have documented an inverse relationship between officers' level of education and use of force; that is, higher levels of officer education tend to correspond with lower rates of force (Paoline & Terrill, 2004, 2007; Rydberg & Terrill, 2010; Terrill & Mastrofksi, 2002). However, the majority of studies on the effects of race (Engel & Calnon, 2004; Lawton, 2007; McCluskey et al., 2005; McCluskey & Terrill, 2005) and gender (Garner et al., 2002; Johnson, 2011a; Lawton, 2007; Paoline & Terrill, 2007; Terrill, Leinfelt & Kwak, 2008) report null findings, with a few exceptions. Finally, a number of scholars have examined the extent to which aggregate-level characteristics impact the officers' decision to use force. Among these are measures of neighborhood SES, racial composition, and perceived level of danger. In general, these studies show that use of force tends to be higher in poorer, more disadvantaged communities (Lee, Jang, Yun, Lim & Tushaus, 2010)—the likes of which indirectly correlate with the racial composition of the neighborhood (McCluskey et al., 2005; Rydberg & Terrill, 2010; Terrill & Reisig, 2003).

Taken together, this wide body of literature indicates that the decision to use force is informed by several factors, including the characteristics of (1) the encounter or situation, (2) the suspect, (3) the officer, and (4) the communities in which the officers work and suspects reside. However, despite a spate of empirical research devoted to identifying the predictors of how and when force is used, less is known about the relative effects exerted by each characteristic. In other words, although the aforementioned characteristics have been linked to variation in use of force, some predictors may be more robust than others. A recent meta-analysis confirms this. Indeed, Bolger's (2015) quantitative evaluation of use of force predictors, based on 19 studies and 44 separate analyses across 12 datasets, shows the strongest effect sizes for variables related to encounter or situational characteristics, including whether the officer was making an arrest (OR = 4.34) and whether the suspect resisted (OR = 2.97), followed by offense seriousness (OR = 1.46) and citizen conflict (OR = 1.34). Although significant across multiple studies, the effects of the suspects' characteristics, including their intoxication (OR = 1.31), sex (OR = 1.30), demeanor (OR = 1.17), SES (OR = 1.14), and race (OR = 1.06) were less pronounced. In the same way, the effect sizes of sex (i.e., male) among officers were also limited (OR = 1.11).

## 3. Explaining the decision to use force

The decision to use force is complex and does not yield itself to a simple explanation. It is instead contingent on the confluence of several factors that involve the actions and characteristics of the suspect, the discretion exercised by the officers, as well the situational context in which the interaction between the officer and suspect occurs (Engel et al., 2019). Yet as other scholars have noted, there are few theoretical frameworks that adequately explain police behavior and decision-making (Crow & Adrion, 2011). Much of the empirical research on police use of force has been conducted atheoretically, with an emphasis on evaluative, applied research. These studies are no doubt important; however, the paucity of any theoretical explanation as a means to substantively interpret their results is problematic. This is especially true considering the fact that attempts have been made to specify decision-making processes in other areas of criminal justice research, including the use of focal concerns theory to explain variation regarding judicial discretion and sentencing outcomes (Johnson, 2005).

### 3.1. The focal concerns of police officers

The focal concerns perspective is based on the notion that criminal justice actors have both limited time and information to aid them in the decisions they make, which oftentimes requires them to develop “perceptual shorthands” as a behavioral guide (Ray & Dollar, 2013). These “shorthands” serve as a way of assessing the offenders' blameworthiness, the threat they pose to the community, and the practical constraints or considerations that might affect the offender as a result of the decision made—all of which are guided by an array of both legal and extralegal variables (Sherman, 1980). Legal factors include, among others, the seriousness of the offense, the suspect's criminal history, and the degree to which they comply with criminal justice actors. Regarding the decision to use force, then, it could be that officers are more likely to invoke it during instances where the suspect (1) has committed a particularly serious or violent offense, (2) has an extensive criminal history, and (3) poses a threat to the greater community by actively refusing to comply with the officer. Extralegal factors include, among others, the race, sex, age, and mental health history of the suspect. Importantly, the use of extralegal characteristics to assess the extent to which one is culpable and poses a threat to the community may be rooted in stereotypical assumptions about the nature of criminal behavior, including the established empirical relationships that sex, age, and race bear with involvement in the criminal justice system. To the extent that this is true, it could be that officers view young, minority males as being more dangerous, which in turn might influence whether and to what degree force is used (Eitle, D'Alessio, & Stolzenberg, 2002).

## 4. Methodology

The current study seeks to examine the extent to which use of force at the point of arrest is a product of officers' focal concerns, with a specific focus on the characteristics of both the situation and suspect. In doing so, we assess the impact of traditional extralegal variables pertaining to the suspect—such as their race and sex—as well as legally relevant variables regarding the situation, including measures of police force and suspect resistance. Based on a review of the current literature, we attempt to address the following research questions:

- RQ1: To what extent to do the extralegal characteristics of suspects influence the decision to invoke the use of force?
- RQ2: Do the effects of extralegal characteristics attenuate or disappear upon controlling for legally relevant variables?

### 4.1. Data source and sample

This study uses data provided by the Department of Justice's Survey of Inmates in State and Federal Correctional Facilities, 2004—a nationally representative sample of 18,185 incarcerated offenders housed in state and federal correctional institutions across the country. The survey employed a two-stage research design where prisons were selected using stratified random sampling with probability proportional to size and, subsequently, inmates were randomly sampled from state prisons while stratified random sampling was used to select inmates

within federal prisons. These inmate self-reports were collected using computer-assisted personal interviewing conducted during October 2003 through May 2004. They yield information related to the respondent's individual social and demographic characteristics, the offense for which they were most recently incarcerated, their criminal and medical history, and their participation in prison programs while incarcerated. Importantly, embedded within the survey are questions concerning the arrest which led to their imprisonment, including detailed information about their actions and those of the responding officer(s).

Of the 18,185 total cases available for analysis, 12,833 contained complete information on all of our variables of interest, representing just under 30% missing data. Various strategies have been proposed for dealing with missing data in criminological research (Brame, Turner, & Paternoster, 2010). Congruent with these approaches, we used multiple imputation by chained equations (MICE) in Stata 15 as it provides less biased results compared to other techniques such as listwise deletion or single imputation (van Ginkel, Linting, Rippe, & van der Voort, 2019). Unlike other imputation methods, MICE is capable of handling different variable types (e.g., binary, categorical, continuous) because it does not assume the data to be multivariate normal. Additionally, through an iterative process, $m$ datasets are imputed with estimated values—after which they are analyzed and the results pooled. Consistent with recent research and reporting standards, we assumed the data were missing at random and performed $m = 30$ imputations with the dependent variable and other covariates included in the model (Graham, Olchowski, & Gilreath, 2007). Specifically, sex and age were not missing any data and were included to mitigate bias (Enders, 2010). Predictive mean matching was then used to impute continuous variables with the "nearest neighbor" donor pool set to $k = 10$, which is recommended with larger samples (Morris, White, & Royston, 2014). Lastly, because the algorithm cannot impute nominal variables with an abnormal number of categories, the inmates' *state of residence* was excluded from this portion of the analysis. Diagnostic checks of the imputed data indicated there were no unusual variable distributions or discrepancies. This resulted in 288 permanently missing cases, leaving a final analytical sample of 17,897.

### 4.2. Dependent variable

The primary outcome for our study is a mutually exclusive, 3-category variable of *police use of force* where respondents reported experiencing no force, non-lethal force, or potentially lethal force during the arrest that led to their current incarceration. From the non-imputed data, 76.8% of respondents reported receiving no force, 9.5% non-lethal force, and 13.7% potentially lethal force. Subjects who did not report having experienced any police use of force were categorized as *no force* and served as the reference category. Given that respondents were not specifically asked about the potential effects of officer presence or simple verbal commands as a use of force, these incidents are inherently subsumed under the "no force" category. Next, those who reported that the police used or threatened any physical force against them, pushed or grabbed them, kicked or hit them (with or without a weapon), unleashed a police dog which bit them, used chemical or pepper spray on them, or any other physical force were classified as having experienced *non-lethal force*. Finally, those who reported that the police pointed or fired a gun at them were coded as having experienced *potentially lethal force*—the highest possible category. The specific wording of the survey items used to construct these categories are presented in Appendix A. To ensure consistency, individual use of force incidents were categorized at the highest level of force reported by the subject. Although we recognize the inherent subjectivity of broadly categorizing police use of force incidents, we are restricted by the questions asked in the survey itself. However, prior research on the use of force continuum has clearly shown that virtually all law enforcement agencies place "less lethal" tactics—such as soft or hard physical force, the use of service dogs, and the application of chemical or impact weapons—below and separate to that of deadly force with a firearm (Dorriety, 2005; Terrill & Paoline III, 2013).

### 4.3. Independent variables

#### 4.3.1. Situational/encounter characteristics

Measures pertaining to the specific circumstances of the inmates' arrest which resulted in their current incarceration were also created. Our primary independent variable, *suspect resistance* during the arrest, is a mutually exclusive, 4-category variable based upon severity. Respondents were categorized based on whether they reported engaging in no resistance, passive resistance, active resistance, or aggressive resistance. From the non-imputed data, 84.3% of respondents reported engaging in no resistance, 6.3% in passive resistance, 8.0% in active resistance, and 1.3% in aggressive resistance. Those who reported *no resistance* group served as the reference category. *Passive resistance* included inmates who reported that they argued with or disobeyed the police, cursed at or insulted the police, or said something threatening to the police. *Active resistance* included inmates who reported resistance to being handcuffed, resistance to being searched or having their vehicle searched, or who tried to escape by hiding, running away, or engaging in a high-speed chase. Lastly, *aggressive resistance* is based on whether inmates reported that they fought with the police, grabbed or hit them, used a weapon to threaten them, or used a weapon to assault them. Again, the wording of the survey items used for these categories are presented in Appendix A. Given that a subject could have engaged in multiple types of resistance during the same encounter, we coded resistance at the highest level reported by the inmate, since police officers would ultimately be responding to the greatest threat presented in accordance with the traditional use of force continuum (Crawford & Burns, 1998; Garner et al., 1995; Terrill & Paoline III, 2013).

Serving as the robust cluster variable for our analyses, the subject's *state of residence* at the time of the arrest was used to address the dependence of observations within distinct geographic regions of the country where behavioral norms, standards of conduct, and social contexts are similar (Williams, 2000). This measure encompassed all 50 states as well as the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico. We also created a measure to reflect the number of *police officers present* at the inmate's arrest, ranging from 1 to 99. A small subset of cases (representing less than 5% of all subjects) were treated as missing data because they reported a non-numerical response, such as voluntarily surrendering at a police station or having been incarcerated during their arrest. Finally, we created a dichotomous indicator of whether or not the inmate used, carried, or possessed any type of *weapon* (e.g., firearm, knife, blunt object) when committing their controlling offense (0 = No, 1 = Yes).

#### 4.3.2. Suspect characteristics

We include a number of variables in our study associated with legal and extralegal factors related to the suspect. The inmates' *sex* is measured as a dichotomous variable (1 = Female, 2 = Male) and *race or ethnicity* is coded using a set of mutually exclusive categories including black, Hispanic, and other race, with white serving as the reference category.[1] *Age* and *education* are continuous measures coded in years, where education ranges from kindergarten or less to two or more years of graduate school and was captured as the highest level attended prior to the subject's incarceration. *Employment history* is based on whether or not the inmate was employed or ran a business during the month before their arresting offense (0 = No, 1 = Yes). We also created a 7-item *mental disorder index* capturing whether inmates had ever been told by a

[1] "Other race" consists of American Indians or Alaskan Natives, Asians, Pacific Islanders, or Native Hawaiians, and individuals reporting multiple races—all of which were classified as non-Hispanic.

mental health professional, such as a psychiatrist or psychologist, that they suffered from any of the following disorders: depression, bipolar (including manic-depression or mania), schizophrenia (including psychotic disorders), post-traumatic stress disorder, anxiety (including panic disorders), personality disorders (including antisocial or borderline personality), or any other type of mental or emotional condition ($\alpha = 0.725$). For each disorder reported, inmates were given one point in order to capture the potential comorbidity of symptoms present, since an officer's perception of mental instability in a suspect may be associated with police use of force (Johnson, 2011b).

#### 4.3.3. Criminal history

The inmates' criminal history was captured using several measures relevant to their prior behavior and those which may have affected the arrest that eventually lead to their current incarceration.[2] *Arrest history* is a continuous measure based on the number of times the inmate was arrested before his or her most recent admission to prison. *Correctional history* is a dichotomous measure of whether an inmate had ever spent time in a juvenile detention facility or another jail, prison, or other correctional facility before their most recent arrest (0 = No, 1 = Yes). *Time in prison* is a continuous measure, coded in years, and was computed by subtracting the inmates' date of admission from the year the survey was administered. This measure serves as both a proxy for offense seriousness and as a check on potential memory degradation over time regarding the inmates' recollection of their arrest. *Violent offense* is a dichotomous measure indicating whether or not the inmate was currently serving time for a violent offense, such as murder, aggravated assault, rape, or child abuse, with non-violent offenses (e.g., property, drug, public order) serving as the reference category (0 = Non-violent, 1 = Violent).

### 4.4. Analytic strategy

The use of an ordinal dependent variable—police use of force—indicates that ordered logistic regression is the most appropriate model for this study. However, underlying this technique is the assumption of proportional odds, sometimes referred to as the parallel lines/regression assumption (Long & Freese, 2014). When met, it is assumed that the effect of the explanatory variables will be consistent across all categories of the dependent variable, meaning only one regression coefficient for each variable will be necessary to report. Yet research indicates that this assumption is often violated or ignored, potentially creating a misleading interpretation of the relationship between the modelled variables (Williams, 2016). For instance, instead of showing a consistent effect at each level of police use of force, it is possible that variables like sex, race, or suspect resistance exert asymmetrical effects at increasing levels of force, thus violating the assumption but otherwise remaining hidden within a traditional ordered logistic model.

To check for a violation, researchers are advised to conduct a Brant test and assess whether the observed coefficients deviate from the predicted proportional odds model more than would be expected by chance (Brant, 1990). Using the non-imputed data, we ran the Brant test and found that our model significantly violated this assumption. Fortunately, new methods have been developed that are less restrictive, but which still provide good model fit and are relatively straightforward to interpret. The partial proportional odds model or generalized ordered logit model is one such alternative which can be executed in Stata via the user-written program *gologit2* (Williams, 2006). In essence, *gologit2* conducts a series of binary logistic regressions by contrasting the first category against all others, the first and second against all others, then the first, second, and third against all others (repeating in this pattern until finished). For our needs, there are only two comparisons necessary: (1) no force vs. non-lethal force and potentially lethal force and (2) no force and non-lethal force vs. potentially lethal force. Another feature of *gologit2* is the iterative *autofit* command, which calculates additional parameter estimates only for those specific variables that violate the proportional odds assumption, thereby providing a more parsimonious output. We successfully used *gologit2* with the default *autofit* settings on our imputed data and obtained results that remained largely robust.[3] Finally, we note that our collinearity diagnostics showed that the average variance inflation factor (VIF) for the full model was 1.15 with no individual score above 1.38, indicating that the values were well within the acceptable range in the social sciences (Fox, 2008).

## 5. Results

Table 1 presents the initial non-imputed sample characteristics and the percentage of missing cases for each variable. As previously mentioned, all cases were successfully imputed except for those of state of residence, leaving a final sample size of 17,897. Table 2 displays the results of our generalized ordered logistic regression without suspect resistance included in the models. To note, coefficients presented in Model 1 meet the proportional odds assumption and are consistent in their effect; only those estimates that violate the assumption and function asymmetrically are reported in Model 2. We observed several important findings related to the suspect's demographic characteristics. First, men were at a significantly increased odds of receiving any force (OR = 2.09) and, to a greater extent, potentially lethal force (OR = 2.79). Younger subjects were also approximately 2% more likely, per year of age, to receive police use of force (OR = 0.981). Across race and ethnicity, the results were less consistent. Although Hispanics were not significantly more likely to report police use of force (relative to whites), blacks (OR = 1.26) and suspects belonging to other races (OR = 1.25) were more likely at each level. Mental illnesses contributed to increased use of force (OR = 1.15) and, interestingly, higher levels of education corresponded with a greater likelihood of receiving potentially lethal force (OR = 1.02). Criminal history and situational variables, such as the number of prior arrests (OR = 1.01), previous incarceration (OR = 1.10), length of time in prison (OR = 1.02), and number of officers present (OR = 1.04, 1.05) were significantly associated with use of force, although their overall magnitude remained relatively modest. Lastly, weapon use during the controlling offense was significantly associated with an increased likelihood of receiving potentially lethal force only (OR = 1.29).

In Table 3, we included a measure of suspect resistance in the model to determine how it affected the other covariates. Despite controlling for resistance, the results remained largely unchanged. Men were still significantly more likely to report experiencing any force (OR = 1.99) or potentially lethal force (OR = 2.64) compared to women. Younger subjects (OR = 0.988), black inmates (OR = 1.27), and inmates of other races (OR = 1.25) were still at a greater likelihood of reporting police force. Since the variables for race meet the proportional odds assumption, their coefficients do not differ based upon the type of force received. While this may be seen in a positive light, since race is not associated with *increased* odds of reporting higher levels of police force,

[2] Although a subject's prior criminal history, the nature of the controlling offense, and weapon use may have directly impacted the police use of force received (i.e., they could result from the same incident), we cannot conclusively determine whether the actual circumstances of the arrest involved these variables directly.

[3] There were only two substantive differences between the imputed and non-imputed *gologit2* full models. Within the non-imputed model, Hispanics were significantly (albeit marginally) more likely to receive any force versus no force (OR = 1.23, $p = .047$) and those with a higher level of education were not significantly more likely to receive potentially lethal force (OR = 1.01, $p = .130$).

**Table 1**
Sample characteristics and percent missing data ($N$ = 18,185)

| | Mean[a] | SD | Min | Max[b] | Missing | Imputed Mean[a] | Imputed SD |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Sex | 78.6 | 0.41 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 78.6 | 0.41 |
| Age | 35.8 | 10.5 | 16 | 84 | 0 | 35.8 | 10.5 |
| Race/Ethnicity | | | 1 | 4 | 0.2 | | |
| White | 35.0 | | | | | 35.0 | |
| Black | 39.8 | | | | | 39.8 | |
| Hispanic | 18.9 | | | | | 18.9 | |
| Other | 6.1 | | | | | 6.1 | |
| Education | 10.9 | 2.49 | 0 | 18 | 1.4 | 10.9 | 2.49 |
| Employment | 70.6 | 0.45 | 0 | 1 | 3.2 | 70.5 | 0.45 |
| Mental Disorder Index | 0.56 | 1.15 | 0 | 7 | 2.4 | 0.56 | 1.15 |
| Arrest History | 4.69 | 7.68 | 0 | 99 | 4.9 | 4.71 | 7.71 |
| Correctional History | 17.2 | 0.37 | 0 | 1 | 3.5 | 17.3 | 0.37 |
| Time in Prison | 3.86 | 5.02 | 0 | 43 | 4.3 | 3.86 | 5.02 |
| Violent Offense | 45.1 | 0.49 | 0 | 1 | 10.4 | 45.1 | 0.49 |
| Weapon Use | 20.7 | 0.40 | 0 | 1 | 2.4 | 20.8 | 0.40 |
| Police Officers Present | 7.19 | 9.68 | 1 | 99 | 9.2 | 7.20 | 9.69 |
| Suspect Resistance | 0.26 | 0.66 | 0 | 3 | 5.6 | 0.26 | 0.65 |
| Police Use of Force | 0.37 | 0.71 | 0 | 2 | 5.5 | 0.36 | 0.71 |
| State of Residence[c] | | | 1 | 52 | 1.6 | | |

SD = Standard deviation.
[a] Means for dichotomous variables are displayed as percentages.
[b] Imputed variables did not differ from the original sample in their minimum or maximum values.
[c] State of residence was used as the robust cluster option. As a nominal variable with numerous categories it was not capable of being imputed.

weapon use (OR = 1.23) remained significantly associated with use of force, although the effects of education and weapon use applied only to potentially lethal force. Upon controlling for suspect resistance, prior correctional history was rendered insignificant.

Finally, the effects of suspect resistance at the point of arrest were the strongest predictors in our models. This pattern held for even the most basic forms of passive resistance, such as arguing with, insulting, or disobeying the police (OR = 3.29, 2.83). For active resistance involving such actions as resisting arrest, resisting a search, or attempting to flee the scene, the effects were even more pronounced (OR = 4.49, 4.09). Not surprisingly, the odds ratios for all forms of resistance exerted stronger effects when no force was designated as the reference category in Model 1 compared to both no force and non-lethal force in Model 2. This is especially true of aggressive resistance—such as fighting with or wielding a weapon against the police—where the odds ratios are considerably large (OR = 9.93, 6.14).

## 6. Discussion

The goal of the current study was to draw on a unique data source—self-report inmate data—to assess the extent to which various legal and extralegal characteristics pertaining to the situation and suspects contributed to the likelihood of experiencing use of force at arrest. Consistent with prior research, including studies examining the use of force continuum (Crawford & Burns, 1998, 2002; Terrill & Paoline III, 2013), we found that various forms of suspect resistance exerted the strongest influence on the likelihood of having forced used against them (Bolger, 2015). Our results also show that the probability of force used is not uniform across respondents; rather, it appears to be contingent on the severity of suspect resistance. Indeed, we found that the likelihood of force precipitously changes based on whether a suspect's behavior

**Table 2**
Generalized ordered logistic regression for police use of force without suspect resistance

| | Model 1 (NF vs. NL and PL) | | | Model 2[a] (NF and NL vs. PL) | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | OR | 95% CI | SE | OR | 95% CI | SE |
| Sex | 2.09*** | 1.84, 2.37 | 0.136 | 2.79*** | 2.32, 3.35 | 0.261 |
| Age | 0.981*** | 0.977, 0.985 | 0.002 | | | |
| Race/Ethnicity | | | | | | |
| Black | 1.26*** | 1.12, 1.41** | 0.075 | | | |
| Hispanic | 1.18 | 0.988, 1.42 | 0.109 | | | |
| Other | 1.25* | 1.05, 1.50 | 0.112 | | | |
| Education | 1.00 | 0.991, 1.02 | 0.008 | 1.02* | 1.00, 1.04 | 0.010 |
| Employment | 0.977 | 0.890, 1.07 | 0.046 | | | |
| Mental Disorder Index | 1.15*** | 1.09, 1.21 | 0.029 | | | |
| Arrest History | 1.01*** | 1.00, 1.01 | 0.002 | | | |
| Correctional History | 1.10* | 1.01, 1.19 | 0.045 | | | |
| Time in Prison | 1.02*** | 1.01, 1.03 | 0.004 | | | |
| Violent Offense | 1.08 | 0.959, 1.22 | 0.066 | 0.971 | 0.850, 1.10 | 0.065 |
| Weapon Use | 1.08 | 0.973, 1.20 | 0.058 | 1.29*** | 1.13, 1.48 | 0.088 |
| Police Officers Present | 1.04*** | 1.03, 1.05 | 0.003 | 1.05*** | 1.04, 1.05 | 0.003 |
| Constant 1 | 0.065*** | 0.047, 0.091 | 0.010 | | | |
| Constant 2 | | | | 0.015*** | 0.009, 0.024 | 0.003 |

NF = No force; NL = Non-lethal force; PL = Potentially lethal force.
OR = Odds ratio; CI = Confidence interval; SE = Robust clustered standard error.
[a] Additional parameter estimates are only shown in Model 2 for variables that violated the proportional odds assumption. All other variables are consistent in their effect.
* $p < .05$.
** $p < .01$.
*** $p < .001$.

these effects are nevertheless consistent—a potentially unfavorable outcome in and of itself. Moreover, mental illness (OR = 1.11), education (OR = 1.02), arrest history (OR = 1.00), time in prison (OR = 1.02), the number of officers present (OR = 1.03, 1.04), and constitutes passive, as opposed to aggressive, resistance. These patterns are theoretically congruent with the primary focal concerns of police officers, whose exercise of force in situations may be proportional to the blameworthiness of suspects, their need to protect the community, as

**Table 3**
Generalized ordered logistic regression for police use of force with suspect resistance

| | Model 1 (NF vs. NL and PL) | | | Model 2[a] (NF and NL vs. PL) | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | OR | 95% CI | SE | OR | 95% CI | SE |
| Sex | 1.99*** | 1.73, 2.30 | 0.146 | 2.64*** | 2.18, 3.21 | 0.260 |
| Age | 0.988*** | 0.983, 0.992 | 0.002 | | | |
| Race/Ethnicity | | | | | | |
| Black | 1.27*** | 1.13, 1.43 | 0.075 | | | |
| Hispanic | 1.22 | 0.995, 1.50 | 0.129 | | | |
| Other | 1.25* | 1.04, 1.51 | 0.117 | | | |
| Education | 1.01 | 0.997, 1.03 | 0.009 | 1.02* | 1.00, 1.05 | 0.011 |
| Employment | 1.01 | 0.924, 1.10 | 0.046 | | | |
| Mental Disorder Index | 1.11*** | 1.06, 1.17 | 0.028 | | | |
| Arrest History | 1.00* | 1.00, 1.10 | 0.002 | | | |
| Correctional History | 1.03 | 0.952, 1.12 | 0.043 | | | |
| Time in Prison | 1.02*** | 1.01, 1.03 | 0.004 | | | |
| Violent Offense | 1.09 | 0.972, 1.23 | 0.066 | 0.967 | 0.852, 1.09 | 0.062 |
| Weapon Use | 1.04 | 0.945, 1.14 | 0.050 | 1.23** | 1.08, 1.40 | 0.081 |
| Police Officers Present | 1.03*** | 1.03, 1.04 | 0.003 | 1.04*** | 1.04, 1.05 | 0.003 |
| Suspect Resistance | | | | | | |
| Passive | 3.29*** | 2.95, 3.68 | 0.186 | 2.83*** | 2.43, 3.29 | 0.216 |
| Active | 4.49*** | 3.87, 5.21 | 0.341 | 4.09*** | 3.52, 4.75 | 0.312 |
| Aggressive | 9.93*** | 6.53, 15.11 | 2.12 | 6.14*** | 4.20, 8.97 | 1.18 |
| Constant 1 | 0.041*** | 0.030, 0.057 | 0.006 | | | |
| Constant 2 | | | | 0.010*** | 0.006, 0.015 | 0.002 |

NF = No force; NL = Non-lethal force; PL = Potentially lethal force.
OR = Odds ratio; CI = Confidence interval; SE = Robust clustered standard error.
[a] Additional parameter estimates are only shown in Model 2 for variables that violated the proportional odds assumption. All other variables are consistent in their effect.
* $p < .05$.
** $p < .01$.
*** $p < .001$.

well as the practical constraints of employing such measures. Thus, suspects who engage in any form of resistance at the point of arrest may be more likely to be met with force because (1) officers might associate noncompliance with degree of guilt; (2) resistance (including the use of a weapon) may pose an immediate threat to citizens; and (3) alternative measures (e.g., verbal de-escalation) may not be feasible, given the situational context.

We also found that the number of officers at the scene of arrest was significantly predictive of force, where more officers present corresponded with a greater likelihood of its use. The number of police officers present could be influenced by the severity of the offense whereby more serious calls for service may necessitate (1) the initial use of force or (2) a greater police presence as a result (i.e., officers who responded, but were not directly involved in the incident). This, in turn, may be more indicative of a suspect's blameworthiness and threat to the community. Alternatively, as some research indicates, it could be that more officers on the scene could unintentionally serve to generate chaos, leading to a loss of suspect compliance, command authority, or individual restraint (Mastrofski, Snipes, & Supina, 1996). By the same token, the link between the number of officers present and use of force could be a product of an "audience effect" whereby officers demonstrate or preserve their authority by using force in an attempt to "save face" in front of their peers (Tedeschi & Felson, 1994). The amount of time inmates served in prison also corresponded with a greater likelihood of force, although its effects were limited. As previously mentioned, it could be that time served is a proxy for offense severity, whereby lengthier sentences are a reflection of a suspect's culpability or threat to their respective communities.

Importantly, however, we observed significant effects of extralegal suspect characteristics, even after controlling for suspect resistance, on the probability of use of force including their race, sex, age, and mental health history—the likes of which also comport with prior studies. Indeed, the relatively modest odds ratios observed for these variables in the current study are comparable to the effect sizes reported in Bolger's (2015) meta-analysis. As previously noted, this consistency is especially important given the precipitous shift toward evidence-based practices over the past few decades (Cullen et al., 2009) and the necessity of replication across different samples (i.e., inmates) and social contexts (i.e., correctional facilities) in criminological research (McNeeley & Warner, 2015).

With respect to suspect race, skin color is a particularly salient feature during any social interaction, and it could be that officers rely on it to inform their "perceptual shorthands" about whether and how much force to use—the likes of which may be rooted in stereotypical assumptions about criminal behavior. As Rosenhan's (1973) seminal work, *On Being Sane in Insane Places*, demonstrates, preconceived and subjective world views about different groups and social contexts by people in positions of power can facilitate attributional biases that guide formal responses to the individuals over whom they have control—irrespective of their actual behavior. Thus, if officers view minority suspects as more threatening or blameworthy (Parker, Stults, & Rice, 2005) prior to any formal interaction, then they may be more likely to default to using force as opposed to other, non-physical methods.

Furthermore, as Johnson (2007) points out, police officers' decision to invoke force is highly contingent on a variety of non-verbal cues during the point of arrest, the likes of which significantly vary by race or ethnicity and may be evaluated as suspicious, deceptive, or otherwise dangerous. For instance, results from his frame-by-frame analyses of 240 videotaped interactions between citizens and police officers showed that during encounters where *no crime was committed*, black citizens were more likely to smile, break eye contact, have speech disturbances, and use more hand gestures. If, as past literature suggests (Blair & Kooi, 2004; Strömwall & Granhag, 2003), police officers and other criminal justice professionals are trained to perceive increases in smiles, speech disturbances, hand gestures, and avoidance of eye contact as indicators of criminal behavior, then it is possible that black suspects may be viewed as inherently more threatening or suspicious.

Conversely, we observed no significant differences between Hispanic and white non-Hispanic suspects with respect to the likelihood of force being used—a finding which is congruent, although not uniform, with other use of force studies (Crawford & Burns, 1998; Gau et al., 2010). This should be interpreted with caution, however, as some research has documented differences between Hispanics and non-Hispanics regarding use of force, including lethal force (Buehler, 2017).

Regarding the effects of suspect sex and age, our results indicate that male suspects and younger suspects are more likely to be the recipients of force, relative to their female and older counterparts. This is not surprising, given that males are disproportionately represented in virtually all categories of offending, including violent crime (D'unger, Land, & McCall, 2002). Therefore, it is plausible that police officers might default to seeing male suspects as being more blameworthy or threatening during the course of an interaction. Likewise, criminal behavior is generally seen as "a young man's game" (Witte & Tauchen, 1994) and police officers may view younger suspects as not only more likely to have committed a crime relative to elderly suspects (i.e., blameworthiness), but also more capable of resistance from a physical standpoint (i.e., posing an immediate threat).

Finally, we observed a modest effect regarding the suspects' history of mental health disorder, whereby higher scores on our index corresponded with greater odds of force being used. Given the past research on the linkage between mental illness and police use of force, this finding is also not surprising (Mulvey & White, 2014; Watson, Morabito, Draine, & Ottati, 2008). Indeed, these studies suggest that individuals suffering from certain mental illnesses—including Axis I disorders, such as psychosis and schizophrenia—may engage in a variety of provocative (i.e., threatening) behaviors toward others which, in turn, can prompt the use of force in lieu of other de-escalation tactics.[4] As Kesic, Thomas, and Ogloff (2010) point out, although some research indicates that police officers have the ability to discern some symptoms of mental disorder, identifying others—like mood or anxiety disorders—is more problematic and becomes an issue when resolving situations in which (1) persons are mentally distressed and (2) where there is increased potential for violent conflict.

## 7. Limitations and future research

While this study produced several important findings and has contributed to a better understanding regarding predictors of police use of force, it is not without limitations. To begin, although the self-reports of inmates provided a unique opportunity to study a pressing issue, the data upon which our analyses are based are secondary and were not originally designed for the purpose of examining officer-citizen interactions. Because the survey is based primarily on the prison experiences of the respondents, we were unable to examine key contextual and situational variables that have been assessed in other studies. These factors include, among others, the location of arrest (e.g., urban, suburban, rural), the crime rate of the area in which the arrest took place, the population density, the number of suspects present, the time of day, or the quality of information or evidence available to responding officers—all of which might be correlated with use of force (Engel et al., 2019; Fridel, Sheppard, & Zimmerman, 2019). Importantly, upon inclusion, these variables could further attenuate or mediate the effects of various extralegal characteristics. The use of inmate data also prohibited us from assessing the extent to which department-wide policies or mandates exert an influence on an officers' decision to employ force.

Relatedly, a second limitation concerns some of the general drawbacks that are inherent to using self-report data in criminal justice research (Lynch & Addington, 2010). Inmates were asked to recall the events of the arrest for which they were most recently incarcerated, which could be affected by recall bias wherein respondents either (1) failed to accurately report their behaviors (or the behaviors of the responding officers) at the point of arrest because they forgot the details or (2) deemphasized the extent to which their actions influenced the officers' decision to invoke force (i.e., social desirability bias). This could be especially problematic for inmates serving longer sentences, whose recollection might be skewed and based on events that occurred several years prior to the survey being administered. However, if inmates were influenced by social desirability bias, we would expect to see patterns that are incongruent with the findings produced from data collected alongside official agencies—which we did not (e.g., Rydberg & Terrill, 2010, p. 109). Indeed, by their own accounts, self-reported measures of resistance among inmates were the strongest predictors in our models. The use of self-report data also prevented us from examining the social and demographic characteristics of the arresting officers, the likes of which may contribute to variation in their decision to employ force. Future research should therefore consider the utility of combining, when possible, both self-report and administrative data (e.g., incident reports) to elucidate the nuanced relationship between legal and extralegal characteristics and the use of force.

A third limitation is that the data are cross-sectional, which prevented us from demonstrating the causal ordering for some of the observed relationships. Most importantly, we were unable to establish temporality between suspect resistance and police use of force. As a measure of situational characteristics, the assumption might be that the offender resisted first and the officer responded accordingly. In reality, however, we cannot determine this. It could be, for example, that force was used first by *either* the officer or the offender which, in turn, led to the other party responding with force, ultimately creating a cycle of increasing confrontation. Likewise, our measure of mental health disorder is based on whether inmates had *ever* been diagnosed by a mental health professional. As such, we are unable to determine whether the suspects' disorders were present before/at the time of arrest, or developed after incarceration as a result of their exposure to the prison environment. Future research in this area would therefore benefit from (1) the incorporation of longitudinal designs as a means of establishing temporal ordering for key variables and (2) specifically asking inmates about the situation in greater detail (i.e., the actions of both suspect and officer that precipitated the use of force incident).

Finally, it is important to note that our measure of potentially lethal force is primarily based on a gun being pointed at suspects, as opposed to actual shots fired. Thus, we were not able to directly assess a key issue in the literature regarding racial disparities and the use of lethal force among police officers because the sample size of inmates who were actually shot at during their arrest—and necessarily survived—was too small to conduct reliable analyses. As such, we call for more attention to be paid to the incremental steps across the categories of the use of force continuum which do not result in the application of lethal force (Hollis, 2018; Kahn, Steele, McMahon, & Stewart, 2017). It could be, for example, that these "lower level" uses of force such as grabs or holds, physical strikes, the use of chemical agents, and other less lethal compliance tactics will show more nuanced racial disparities.

## 8. Conclusion

The extent to which police officers invoke the use of force is contingent on a number of factors. Yet previous research assessing the impact of each has traditionally used official, administrative data, creating a potential bias that may be more reflective of police—as

[4] Anonymous reviewers suggested that we investigate whether particular mental illnesses were driving this relationship. Using the non-imputed data, we found that depression, personality disorders, and the "other" category were primarily responsible. We also considered whether drug or alcohol abuse could potentially augment this association as some researchers have found, but there was too much missing data on the available substance abuse measures to conduct a reliable analysis (Morabito & Socia, 2015). We encourage future research on this topic while also cautioning scholars to recognize the potential limitations of self-reported mental illness data in samples of incarcerated subjects (e.g., malingering, temporal ordering).

opposed to suspect—behavior. Drawing on focal concerns theory and using nationally representative data based on the self-reports of inmates, our findings comport with the extant literature by underscoring the importance of not only suspect behavior and other situational characteristics, but also the influence that certain demographic characteristics have on use of force decisions.

On the one hand, our results suggest that use of force is primarily driven by suspect resistance whereby higher levels of noncompliance, especially combative resistance, correspond with increased odds that force will be used; on the other hand, we observed consistent and significant effects regarding the race, sex, age, and mental health history of the suspect—above and beyond the influence of resistance. Even though the decision to use force is in large part a response to the noncompliance of suspects, our study suggests that officers' responses may also be guided by extralegal considerations that are rooted in stereotypical assumptions about the nature of criminal behavior. Indeed, the internalized perception of police bias and greater use of force reported among black and other minority inmates is supported by our results and is consistent with more general research on the link between race and cynicism toward the police (Sampson & Bartusch, 1998).

Understanding how and why police use of force is applied continues to be an important area of study. Our research suggests that inmate samples can offer a tenable perspective from which to examine police use of force. Especially promising is the potential for future research to incorporate into this methodology a range of key variables such as procedural justice, legal cynicism, perceptions of police legitimacy, past contact with the police, and changes in the law. Furthermore, as Engel et al. (2019) point out, the long-term, collateral consequences surrounding the decision to arrest make it imperative to better understand these highly situational officer-suspect encounters and their outcomes.

## Funding disclosure

This work was supported by a faculty research grant from Miami University in Hamilton, Ohio (RAA-H01) and a graduate student grant from the University of Cincinnati (PSG-E15).

## Appendix A. Response categories for each item were *yes*, *no*, *don't know*, *refused*, or *blank* (i.e., missing)

*Police Use of Force*

1. Did the police officer(s) for any reason use or threaten to use physical force against you, such as grabbing you or threatening you?
2. At the time of your arrest, did the police officer(s) push or grab you?
3. At the time of your arrest, did the police officer(s) kick you or hit you with their hand or something held in their hand?
4. At the time of your arrest, did the police officer(s) unleash a police dog that bit you?
5. At the time of your arrest, did the police officer(s) spray you with a chemical or pepper spray?
6. At the time of your arrest, did the police officer(s) use some other form of physical force?
7. At the time of your arrest, did the police officer(s) point a gun at you but not shoot?
8. At the time of your arrest, did the police officer(s) fire a gun at you?

*Suspect Resistance*

1. At any time during the arrest, did you argue with or disobey the police officer(s)?
2. At any time during the arrest, did you curse at, insult, or call the police officer(s) a name?
3. At any time during the arrest, did you say something threatening to the police officer(s)?
4. At any time during the arrest, did you resist being handcuffed or arrested?
5. At any time during the arrest, did you resist being searched or having the vehicle searched?
6. At any time during the arrest, did you try to escape by hiding, running away, or engaging in a high-speed chase?
7. At any time during the arrest, did you grab, hit, or fight with the police officer(s)?
8. At any time during the arrest, did you use a weapon to threaten the police officer(s)?
9. At any time during the arrest, did you use a weapon to assault the police officer(s)?

## References

Alpert, G. P., & Dunham, R. G. (2004). *Understanding police use of force: Officers, suspects, and reciprocity.* Cambridge University Press.
Bittner, E. (1970). *The functions of the police in modern society.* Chevy Chase, MD: National Institute of Mental Health.
Blair, J. P., & Kooi, B. (2004). The gap between training and research in the detection of deception. *International Journal of Police Science and Management, 6*(2), 77–83.
Bolger, P. C. (2015). Just following orders: A meta-analysis of the correlates of American police officer use of force decisions. *American Journal of Criminal Justice, 40*(3), 466–492.
Brame, R., Turner, M. G., & Paternoster, R. (2010). Missing data problems in criminological research. In A. Piquero, & D. Weisburd (Eds.). *Handbook of quantitative criminology* (pp. 273–288). New York, NY: Springer.
Brant, R. (1990). Assessing proportionality in the proportional odds model for ordinal logistic regression. *Biometrics,* 1171–1178.
Brown, R. A., & Frank, J. (2006). Race and officer decision making: Examining differences in arrest outcomes between black and white officers. *Justice Quarterly, 23*(1), 96–126.
Buehler, J. W. (2017). Racial/ethnic disparities in the use of lethal force by US police, 2010– 2014. *American Journal of Public Health, 107*(2), 295–297.
Crawford, C., & Burns, R. (1998). Predictors of the police use of force: The application of a continuum perspective in Phoenix. *Police Quarterly, 1*(4), 41–63.
Crawford, C., & Burns, R. (2002). Resisting arrest: Predictors of suspect non-compliance and use of force against police officers. *Police Practice and Research, 3*(2), 105–117.
Crow, M. S., & Adrion, B. (2011). Focal concerns and police use of force: Examining the factors associated with Taser use. *Police Quarterly, 14*(4), 366–387.
Cullen, F. T., Myer, A. J., & Latessa, E. J. (2009). Eight lessons from Moneyball: The high cost of ignoring evidence-based corrections. *Victims and Offenders, 4*(2), 197–213.
Dorriety, J. K. (2005). Police service dogs in the use-of-force continuum. *Criminal Justice Policy Review, 16*(1), 88–98.
D'Unger, A. V., Land, K. C., & McCall, P. L. (2002). Sex differences in age patterns of delinquent/criminal careers: Results from Poisson latent class analyses of the Philadelphia cohort study. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology, 18*(4), 349–375.
Duntley, J. D., & Buss, D. M. (2005). The plausibility of adaptations for homicide. *The Innate Mind: Structure and Contents* (pp. 291–304). .
Eck, J. (2003). Police problems: The complexity of problem theory, research and evaluation. *Crime Prevention Studies, 15*, 79–114.
Eitle, D., D'Alessio, S. J., & Stolzenberg, L. (2002). Racial threat and social control: A test of the political, economic, and threat of black crime hypotheses. *Social Forces, 81*(2), 557–576.
Enders, C. K. (2010). *Applied missing data analysis.* New York, NY: Guilford Press.
Engel, R. S., & Calnon, J. M. (2004). Examining the influence of drivers' characteristics during traffic stops with police: Results from a national survey. *Justice Quarterly, 21*(1), 49–90.
Engel, R. S., Sobol, J. J., & Worden, R. E. (2000). Further exploration of the demeanor hypothesis: The interaction effects of suspects' characteristics and demeanor on police behavior. *Justice Quarterly, 17*(2), 235–258.
Engel, R. S., et al. (2019). Explaining the decision to arrest. In Engel et al (Ed.). *The power to arrest: Lessons from Research* (pp. 29–74). New Zealand: Springer.
Felson, R. B. (1996). Big people hit little people: Sex differences in physical power and interpersonal violence. *Criminology, 34*(3), 433–452.
Felson, R. B., & Messner, S. F. (1996). To kill or not to kill? Lethal outcomes in injurious attacks. *Criminology, 34*(4), 519–545.
Finn, M. A., Blackwell, B. S., Stalans, L. J., Studdard, S., & Dugan, L. (2004). Dual arrest decisions in domestic violence cases: The influence of departmental policies. *Crime and Delinquency, 50*(4), 565–589.
Fitzgerald, R. T., & Carrington, P. J. (2011). Disproportionate minority contact in Canada: Police and visible minority youth. *Canadian Journal of Criminology and Criminal Justice, 53*(4), 449–486.
Fox, J. (2008). *Applied regression analysis, linear models, and related methods.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
Fridel, E. E., Sheppard, K. G., & Zimmerman, G. M. (2019). Integrating the literature on police use of deadly force and police lethal victimization: How does place impact fatal police– Citizen encounters? *Journal of Quantitative Criminology,* 1–36.
Fyfe, J. (1982). Blind justice: Police shootings in Memphis. *The Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology, 73*, 707–722.
Garner, J. H., Maxwell, C. D., & Heraux, C. G. (2002). Characteristics associated with the prevalence and severity of force used by the police. *Justice Quarterly, 19*(4), 705–746.

Garner, J. H., Schade, T., Hepburn, J., & Buchanan, J. (1995). Measuring the continuum of force used by and against the police. *Criminal Justice Review, 20*(2), 146–168.
Gaston, S. (2019). Producing race disparities: A study of drug arrests across place and race. *Criminology, 57*(3), 424–451.
Gau, J. M., Mosher, C., & Pratt, T. C. (2010). An inquiry into the impact of suspect race on police use of Tasers. *Police Quarterly, 13*(1), 27–48.
van Ginkel, J. R., Linting, M., Rippe, R. C. A., & van der Voort, A. (2019). Rebutting existing misconceptions about multiple imputation as a method for handling missing data. *Journal of Personality Assessment,* 1–12.
Goldstein, J. (1960). Police discretion not to invoke the criminal process: Low-visibility decisions in the administration of justice. *The Yale Law Journal, 69*(4), 543–594.
Graham, J. W., Olchowski, A. E., & Gilreath, T. D. (2007). How many imputations are really needed? Some practical clarifications of multiple imputation theory. *Prevention Science, 8*(3), 206–213.
Harris, D. A. (1997). "Driving while black" and all other traffic offenses: The Supreme Court and pretextual traffic stops. *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology, 87*(2), 544–582.
Hickman, M. J., Piquero, A. R., & Garner, J. H. (2008). Toward a national estimate of police use of nonlethal force. *Criminology & Public Policy, 7*(4), 563–604.
Hollis, M. E. (2018). Measurement issues in police use of force: A state-of-the-art review. *Policing: An International Journal, 41*(6), 844–858.
Jacobs, D., & O'Brien, R. M. (1998). The determinants of deadly force: A structural analysis of police violence. *American Journal of Sociology, 103*, 837–862.
Johnson, B. D. (2005). Contextual disparities in guidelines departures: Courtroom social contexts, guidelines compliance, and extralegal disparities in criminal sentencing. *Criminology, 43*(3), 761–796.
Johnson, R. R. (2007). Race and police reliance on suspicious non-verbal cues. *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies and Management, 30*(2), 277–290.
Johnson, R. R. (2011a). Predicting officer physical assaults at domestic assault calls. *Journal of Family Violence, 26*(3), 163–169.
Johnson, R. R. (2011b). Suspect mental disorder and police use of force. *Criminal Justice and Behavior, 38*(2), 127–145.
Kahn, K. B., Steele, J. S., McMahon, J. M., & Stewart, G. (2017). How suspect race affects police use of force in an interaction over time. *Law and Human Behavior, 41*(2), 117–126.
Kane, R. J. (2002). The social ecology of police misconduct. *Criminology, 40*(4), 867–896.
Kelling, G. L. (1999). *Broken windows and police discretion.* Washington, DC: US Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, National Institute of Justice.
Kesic, D., Thomas, S. D., & Ogloff, J. R. (2010). Mental illness among police fatalities in Victoria 1982–2007: Case linkage study. *Australian & New Zealand Journal of Psychiatry, 44*(5), 463–468.
Klockars, C. B. (1985). *The idea of police.* Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.
Lawton, A., & Lamboo, T. (2010). Police misconduct: Accountability of internal investigations. *International Journal of Public Sector Management, 23*(7), 613–631.
Lawton, B. A. (2007). Levels of nonlethal force: An examination of individual, situational, and contextual factors. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, 44*(2), 163–184.
Lee, C. (2004). But I thought he had a gun: Race and police use of a deadly force. *Hastings Race and Poverty Law Journal, 2*, 1–51.
Lee, H., Jang, H., Yun, I., Lim, H., & Tushaus, D. W. (2010). An examination of police use of force utilizing police training and neighborhood contextual factors: A multilevel analysis. *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies & Management, 33*(4), 681–702.
Lee, H., Vaughn, M. S., & Lim, H. (2014). The impact of neighborhood crime levels on police use of force: An examination at micro and meso levels. *Journal of Criminal Justice, 42*(6), 491–499.
Long, J. S., & Freese, J. (2014). *Regression models for categorical dependent variables using Stata.* College Station, TX: Stata Press.
Lynch, J. P., & Addington, L. A. (2010). Identifying and addressing response errors in self-report surveys. In A. Piquero, & D. Weisburd (Eds.). *Handbook of quantitative criminology* (pp. 251–272). New York, NY: Springer.
Manzoni, P., & Eisner, M. (2006). Violence between the police and the public: Influences of work-related stress, job satisfaction, burnout, and situational factors. *Criminal Justice and Behavior, 33*(5), 613–645.
Mastrofski, S. D., Snipes, J. B., & Supina, A. E. (1996). Compliance on demand: The public's response to specific police requests. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, 33*(3), 269–305.
McCluskey, J., & Terrill, W. (2005). Departmental and citizen complaints as predictors of police coercion. *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies and Management, 28*, 513–529.
McCluskey, J., Terrill, W., & Paoline, E. (2005). Peer group aggressiveness and the use of coercion in police-suspect encounters. *Police Practice & Research, 6*, 19–37.
McNeeley, S., & Warner, J. J. (2015). Replication in criminology: A necessary practice. *European Journal of Criminology, 12*(5), 581–597.
Morabito, M. S., & Socia, K. M. (2015). Is dangerousness a myth? Injuries and police encounters with people with mental illnesses. *Criminology & Public Policy, 14*(2), 253–276.
Morris, T. P., White, I. R., & Royston, P. (2014). Tuning multiple imputation by predictive mean matching and local residual draws. *BMC Medical Research Methodology, 14*(1), 75.
Mulvey, P., & White, M. (2014). The potential for violence in arrests of persons with mental illness. *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies & Management, 37*(2), 404–419.
Nix, J., Campbell, B. A., Byers, E. H., & Alpert, G. P. (2017). A bird's eye view of civilians killed by police in 2015: Further evidence of implicit bias. *Criminology & Public Policy, 16*(1), 309–340.
Paoline, E., & Terrill, W. (2004). Women police officers and the use of coercion. *Women and Criminal Justice, 15*, 97–119.
Paoline, E., & Terrill, W. (2007). Police education, experience, and the use of force. *Criminal Justice and Behavior, 34*(2), 179–196.
Parker, K. F., Stults, B. J., & Rice, S. K. (2005). Racial threat, concentrated disadvantage and social control: Considering the macro-level sources of variation in arrests. *Criminology, 43*(4), 1111–1134.
Ray, B., & Dollar, C. B. (2013). Examining mental health court completion: A focal concerns perspective. *The Sociological Quarterly, 54*(4), 647–669.
Richards, S. C., Faggiani, D., Roffers, J., Hendricksen, R., & Krueger, J. (2008). Convict criminology: Voices from prison. *Race/Ethnicity: Multidisciplinary Global Contexts* (pp. 121–136). .
Rosenhan, D. L. (1973). On being sane in insane places. *Science, 179*(4070), 250–258.
Rydberg, J., & Terrill, W. (2010). The effect of higher education on police behavior. *Police Quarterly, 13*, 92–120.
Sampson, R. J., & Bartusch, D. J. (1998). Legal cynicism and (subcultural) tolerance of deviance: The neighborhood context of racial difference. *Law and Society Review, 32*(4), 777–804.
Shane, J. M., Lawton, B., & Swenson, Z. (2017). The prevalence of fatal police shootings by US police, 2015–2016: Patterns and answers from a new data set. *Journal of Criminal Justice, 52*, 101–111.
Sherman, L. W. (1980). Causes of police behavior: The current state of quantitative research. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, 17*(1), 69–100.
Strömwall, L., & Granhag, P. A. (2003). How to detect deception? Arresting the beliefs of police officers, prosecutors and judges. *Psychology, Crime and Law, 9*(1), 19–36.
Sung, H. E. (2002). *The fragmentation of policing in American cities: Toward an ecological theory of police-citizen relations.* Westport, CT: Greenwood Publishing Group.
Tedeschi, J. T., & Felson, R. B. (1994). *Violence, aggression, and coercive actions.* Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
Terrill, W. (2001). *Police coercion: Application of the force continuum.* El Paso, TX: Scholarly Publishing.
Terrill, W. (2005). Police use of force: A transactional approach. *Justice Quarterly, 22*(1), 107–138.
Terrill, W., Alpert, G. P., Dunham, R. G., & Smith, M. R. (2003). A management tool for evaluating police use of force: An application of the force factor. *Police Quarterly, 6*(2), 150–171.
Terrill, W., & Mastrofski, S. D. (2002). Situational and officer-based determinants of police coercion. *Justice Quarterly, 19*(2), 215–248.
Terrill, W., Leinfelt, F. H., & Kwak, D. H. (2008). Examining police use of force: A smaller agency perspective. *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies & Management, 31*(1), 57–76.
Terrill, W., & Paoline, E. A., III (2013). Examining less lethal force policy and the force continuum: Results from a national use-of-force study. *Police Quarterly, 16*(1), 38–65.
Terrill, W., & Reisig, M. D. (2003). Neighborhood context and police use of force. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, 40*(3), 291–321.
Watson, A. C., Morabito, M. S., Draine, J., & Ottati, V. (2008). Improving police response to persons with mental illness: A multi-level conceptualization of CIT. *International Journal of Law and Psychiatry, 31*(4), 359–368.
Williams, R. L. (2000). A note on robust variance estimation for cluster-correlated data. *Biometrics, 56*(2), 645–646.
Williams, R. L. (2006). Generalized ordered logit/partial proportional odds models for ordinal dependent variables. *The Stata Journal, 6*(1), 58–82.
Williams, R. L. (2016). Understanding and interpreting generalized ordered logit models. *The Journal of Mathematical Sociology, 40*(1), 7–20.
Witte, A. D., & Tauchen, H. (1994). *Work and crime: An exploration using panel data.* Cambridge, MA: National Bureau of Economic Research.
Wooldredge, J. D. (1994). Inmate crime and victimization in a southwestern correctional facility. *Journal of Criminal Justice, 14*, 1–25.
Worden, R. E. (2015). The "causes" of police brutality: Theory and evidence on police use of force. In E. Maguire, & D. Duffee (Vol. Eds.), *Criminal justice theory: Explaining the nature and behavior of criminal justice. 2. Criminal justice theory: Explaining the nature and behavior of criminal justice* (pp. 149–204).
Worden, R. E., & Shepard, R. L. (1996). Demeanor, crime, and police behavior: A reexamination of the police services study data. *Criminology, 34*(1), 83–105.

**Mark A. Morgan** received his Ph.D. from the University of Cincinnati's School of Criminal Justice. His research has been published in the *American Journal of Criminal Justice*, *Justice Quarterly*, *Criminal Justice Review*, and the *Journal of Criminal Justice*.

**Matthew W. Logan** received his Ph.D. from the University of Cincinnati's School of Criminal Justice and is currently an Assistant Professor in the School of Criminal Justice at Texas State University. His research primarily focuses on inmate experiences and his work has appeared in a number of peer-reviewed scientific journals including *Victims and Offenders*, the *American Journal of Criminal Justice*, *Justice Quarterly*, the *Journal of Criminal Justice*, the *Journal of Quantitative Criminology*, *Criminal Justice Policy Review*, and *Society and Mental Health.*

**Tayte M. Olma** is a doctoral candidate in the School of Criminal Justice at the University of Cincinnati. Her research interests include institutional corrections and immigration and crime. Her research has appeared in the *Journal of Criminal Justice* and the *Handbook of Incarceration in Popular Media.*