

Nursing Education 2016: A Forensic Psychological Research Question of Whether or Not High Profile Cross-Racial Police Incidents Compromise Officer Safety: A Dissenting Voice on Bias Training- Ronn Johnson- University of Creighton Medical School

Ronn Johnson

University of Creighton Medical School, USA

Introduction: Research to date has offered few insights when examining the forensic psychological impact that assessed bias (i.e., explicit-implicit) may have on police officer safety as a consequence of high profile cross-racial police incidents. This editorial reflects on 21st Century law enforcement complexities as noted by the stressful in-the-street policing work performed through using a multilayered public safety framework. From a forensic psychological perspective, by default, the lawful execution of police duties means that the calculated creation of a culture of safety is a critical psychosocial trust factor in diverse communities. Most informed police departments fully understand that public safety is an immediate product signaled by community markers like ethnoracial values, attitudes, perceptions, officer cross-cultural competencies, trust and historical patterns of procedural justice. However, high profile cross-racial police incidents are actually more known for reactivating unresolved residual affect that stems largely from the trans-generational communication of the perceptions from previous law enforcement offenses.

These perceived police misconduct incidents usually predate current technology. For example, today the explosive use of cell phone cameras, 24-7 news coverage and easy access to social media outlets allow the more pointed details of police conduct to be made immediately known to the public. In fact, departments struggle to stay ahead of an unwanted public safety narrative that can reflexively emerge following these incidents. As a result, departments are too often left having to play catch up succeeding another high profile cross-racial incident. Forensically relevant research questions must be posed that ask whether or not the gathering storm of community outrage seemingly emerging from these

cross-racial police incidents truly result in a rise in the violence directed towards police officers? Still, in order to address this police reality, post-offer forensic psychological screenings of applicants, academy preparation experiences and subsequent field training efforts continue to struggle to remain ahead of these diverse officer safety challenges. Perceived officer racial mistreatment remains a major concern in policing. As a result of another racial quick fix assessment, it has been determined that cross-racial incidents may in fact be a direct consequence of a paucity of officer training about their potential biases (e.g., implicit or explicit).

There is some empirical basis that underscores a belief that Whites' unconscious or implicit racial biases can influence them to evaluate and then react more negatively towards some racial groups. Perhaps even more challenging, these unwanted ethnoracial behaviors can appear beyond their own level of awareness or are otherwise unconscious. In terms of the explicit side of this policing issue, there is also an unfounded belief that perhaps officers can consciously escape coming across as racially motivated simply as a result of cognizant efforts to avoid seeming to be racist through some type of an assessment of themselves during these cross-racial situations. Missing from this debate is the misplaced belief that ethnoracial prejudice is ubiquitous amongst officers, and what is most needed for correction is anti-bias training of some sort. What some has hailed as an ethnoracially responsive corrective action has now mushroomed into a growing covert and overt resentment amongst officers who are mandated to attend these bias training sessions. Even the Department of Justice has mandated it. There is an implied assumption that a unique blend of scene management factors (e.g., officer-suspect race, mental illness, failure

to comply with lawful commands and the situational assessment of a threat to safety, etc.) can now somehow be integrated into various bias training sessions and would theoretically result in an appreciable improvement in the cross-racial responses during an officer's life-death split second decision-making. This is an unfortunate line of reasoning that has failed to make a clear and convincing case to the targeted recipients of the training who are the sworn weapons carrying law enforcement personnel confronting these scene management situations on a daily basis. No matter how these bias assessments and trainings are packaged, they are largely viewed as carefully veiled corrective actions that boil down to an unspoken but unflinching charge that "you're all a bunch of racist bigots that can only be saved through these bias training sessions." Are there racially biased police? The fast answer is "yes! This cross-racial circumstance begs the question, why aren't these bias issues screened for during the pre-offer, academy and FTO phases?" Comparatively speaking, there are also individuals who hold radicalized extremist views but do not act on them or otherwise engage in terrorism. On the whole, high profile cross-racial police incidents are not bias training issues. Why? It is virtually impossible and impractical to try to make a defensible forensic psychological case that a particular officer's scene management actions, or lack thereof, are the direct result of explicit or implicit biases.

One of the many problems with the aforementioned bias line of reasoning is that predictable scene management situations must always include an assessment of the severity of the risks that police specifically encounter at the time. In addition, police experience these stressful exchanges under real time circumstances that are emotionally charged and coincide with split second life-death decisions that must be made. All of these decisions are executed with full consideration of the guidance provided from more qualified firearms and use of force trainers. For example, a black male suspect is confronted

by two uniformed police officers for bizarre behavior observed in public.

Result: During this encounter the officers on the scene are made aware that the suspect is a mental patient. As officers approached him, the suspect gave every indication of refusing to comply with several commands to show his hands. At the time, the suspect removed an object from his pocket and then assumed what was later described as a shooter's stance while pointing the object at one of the officers. From a purely public safety standpoint, there are at least five risk assessment questions here. First, since it only takes seconds or less to discharge a weapon, can or should an officer take the risk that this suspect is not actually pointing a gun at him or her? Second, can the same officers also take the risk of allowing this person to discharge what is thought to be a weapon in public with the unknown possibility of injuring others, much less himself? Third, can the officer having the object pointed at him assume that the bystander information received about the suspect's mental status is factual or even relevant under the circumstances of the scene? Fourth, does the extremely broad designation of mental illness exempt any officer from exercising deadly force, or is there a specific protocol for handling a Black mental health suspect that has assumed a shooter's stance while pointing an object at an officer on the scene which could be reasonably assessed as a gun of some type? Finally, if so, do the suspect's actions in and of themselves at the scene justify the use of lethal force under the guidance of departmental policy or based on their training? The use of lethal force because of a perceived threat in the case here unfortunately resulted in the death of this suspect who was later confirmed to have mental health issues. As a result, there were large scale community protests with accusations that the police killed another suspect because of his race and who was later determined to be unarmed at the time of the incident.