VIOLENCE AGAINST THE POLICE:

ASSAULTS ON BALTIMORE COUNTY POLICE, 1984-1986

FINAL REPORT

By

Craig D. Uchida
and
Laure W. Brooks

With
Roxie Eigenbrode Schoppet
and
Christopher Koper

Institute of Criminal Justice
and Criminology

University of Maryland
College Park, MD

July 1988

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

Violence against the police, like violence by the police has become a critical topic in the 1980s. Unlike police use of deadly force, however, assaults and homicides of police have not received the attention by researchers that it merits.

Though the actual number of officers killed and assaulted has declined in recent years, the rate of violence against the police is greater than the violence that occurs within the general population. For example, in Illinois, although assaults against police decreased by more than 26 percent from 1972 to 1982 (2,408 incidents to 1,761) and assaults against the general public increased 80 percent during the same period, police officers in Illinois have an assault rate more than 10 times higher than the comparable rate for Illinois citizens (Dykstra, 1984). Nationwide, in a ten-year period (1977-1986), the number of assaults against the police has averaged more than 58,000 per year, with 22,000 involving injuries. This breaks down to about 17 assaults per 100 officers throughout the country, with an injury rate of about six per 100 officers (FBI, 1987). During the same time period (1977-1986), 875 officers lost their lives nationwide, ranging from a low of 66 in 1986 to a high of 106 in 1979. During 1970-1978, three law enforcement officers were killed annually for every 10,000 officers in the major U.S. cities, with rates ranging from 0.0 in Albuquerque and other cities to 10.5 in Atlanta (Lester, 1981).

Surprisingly, we know little about violence against the

police beyond these data. Only a handful of studies have examined violence against police, and most have done so within the context of police use of deadly force against civilians. Other studies of police violence have restricted their scope to killings of police and have ignored assaults against police officers.

Currently there is little basis in research for telling police executives what they may do tomorrow to reduce violence against their officers. No administrative strategy, no training program, no police procedure has been shown to reduce violence against police. Similarly, prior research is unable to give us a complete picture of the violent encounter: Who is the offender? Who is the officer? What kind of interaction takes place between the offender and officer that leads to an assault? Under what circumstances is an officer in more or less danger?

Additionally, a number of methodological flaws exist in previous research efforts which preclude accurate identification of situational and dynamic characteristics. Inconsistent reporting practices, definitional discrepancies, problems of representativeness of the findings, and a lack of baseline information are among the problems that exist in prior research. We have attempted to overcome these difficulties in this study.

Overall, this report examines issues and problems related to violence against the police in Baltimore County. Through an analysis of 1,550 assaults over a three-year period we have identified characteristics of the offender and officer, described

the environment of the encounter, and have explained the interactions of the actors. Five data sources were employed: 1) all assaults reported by the Baltimore County police from January 1, 1984 to December 31, 1986; 2) police personnel records; 3) a random sample of calls for service; 4) demographic information of Baltimore County; and 5) the FBI's national database on law enforcement officers killed and assaulted.

Specifically, we have addressed the following questions: 1) What are the situational and individual-level characteristics (offender and officer) that are likely to be associated with the violent encounter? 2) How do these characteristics vary with the degree of violence used? 3) What are the dynamics of the event that facilitate or prevent violence from occurring or escalating? 4) What are the "most" and "least" dangerous types of activities that police officers are involved in on a daily basis?

The report is divided into six sections. First, prior studies and data collection efforts are examined. Second, we discuss the methodological problems with these efforts. Third, we present the research questions and methods used in this study. In Section IV we describe the basic characteristics of the assault incident. In Section V two specific issues are addressed--officer safety and domestic disturbances. In the final section, we discuss the policy implications of our study and examine future research questions.

I. PRIOR RESEARCH AND DATA COLLECTION EFFORTS

In the last two decades a number of studies have appeared that have devoted some attention to assaults and killings of police. In addition, the FBI has collected data since 1962 on the number of officers killed and assaulted on an annual basis.

The most extensive study of violence against the police was conducted by researchers at the University of Oklahoma over 15 years ago. A number of books, monographs, and journal articles have appeared that make use of the data collected from police agencies in five south-central states (see for example, Hale and Wilson, 1974; Meyer et al., 1974, 1978, 1981; Morrison and Meyer, 1974; Regens et al., 1974; and Chapman, 1976).

Since the mid-1970s at least three dissertations have dealt with violence against the police in some fashion. James Bannon examined assaults and killings of Detroit police officers in 1976, while New York City police were the subject for both James J. Fyfe (1978) and Mona Margarita (1980). Fyfe concentrated primarily on citizens killed by the police, though he also discussed killings of police. Margarita focused on killings of the police from 1844 to 1978 using a social-psychological classification scheme to examine motives of the citizen assailants.

As part of a broader study of police use of deadly force in Chicago, William Geller and Kevin Karales examined shootings of police in 1981.

More recently, two studies have used FBI data to examine

police deaths and assaults. David Konstantin, focusing on police homicides from 1978 to 1980, found that officers were less likely to be killed in domestic disturbances than originally thought by police and researchers (Konstantin, 1984). Joel Garner and Elizabeth Clemmer (1987) combined the FBI data with data from previous studies and found that danger to police in certain situations has been overstated.

Overall, prior research on violence against police is divided into three subsets: individual-level analysis, situational analysis, and the interactions of individuals and situations or the dynamics of the violent events. Using these three components, the previous research attempts to describe and explain violence against police, but lacks sufficient detail to make decisions about how to reduce violence or to develop an accurate profile of the violent police assaulter. At the individual level, officer and offender characteristics are examined. At the situational level, the circumstances of the shooting or assault, the type of crime committed, the type of police entry to the encounter, and other variables are used. Less attention has been focused on the dynamics of the violent event.

A. Individual-Level Variables

Officer Characteristics.

Prior studies have been somewhat uniform in reporting the officer's characteristics common in violent encounters. Overall,

the material makes reference to the officer's age, sex, race, and years served. More detailed studies examine the individual's duty status and area of residence.

Recent statistics show that young, educated, male patrol officers with an average of five years or less on the police force are most likely to be assaulted. Nationally, police officers killed in the line of duty have been variously described as white, male, tall, in their mid-twenties, and employed on the police force for a median of five and one-half years (FBI, 1987). In addition, regional variations have been reported regarding officers killed. Margarita reports that most New York City officers killed between 1966 and 1971 were white, in their mid-twenties, and worked five years or less as policemen. Fifty percent of the officers were off-duty at the time of death (Margarita, 1980:7). The "typical" Oklahoma officer killed during the period between 1950 and 1971 was a native Oklahoman, 42 years old, white, in uniform, working in a non-urban setting, married and also with less than five years on the force (Chapman, 1976). In Chicago, Geller and Karales found that all of the officers shot or wounded were males, most had less than ten years of service, and only a few had supervisory positions. The duty status of the officers was also significant in that 43.5 percent of the officers died while off-duty.

The research on assaults is similar in some respects to the homicide studies. Hale and Wilson (1974) show that officers assaulted by civilians were under the age of 30 and had two to

three years of service. Bannon's research in Detroit differed slightly in that the characteristics of the assaulted officers included predominantly white males under the age of 27 with three to five years of service.

Offender Characteristics.

Similar attempts have been made to describe the "typical" police assailant. Homicide data from the FBI's reports (1972-1986), research by Chapman (1976), and Geller and Karales (1981) found that offenders were primarily non-white males under the age of 25 who had prior records and were intoxicated at the time of the incident. More specifically, the FBI reported offender characteristics as 90 percent between the ages of 18 and 34; 41.6 percent were nonwhite; 88.3 percent males; 70 percent had prior records; and 64 percent were drinking alcohol before the event. For studies on assaults, Bannon (1976) and Meyers et al. (1979) discovered similar findings.

B. Situational Characteristics

The prior research on homicides and assaults of police are somewhat in agreement over their situational variables. The FBI, Geller and Karales (1981), and Bannon (1976) found that weekends, evening hours, and summer months were particularly dangerous times for the police. The type of assignment for police, especially patrol, led to increased violent encounters (Bannon, 1976).

Geller and Karales (1981) shed more light on the situational

characteristics than the other homicide researchers. In 98 shootings of the police, 24 percent involved more than one offender. Officers were wounded in 83 percent of those events, and killed in 15.7 percent of those incidents. Most shootings took place outdoors (58.2 percent), with 26.6 percent of the outdoor shootings occurring on the streets. The circumstances under which police were shot in Chicago included: disturbance calls (43 percent); other situations (22 percent); robberies (18 percent); personal business (10 percent); traffic stops (5 percent); and burglaries (2 percent).

Research on situational factors for assaults has been superficial. The FBI presents data on the type of activity (disturbance calls, burglaries in progress, etc.), the type of weapon, the time of the activity, and the type of assignment of the officer. Usually, disturbance calls (family quarrels, man with a gun, etc.) account for the plurality of assaults; and hands, fists and feet are the main types of weapons used in the encounter (on average about 80 percent). Regens, Meyer, Swanson, and Chapman (1974) found that certain types of incidents -- narcotics, liquor law violations, and disorderly conduct increased the frequency of injury assaults. For non-injury assault, the types of arrest found prevalent were robbery, larceny, stolen property, traffic violations, and other assaults.

Konstantin (1984) examined FBI reports of all felonious deaths of law enforcement officers in the U.S. between 1978-1980. Hypotheses concerning the manner in which officers became

involved in the incident (citizen-initiated v. police-initiated), the type of incident leading to the death of the officer, as well as the race and duty status of the officer involved, were tested. Konstantin found that deaths of law enforcement officers were largely the result of police-initiated contacts. He suggested that officers were inadequately prepared when they initiated contacts and unknowingly inserted themselves into dangerous situations. He advised that police training should focus not only on citizen-initiated routine activities but also on the necessity to approach carefully police-invoked situations.

Konstantin additionally examined the type of incident that typically preceded a death of a law enforcement officer. Contrary to the often dramatized belief that domestic disturbances are the most dangerous call for service, Konstantin found that domestic disturbances only account for approximately one in twenty police line-of-duty deaths, while robbery ranked much higher in terms of dangerousness. The modal category of incident precipitating an officer death was the general category of "attempting other arrests" which involves a non-warrant arrest situation for offenses other than robbery or burglary. Konstantin explained that the common misconception concerning the dangerousness of domestic disturbances is the result of three factors. First, the FBI aggregates all disturbances into one category. Second, the intimate relationship between the victim and the suspect in a domestic encounter opens up the possibility that both will team up against the officer. And third, the

police hold the attitude that handling domestics is not "real police work," leaving them unprepared for a violent situation.

Like Konstantin, Garner and Clemmer (1986) found that domestic disturbances did not account for as much danger as previously thought. Garner and Clemmer construct "harm ratios" to estimate danger rates. The authors use homicide and assault data collected by the FBI, Bannon, Chapman, Margarita, and Geller and Karales, and combine them with various studies of police activity to construct their ratios. Their findings indicate that "the consistently low rankings for domestic disturbances and traffic argue that these types of police work are less likely per incident to result in officer deaths than robberies or burglaries." The authors note however, that "the evidence for assaults and injuries to police is less clear cut. Whenever data are available, robbery continues to rank as the most dangerous assignment. Domestic disturbances, other disturbance, burglaries, and traffic shift rank depend[ing] on the data source and the type of harm" (Garner and Clemmer, 1986:5).

C. The Dynamics of the Encounter

The dynamics of the violent encounter are the least researched variables in prior studies. We define the dynamics of the encounter as the interaction between the offender, officer, and situation that leads to a resolution of a problem. This could mean that the encounter is de-escalated, causes aggressive behavior by both parties, involves an arrest, or simply involves

a warning by the police. The interaction effects are those areas where police discretion comes into play.

For the most part, the past research treats the actors and situations as if they were autonomous units. The FBI, Bannon (1976), Chapman (1976), and other studies give the characteristics of the offenders and the officers as well as some of the situational components (time, patrol assignment, etc.), but do not indicate much interaction. We know who was involved, where the event occurred, and at what time, but we need to know more about what happened and why it occurred in order to prevent future violence from taking place. The interaction between the police and the offender is crucial to that understanding.

Prior research has looked at a few aspects of interaction, including race, neighborhoods, crowd presence, number of police, and the motivations of the offenders. Geller and Karales (1981), as did Konstantin (1984), explained the race variable in conjunction with duty status and place of residence. Overall, black officers in Chicago were three times more likely to be shot than white officers. When black officers were on-duty, they were fired upon 1.6 more times than white officers, but when off-duty, they were shot at five times more than white officers. Also, a black officer was nine times more likely to be shot by a black offender than a white officer was shot by a white offender. Finally, black officers were shot at a frequency of 13 times more in high crime areas and two times more in low crime areas compared to white officers. Geller and Karales concluded that

black officers are fired upon more often due to their residence in high and medium crime areas.

Mona Margarita's (1980) research focused to some extent on the dynamics of the homicides of police. She examined officer homicides from the New York City Police Department between 1844-1978 with a sample size of 245. Margarita used Hans Toch's social psychological classification scheme to investigate the motives of the assailants. Five primary motives -- perseverance, autonomy, protection, defense of others, and contempt were used in the analysis. Perseverance as a motive involved the officer intervening in a violent act that was already in progress. This intervention caused the officer to become part of the already existing violence. The offender was persevering, or continuing his criminal behavior. The autonomy motive described the violent reaction of a person who saw the officer as a form of undesirable manipulation. Protection was defined as the use of violence to flee from impending doom, the officer. The defense of others meant the rescue of an accomplice from the impending doom of capture. Finally, contempt was described as an individual expressing violent disapproval of an officer's presence. Margarita's findings show protection as the predominant motive in the killing of an officer (63 percent of the cases); contempt, 13 percent; autonomy, 9 percent; perseverance, 8 percent; defense of others, 2 percent; and 4 percent were considered unclassifiable. One last note, Margarita found that the protection motive was strongly related to more serious crime.

In assault research, the analyses are less detailed than the homicide literature. Regens et al. (1974) discovered that the presence of alcohol increased the level of violence in a situation. Bannon (1976) found that the presence of a crowd and the number of officers present had an effect on the violent event.

II. PROBLEMS WITH PRIOR RESEARCH

A number of methodological flaws exist in the prior studies which precludes an accurate assessment of violence against the police. The most important difficulties include inconsistent reporting procedures, definitional discrepancies, problems of representativeness of the findings, and a lack of baseline information from which to generalize the results.

A. Reporting Procedures

One of the most troublesome methodological issues deals with methods of data collection. Specifically, the national statistics reported by the FBI and used by several researchers, are limited because of reporting procedures. Each police department experiencing an assault or homicide of an officer is requested to submit a standard form on a monthly basis to the FBI. Unfortunately, there is no guarantee that each department will report all assaults or homicides each year, though homicides are likely to be reported accurately. Some departments disregard the directive to report all assaults, including non-injury as

well as injury assaults, especially when charges relating to the assault are not filed against the offender. This results in underreporting. Departments may also submit only partially completed FBI forms, thus weakening the ability of researchers to describe the incidents fully. These difficulties with reporting procedures severely undermine confidence in the validity and reliability of the statistics.

B. Definitional Inconsistencies

Definitional inconsistencies are inevitable in determining what constitutes an assault among a large number of agencies. Margarita notes that reporting practices for what constitutes an assault on a police officer vary widely from city to city so that although the rates are reliable, they may not be valid or comparable. She found that in some communities, the most severe assaults on police may involve "punches in the nose" and other uses of non-lethal force. Other larger communities may experience more serious assaults (e.g., shootings or stabbings) with greater frequency. In larger jurisdictions, we might anticipate that lesser assaults would be regarded as routine and of insufficient justification for the paperwork required for reporting. Thus, total jurisdictional frequencies may be similar but may in fact describe two very different categories of violence.

Another definitional problem arises in the categories provided by the FBI. As mentioned previously, one striking

example is the "disturbance" category, which, up until 1986, included drunken disturbances, domestic disputes, and man-with-gun calls. Another category, "attempting arrests for other crimes" includes arrests for all crimes other than robbery or burglary; the variety is enormous, ranging from prostitution, gambling, fraud, and drugs to arson, assault, rape, larceny, and homicide. These broad categories tend to conceal and distort the frequencies of several discrete events. While these flaws have been noted by researchers, only recently have they been corrected (see, Garner and Clemmer, 1986).

C. Representativeness of the Findings

The size of the sample used in most studies has limited the generalizability and significance of the findings. The frequency of assaults and homicides of police in a particular city or region of the United States is low. Therefore, in order to amass enough data, a very lengthy period of time would be required for study. Only recently have police departments begun collecting data over time. The problem with small sample sizes has been that rates or percents are often reported, allowing the reader to form an opinion concerning the "typical" officer, offender or circumstances unaware that it is based on a small number of cases and prone to substantial measurement error.

The geographic location of jurisdictions that have been studied also places restrictions upon the representativeness of results. Although assaults on officers in the south-central U.S.

have been analyzed extensively, the researchers themselves have cautioned against generalizing beyond the region studied (see, e.g., Chapman, 1976). This an important shortcoming in much of the research.

D. Lack of Comparison Groups and Baseline Information

Base rates or base frequencies are absent in previous studies, with the more recent exception of the Garner and Clemmer study. The lack of these important data elements precludes making general and specific comparisons. That is, without a baseline of data from which to operate, conclusions about the "typical" officer, offender and circumstances of assaults and homicides are meaningless. Few studies can place these descriptions in their proper context. For example, domestic disturbances are often cited as one of the most dangerous situations for police. However, this finding may be dependent upon the baseline frequency of domestic disturbance incidents, rather than on a disproportionate danger-potential peculiar to the domestic call.

In addition, we do not know whether assailants or police officers share the characteristics of their respective populations. That is, the profiles of assailants and victim-officers given in the previous research might very well fit the general population of offenders and the entire police force. There are no control groups that would allow comparisons of assailants and victims with their general populations.

III. RESEARCH QUESTIONS AND RESEARCH METHODS

Based on our examination of the literature, we asked a number of fundamental questions. First, what are the prevalent characteristics of actors, situations, and dynamics when violence is used against police? Second, are there significant differences in the actors, situations, and dynamics of the event for the degree of violence? Third, what activities are the most dangerous to the police? The first question is one that is asked by all previous researchers and is, therefore, a necessary component of our study. The second and third questions differentiate our study from the others. A number of studies fail to distinguish injury from non-injury; all studies neglect accumulation of baseline data.

A. Methodology

Data and Data Sources

To answer the research questions, the research staff used five different data sources for the study. Official records of police assaults in the Baltimore County Police Department, police personnel records, calls for service data, demographic information, and the Uniform Crime Report's Law Enforcement Officers Killed and Assaulted were the major sources of information.

We examined 1,550 assaults that occurred between January 1, 1984 and December 31, 1986. The police maintain crime and arrest reports for each assault. Files are kept in chronological order

and indexed through the department's computer system. Within each file the assaulted officer writes his/her report indicating the characteristics of the event (date, time, type of call, etc.), names and physical attributes of the offender, witnesses, and complainant, and provides a narrative of the incident. Within the narrative, details of the assault are given. The account of the event may include information about the type of weapon used, whether words were spoken prior to the assault, the officer's and offender's actions prior to and after the assault, the extent of injury to both parties, the presence of alcohol or drugs, and whether an arrest was made. (See Appendix A for the forms for the crime and arrest reports.)

Police personnel records were used to determine the characteristics of the assaulted officer. Age, gender, race and ethnicity, physical traits, years of experience, and years of education were the variables sought.

To obtain a baseline of information about police activity in Baltimore County, we obtained calls for service data from the police for the first quarter of 1987 (January 1 to March 31). From this 90-day period, we randomly selected 14 days for analysis. We coded and keypunched all calls for service for each of the 14 days. These data include the date, time, type of call, and type of response by police. A total of 12,270 calls for service were analyzed.

Demographic information about each of the nine precincts in Baltimore County was obtained from the police. Population,

poverty, unemployment, race, age, education, income, and home ownership, were among the variables used and analyzed.

Data from the FBI's annual publication, Law Enforcement Officers Killed and Assaulted were used to compare Baltimore County with the rest of the country.

B. Methods of Analysis

Descriptive statistics were used to determine the prevalent characteristics of actors, situations, and dynamics of when violence is used against police. T-tests were employed to identify significant differences in the characteristics of the event for the degree of violence that occurred and for other areas as well.

C. The Variables

Offender, officer, situational, and interactional characteristics are the four categories of variables utilized.

Offender Characteristics. These were assimilated and tabulated to provide a profile of citizens who engage in assaultive behavior against the police. Demographics such as age, sex, race, and social status were identified and the relative frequency of violence for such categories established.

Officer Characteristics. These are perhaps the most significant variables because police agencies have direct control over officers. Officers, were classified on both individual and contextual levels. Individually, age, sex, race, years of

service, extent of prior training, etc. were classified. Furthermore, contextual effects of their working environments such as traffic, patrol, detectives, vice squad, and duty-status (on-duty or off-duty) were analyzed to determine if the incidence of violence directed against officers is greater for some categories than others given the distribution of that unit in all encounters.

Situational or Environmental Characteristics. The situational components of incidents were examined in terms of the temporal and spatial aspects of the encounter, such as time of day and whether the location of the incident was public or private.

Interactional Characteristics or Dynamics of the Situation. To determine the way in which the violent police-citizen encounter unfolds, we relied on a typology set forth by Fyfe (1978) in his dissertation, and by Binder and Scharf (1980) in their discussion of violence and the police. This typology permits additional insight into the violent encounter. In their discussion, Binder and Scharf discuss four stages of the incident: anticipation, entry, information exchange, and the final decision stage.

During the phase of anticipation the police-citizen confrontation is first initiated. The officer is alerted to a problem through radio dispatch, direct observation, or through information from another officer. Based on the particulars of the call, the officer formulates an intellectual and emotional

anticipatory response. Thus, a radio call about a cat in a tree will elicit a different reaction than a call about an armed robbery in progress. The second step is the phase of entry where the officer arrives at the physical scene of the encounter. According to Binder and Scharf, the officer must determine the extent of danger, establish his authority, and gather information about the actual incident. The third phase is an information exchange which may range from short, terse statements to long drawn-out discussions. In certain encounters there may be an immediate transition from entry to the final decision for physical force based on only visual or auditory cues.

The last stage is the final decision, where an officer chooses to engage in physical force. This step often depends on the previous stages and is an "admixture of intellectual and emotional factors [that] may vary from the completely rational decision ... to the impulsive reaction" (Binder and Scharf, 1980:118).

These stages are not mutually exclusive, nor do they explain all of the events within the assault. One step that Binder and Scharf omit is the outcome stage. That is, the end result of the assault is not discussed. At this stage, which we call "the final outcome", we include the extent of injury to the officer and assailant and the arrest status of the offender. With these stages in mind, the assault encounter was reconstructed for Baltimore County.

IV. ASSAULTS ON BALTIMORE COUNTY POLICE

This section first describes general characteristics of the Baltimore County Police Department. We then turn to assault incidents that occurred from 1984 to 1986. Officer and suspect characteristics, the environment of the incident, and the interactions that took place during the assault are discussed.

A. General Characteristics of the Baltimore County Police

The Baltimore County Police Department serves a community of 655,000 in a 625 square-mile area. The county is ethnically homogeneous, with a population that is 90% white, 8% black, 1% Asian, and 1% Hispanic. Currently, about 1,400 sworn officers and 179 non-sworn persons police the county. Of the sworn officers, 95% are white, 4% black, and 1% Asian and Hispanic. Women officers constitute 5% of the county force.

The police divide the county into nine precincts, each with different populations and unique crime problems. Crime rates range from a low of 75 crimes per 1,000 in Parkville, to a high of 151 crimes per 1,000 in Essex (see Table 1). Part I crimes are highest in Woodlawn, followed by Dundalk-Edgemere, Essex, and Fullarton. Part II crimes are highest in Essex and Dundalk-Edgemere.

TABLE 1 ABOUT HERE

B. Characteristics of the Encounter

One thousand five hundred and fifty assaults on police

occurred from January 1, 1984 to December 31, 1986 in Baltimore County. These assaults took place during 1,158 police-citizen encounters. This means that during some encounters more than one officer was assaulted. The unit of analysis for this report, however, is the assault rather than the police-citizen encounter. The assaults will be explained within the context of the encounter.

Over the three-year period, 1984-1986, 1,550 assaults occurred, with 375 (24.2%) resulting in some type of injury to a Baltimore County police officer. Since 1984 a decrease in the number of assaults and in the number of injuries took place in Baltimore County. In 1984, 535 officers were assaulted with 141 suffering injury. In 1985, 507 officers were attacked with 137 injuries and in 1986, 491 assaulted and 97 injured.

The rate of assaults with injury is lower than the national rate of 33.7% reported by the FBI for all law enforcement officers, but similar to the 24.8% rate of other suburban county police agencies in the United States (FBI, 1987:42). However, in examining the injury rate per 100 officers, we find that while the rate has declined for Baltimore County during the 3-year period, it still remains higher than both the national rate and the suburban county rate (see Table 2).

TABLE 2 ABOUT HERE

C. Officer Characteristics

In this section, various characteristics of officers are examined. Table 3 depicts these characteristics.

Approximately 93% of all assaulted officers are male and 94% are white. These figures are in direct proportion to the general characteristics of the department. The average age of the assaulted officer is 30. Eighty-four percent of the assaulted officers were between the ages of 21 and 35. Most of the officers had only a few years of experience on the force. The modal length of time in the department was 3 years, and the average was 6.5 years.

Typically, uniformed, on-duty patrol officers were the targets of assaults. Only in rare instances were sergeants or higher ranking officers involved in violent encounters (3%).

Physically, the average male officer is 71 inches tall and weighs 182 pounds. The average female officer is 65 inches tall and weighs 131 pounds.

TABLE 3 ABOUT HERE

D. Suspect Characteristics

Demographic characteristics of suspects are presented in Table 4. In some encounters more than one suspect attacked a police officer. As a result, the findings are divided into two categories, a one-suspect sample and a two-suspect sample.

In the one-suspect sample, 84% of all suspects were male and

86% were white. These figures reflect an overrepresentation of males based on census data and a slightly disproportionate percentage of non-whites. That is, in Baltimore County females constitute about 54% of the population, and non-whites represent about 10%. The suspects in this sample tend to be somewhat younger than the officers with an average age of 28, and a modal category of 21-25 years old.

TABLE 4 ABOUT HERE

In the two-suspect sample the number of cases is significantly smaller than the previous one with an N of 60. In analyzing this group, we find that in general, suspect diads tend to be composed of same sex and same race individuals. Males and whites tend to be the predominant categories. Overall, the two-suspect teams tend to be composed of individuals from different age groups.

E. Environmental Characteristics

The characteristics discussed in this section deal with the setting of the assault. Questions of when and where the assault occurred are answered. Tables 5-8 present these characteristics.

Assaults on police appear, in general, to be an extended weekend phenomenon, with the highest percentage (35%) occurring on Saturday and Sunday. The mid-summer months (July and August) and winter months (November and December) are periods when

assaults are more likely to occur (Table 5).

TABLE 5 ABOUT HERE

Compared to the rest of the country (Table 6), Baltimore County police experience more assaults from 12 a.m. to 2 a.m. and less attacks from 10 p.m. to midnight.

TABLE 6 ABOUT HERE

Assaults primarily occurred in private homes or apartments, on the street, and in a criminal justice-related building (e.g., police department, courthouse). Approximately 1/3 of the locations were residential structures and approximately 1/4 were business establishments. Slightly more than 1/2 (55%) of the assaults took place outdoors (Table 7).

TABLE 7 ABOUT HERE

Geographically, the largest proportion of assaults occurred in Essex precinct, followed by Dundalk-Edgemere precinct. The smallest percentage of assaults occurred in Cockeysville, and low rates are observed for Parkville and Fullarton.

Table 8 shows the actual rates of various neighborhood characteristics by precinct.

TABLE 8 ABOUT HERE

The third column in the table is the average number of assaults per patrol officer in each precinct over the three years of study. The patrol rate was calculated by dividing the average assault number by the number of officers assigned to patrol units. This rate was computed to allow for precinct comparison based on police strength. From the frequency distribution presented in Table 8, Essex precinct is the area in which officers face the highest risk of an assault. It is also the precinct with the highest total crime rate (see Table 1, page 21), the second highest percent of households below the poverty-level, the largest percentage of residents aged nineteen or less, and has one of the highest unemployment rates in the county. The least "dangerous" precinct is Cockeysville where the neighborhood characteristics of this precinct appear, in general, to be the least problematic of the group.

F. The Dynamics of the Encounter

In this section, we are concerned with reconstructing the assault incident. To do so we follow a typology discussed by Binder and Scharf (1980) in their work on the police-citizen violent encounter.

Binder and Scharf explain that a violent encounter has four basic stages: anticipation, entry, information exchange, and the final decision. We have added a fifth stage--final outcomes--to

describe the aftermath of the event.

Anticipation

The violent police-citizen encounter is initiated through a reactive or proactive means. We found that 63 percent of the assaults occurred in citizen-initiated encounters. These may involve citizens calling the police or flagging officers down on the street. The remaining 37% of the assaults were police-initiated, involving observations by the police. Most of the assaulted officers (96.4%) were those who responded to the scene first.

The anticipated calls are given in Table 9. The highest percentage of calls were for public disturbances (28.2%) and domestic disturbances (23.5%). Legal interventions (executing search and arrest warrants, transporting prisoners, conducting jail searches, and backing up officers) made up 14.1% of the calls. Traffic stops constituted about 11% of the anticipated calls.

TABLE 9 ABOUT HERE

Phases of Entry and Information Exchange

The phases of entry and information exchange are difficult to separate into distinct categories. Upon arrival (entry stage) the police assessed the situation. In doing so, officers sometimes engaged in conversation with the complainants, witnesses, or suspect. As a result, the entry and information

exchange phases interrelate. In fact, in the majority of encounters (80%), information was exchanged between the officer and the would-be assailant as the officer entered the scene.

Prior to the assault, the officer interacted with a number of individuals on the scene. Most of the encounters involved only one suspect (95.6%) and most did not involve other non-assaultive offenders (85%). At times, the complainant was on the scene as well (35%). In approximately 1/2 of the encounters (53%), a citizen bystander was present, but only rarely did a crowd gather. The average situation involved one additional officer, and as expected, in 95% of the encounters, no supervisors were at the scene of the encounter (Tables 10 and 11).

TABLES 10 AND 11 ABOUT HERE

During the incident, illegal narcotics did not play a major role. In only 9% of the encounters were drugs present, and only 3% of the suspects were actually under the influence of an illegal narcotic. The presence of alcohol, however, had a greater effect. In the one-suspect sample, 72% of the suspects either had been drinking or were intoxicated during the assault incident. In situations where two suspects assaulted an officer, alcohol had less of an impact. In about 40% of the two-suspect encounters the suspects either had been drinking or were intoxicated.

Assaulters rarely had tangible weapons with them (12%).

Guns (4%), sharp objects (2%), vehicles (2%), blunt objects (2%), and other weapons (2%) were the visible armaments that police could anticipate being used.

TABLE 12 ABOUT HERE

Having assessed the situation at the phase of entry, officers took some type of action immediately before the assault. Usually, officers attempted to investigate a complaint (18%), tried to make an arrest of the assaulter (17%), processed or transported the suspect to the stationhouse (14%), attempted to resolve a dispute (9%), or obtained information (10%). At the same time, the suspect was also engaging in some type of movement. Table 14 shows the actions of the suspect just prior to the assault. In 37% of the encounters where actions by the suspect were indicated, the offender conversed with or yelled at the police officer. In 24.2% of the situations, the officer had placed the individual under arrest when the assault occurred.

TABLES 13 AND 14 ABOUT HERE

Final Decision

The final decision stage is difficult to assess as it means analyzing the rationale behind the assault and the subsequent police response. From the data we cannot determine actual reasons for the assault on a police officer. The motivations of

the assailant cannot be known from a crime or arrest report. Nor can we determine the emotional state of the officer at the time of the attack. We do know the type of action that the police officer took to defend himself and the end result of the assault.

As mentioned previously, tangible weapons were rarely used by offenders. Most of the weapons used by suspects in this sample were their hands, fists or feet (76%), followed by kicking or throwing objects at officers (5.9%).

Suspects wielded guns in 57 of the 1,550 assault incidents (4%). Shots were fired in 23 of those cases (40%). No officers were hit by gunfire.

In response to the assault, officers drew their guns in 58 of the 1,550 encounters. Shots were fired by the assaulted officer in 10 of those cases. In two situations, other officers fired shots at suspects. No fatalities occurred as a result of gunfire.

TABLE 15 AND 16 ABOUT HERE

Final Outcomes

Both officers and assailants were injured during the encounter. Table 17 presents information on the degree and location of injury that officers received during the assault. In some cases officers received only one injury, while in others, multiple injuries were reported. In the sample with one or fewer injuries, 77.5% of the officers reported no injuries. The most common complaint was a superficial injury (bruises, scratches,

etc.) which occurred in 14.8% of the cases. The most serious injury--fracturing or dislocating a bone--was rare. When multiple injuries were reported, we counted the most serious one first. Lacerations were the most common complaint (64.1%) in this sample. Overall, in the cases of multiple injuries, more serious injuries were suffered.

When a police officer was injured, the location of the injury was recorded. For both one-injury and multiple-injury samples, the most common location of the injury was the arms-hands-fingers category (47.3, 56.8% respectively).

TABLE 17 ABOUT HERE

Suspects sustained injuries in only a very small percent (2.3%) of the assault incidents (Table 18). When these injuries occurred, they were generally located on the head or neck (42.9%) or on the arms, hands, or fingers (37.1%).

TABLE 18 ABOUT HERE

Most suspects (94.5%) were arrested after the assault. This figure is slightly higher than the national average reported by the FBI for all law enforcement officers assaulted (93%) and for officers assaulted in suburban counties (92.2%).

In the next section we discuss the extent of danger to officers, with particular focus on the domestic disturbance.

TABLE 1

BALTIMORE COUNTY POLICE PRECINCTS
MEAN CRIME RATES, 1984-1986

NAME	POP.	VIOLENT CRIME	PROP. CRIME	PART I CRIME	PART II CRIME	TOTAL CRIME
WILKINS	70,130	10.85	48.03	58.86	53.64	112.51
WOODLAWN	65,472	13.14	72.35	85.47	57.41	142.89
GARRISON	101,912	9.22	49.86	59.08	46.84	105.92
TOWSON	78,280	7.32	47.13	54.45	40.60	95.03
COCKEYSVILLE	68,822	4.33	44.97	49.29	35.73	85.02
PARKVILLE	70,289	6.16	31.07	37.23	38.14	75.36
FULLARTON	39,965	9.01	62.18	71.16	53.67	124.83
ESSEX	86,217	15.51	58.98	74.47	76.95	151.08
DUNDALK/EDGEMERE	74,528	13.38	45.39	76.95	68.67	127.43

TABLE 2

Assaults and Injury Rates, 1984-86
U.S., Suburban Counties, and Baltimore County

	1984			1985			1986		
	US[1]	SC[2]	BC[3]	US	SC	BC	US	SC	BC
Totl Asslts	60,153	7,929	535	61,724	8,259	507	64,259	8,670	491
Rate 100 Offs.	16.2	12.1	38.0	15.8	12.2	36.0	16.9	14.3	35.0
Asslts w/Inj.	20,205	2,002	141	20,817	2,205	137	21,639	2,157	97
Rate 100 Offs.	5.4	3.0	10.0	5.3	3.3	9.8	5.7	3.6	6.9

Sources: FBI, Law Enforcement Officers Killed and Assaulted, 1984-86 and the present database on Violence Against Police in Baltimore County

[1] All law enforcement agencies in the United States.

[2] Suburban Counties in the United States.

[3] Baltimore County Police Department.

TABLE 3

Characteristics of Assaulted Officers,
Baltimore County Police Department, 1984-86

Variable	Number of Incidents	Percent
Gender		
Male	1437	93
Female	110	7
Total	1547	100
Race		
White	1437	94
Non-white	90	6
Total	1527	100
Age (yrs.)		
19-25	319	21
26-30	571	38
31-35	395	26
36-40	191	13
41 +	47	3
Total	1523	100
Years of Experience		
Less than 1	46	3
1-5	757	53
6-10	323	22
11-15	228	16
16 +	87	6
Total	1441	100
Rank		
Patrol	1372	93
Corporal	59	4
Sgt. +	43	3
Total	1474	100

TABLE 4

Characteristics of Suspects/Offenders
Baltimore County, 1984-1986

One-Suspect Sample			Two-Suspect Sample		
	Number of Incidents	Percent		Number of Incidents	Percent
Gender					
Male	1240	84	Same Gender	37	63
Female	233	16	Different	22	37
Totals	1473	100		59	100
Race					
White	1260	86	Same race	57	97
Non-white	211	14	Different	2	3
Totals	1471	100		59	100
Age					
Less than 18	143	10	Same age	25	43
19-25	567	39	Different	33	57
26-30	300	21			
31-35	184	13			
36-40	102	7			
41 +	153	11			
Totals	1449	100		58	100

TABLE 5

Characteristics of the Environment
Temporal Patterns
Baltimore County, 1984-86

	Number of Incidents	Percent
Day of the Week		
Sunday	279	18.0
Monday	208	13.4
Tuesday	196	12.6
Wednesday	199	12.8
Thursday	179	11.5
Friday	218	14.1
Saturday	271	17.1
Total	1550	100
Month of the Year		
January	129	8.3
February	113	7.3
March	128	8.3
April	98	6.3
May	133	8.6
June	131	8.5
July	141	9.1
August	152	9.8
September	107	6.9
October	109	7.0
November	146	9.4
December	163	10.5
Total	1550	100

TABLE 6

Characteristics of the Environment
Time of Day of the Assault

United States, Suburban Counties, and Baltimore County
Mean Percentages, 1984-86

	United States	Suburban	Balt. County
Time of Day			
A.M.			
12:01 - 2:00	16.7	15.3	19.2
2:01 - 4:00	11.3	11.4	17.8
4:01 - 6:00	4.1	5.0	5.0
6:01 - 8:00	2.1	2.8	1.1
8:01 - 10:00	2.9	4.1	2.2
10:01 - 12:00	3.7	4.8	2.9
P.M.			
12:01 - 2:00	4.6	5.2	4.0
2:01 - 4:00	5.7	6.0	4.3
4:01 - 6:00	8.1	7.9	7.1
6:01 - 8:00	10.2	9.6	13.0
8:01 - 10:00	13.9	13.0	14.7
10:01 - 12:00	16.5	15.3	8.5

TABLE 7

Characteristics of the Environment
Spatial Patterns
Baltimore County, 1984-1986

	Number of Incidents	Percent
Location of Encounter		
Indoors	856	55.5
Outdoors	685	44.5
Totals	1541	100
Type of Premise		
Street/Alley	445	28.8
Private Dwelling	498	32.3
Commercial	53	3.4
Bar/Restaurant	60	3.9
Parks/Fields	34	2.2
Parking Lot	200	13.4
Crim. Bldg	214	13.9
Police Vehicle	6	.4
Other	31	2.1
Totals	1541	100
Purpose of Premise		
Residence	498	32.3
Business	358	23.3
Other	685	44.5
Totals	1541	100

TABLE 8

Characteristics of the Encounter Precincts
Baltimore County, 1984-86

Precinct of Occurrence	Number of Incidents	Percent	Asslts per officer
Wilkins	179	11.5	.66
Woodlawn	158	10.2	.61
Garrison	177	11.4	.57
Towson	124	8.0	.52
Cockeysville	46	3.0	.20
Parkville	86	5.5	.42
Fullarton	69	4.5	.60
Essex	395	25.5	1.15
Dundalk-Edgemere	316	20.4	.85
Totals	1550	100	

Precinct Characteristics
1984

Precinct	% Below Poverty	% Unemp.	% Non-white	% Below Age 19
Wilkins	6.2	5.5	8.4	27.2
Woodlawn	4.8	5.2	31.5	28.3
Garrison	4.4	5.1	15.3	29.0
Towson	4.6	4.5	7.4	24.0
Cockeysville	3.3	4.0	4.4	27.3
Parkville	3.6	5.6	5.4	28.1
Fullarton	3.1	6.3	5.7	27.1
Essex	9.1	9.6	7.6	30.6
Dundalk-Edgemere	9.7	9.7	7.4	28.7

TABLE 9

Phase of Anticipation

	Number of Incidents	Percent
Type of Call		
Police-Initiated	265	24.7
Citizen-Initiated	677	63.1
No Call	131	12.2
Totals	1073	100
Anticipated Circumstances		
Disturbances	321	28.2
Domestics	267	23.5
Legal Interventions	161	14.1
Traffic	119	10.5
Alcohol	38	3.3
Criminal-Other	34	3.0
Property problems	26	2.3
Theft	23	2.0
Suspicious Sits.	20	1.7
Weapons	20	1.7
Assault & Battery	18	1.6
Medical	17	1.5
Unknown Trouble	17	1.5
Noncriminal-Other	12	1.1
Narcotics	12	1.1
Burglary	10	.9
Fraud	10	.9
Robbery	7	.6
Sex Offenses	4	.4
Auto Theft	2	.2
Totals	1138	100

TABLE 10

Phase of Entry

Persons at the Assault Incident

	Number of Incidents	Percent
Number of Assaulters		
1	1481	95.6
2	60	3.8
3	9	.7
Totals	1550	100
Number of Non-Assaultive Offenders Present		
None	1317	85.0
1	164	10.6
2	55	3.6
3 or more	13	.8
Totals	1549	100
Complainant Present?		
Yes	483	35.5
No	879	64.5
Totals	1362	100
Number of Citizen-Bystanders		
None	473	47.1
1	367	36.6
2	138	13.7
3	15	1.5
4 +	11	1.0
Totals	1004	100

TABLE 11

Phase of Entry

Police at the Assault Incident

	Number of Incidents	Percent
Number of Officers Assaulted		
1	861	55.5
2	462	29.8
3	137	8.8
4	63	4.1
5	26	1.7
6	1	.1
Totals	1550	100
Number of Additional Officers		
None	373	27.3
1	642	47.0
2	237	17.3
3	83	6.1
4 +	31	2.0
Totals	1366	100
Number of Police Supervisors		
None	1410	95.3
1	67	4.5
2	3	.2
Totals	1480	100

TABLE 12

Phase of Entry

	Number of Incidents	Percent
Presence of Tangible Weapon by Assailant		
Yes	181	11.7
No	1369	88.3
Totals	1550	100
Alcohol Use by Suspect		
Sober	356	27.8
Had been Drinking	288	22.5
Intoxicated	635	49.6
Totals	1279	100
Presence of Drugs?		
Yes	137	9.2
No	1351	90.8
Totals	1488	100
Drug Use by Suspect?		
Yes	35	2.6
No	1319	97.4
Totals	1354	100

TABLE 13

Phase of Entry and Information Exchange

Officer Actions Prior to Assault

	Number of Incidents	Percent
Information Exchange?		
Yes	1224	94.7
No	68	5.3
Totals	1292	100
Officer Actions Prior to Assault		
Investigate Complaint	253	17.6
Arrest Suspect	244	16.9
Process/Transport Susp.	202	14.0
Obtain Information	142	9.9
Resolve Dispute	135	9.4
Approach Suspect	114	7.9
Struggle W/Suspect	109	7.6
Handcuff	57	4.0
Pursue Suspect	48	3.3
Search Susp/Scene	36	2.5
Arrest Non-Assaulter	26	1.8
Protect/Assist Officer	23	1.6
Other	22	1.5
Issue Summons	21	1.5
Stop/Frisk	9	.6
Totals	1441	100

TABLE 14

Suspect Actions Prior to Assault

Suspect Action	One-Suspect Sample		Two-Suspect Sample	
	Number of Incidents	Percent	First Suspect (N)	Second Suspect (N)
Converse	531	37.4	18	12
Arrested	344	24.2	8	1
Fight	262	18.5	17	15
Approach Officer	121	8.5	7	9
Flee	72	5.1	-	6
Commit Crime	28	2.0	-	-
Hinder	24	1.7	-	6
Fight w/ non-Offr.	11	.8	5	-
Hide	10	.7	-	-
Sleep	7	.5	-	-
Other	6	.4	-	-
Summoned	3	.2	-	-
Totals	1419	100	55	49

TABLE 15

Final Decision

Weapon used by Suspect and Officer

	Number of Incidents	Percent
Officers Weapon Used		
Gun	58	3.8
Personal	22	1.4
Other	20	1.3
None	1433	93.5
Totals	1533	100

Suspect Weapon Used

	One-Suspect Sample		Two-Suspect Sample	
	Number of Incidents	Percent	First Suspect	Second Suspect
Gun	56	3.8	1	-
Sharp Object	32	2.2	-	-
Vehicle	29	2.0	9	7
Blunt Object	29	2.0	-	-
Kick/Throw	87	5.9	1	3
Limbs	1122	76.1	46	42
Teeth/Mouth	20	1.4	2	-
Spitting	47	3.2	-	-
Words/Gesture	34	2.3	-	-
Other Body	18	1.2	-	-
Totals	1474	100	59	52

TABLE 16

Shots Fired by Police and Assailants

	One-Suspect Sample		Two-Suspect Sample	
Shots Fired	Number of Incidents	%	First	Second
None	1459		59	52
1	8		-	-
2	2		-	-
4	2		1	-
6	5		-	-
8	5		-	-
Totals	1481		60	52

Shots Fired by Assaulted Police Officer

None	1540
1	8
2	2
Totals	1550

Shots Fired by Non-Assaulted Officer

None	1545
1	2
Totals	1547

TABLE 17

Final Outcomes

Injury to Officers and Suspects

Officer Injury Levels

	One or Less		Multiple Injuries	
Variable	N	%	N	%
Type of Injury				
None	1155	77.5	0	0
Superficial	220	14.8	5	12.8
Strain/Sprain	24	1.6	3	7.7
Laceration	84	5.6	25	64.1
Fracture/Dislocate	8	.5	6	15.4
Total	1491	100	39	100
Location of Injury				
Head/Neck	73	22.9	11	29.7
Torso	28	8.7	3	10.8
Arms/Hands/Fingers	151	47.3	21	56.8
Legs/Feet/Toes	59	18.5	1	2.7
Groin	8	2.5	0	0
Total	319	100	37	100
Hospitalization for Officer?	N	%		
Yes	78	5.1		
No	1459	94.9		
Total	1437	100		

TABLE 18

Suspect Injury Levels

	One-Suspect Sample		Two-Suspect Sample
Injury to Suspect			
None	1428	97.7	No Injuries
Superficial	5	.3	
Strain/Sprain	3	.2	
Laceration	18	1.2	
Shot	7	.5	
Total	1461	100	
Location of Injury			
Head/Neck	15	42.9	Not Applicable
Torso	3	8.6	
Arms/Hands/Fingers	13	37.1	
Legs/Feet/Toes	4	11.4	
Total	35	100	

V. SPECIAL ISSUES

This section of the report addresses two overlapping issues: officer danger and domestic disturbances. In the first area, we estimate danger rates to compare the risks posed by particular police assignments. Within this area, we also examine injury-related assaults more carefully by comparing them to non-injury assault incidents. We hypothesize that no significant differences exist between the injury and non-injury encounters.

The second issue examines the domestic disturbance. Recent research (Konstantin, 1984 and Garner and Clemmer, 1986) shows that domestic disturbances are less dangerous than originally thought; that circumstances involving robbery and burglary lead to more deaths and assaults on police. However, our research shows that in Baltimore County the domestic disturbance creates or leads to more danger than robberies or burglaries. As a result of this finding, we compared domestic disturbances to all other offenses to determine whether differences existed between groups.

A. Officer Danger

What is the most dangerous type of activity for police officers? This question, posed by police, policymakers, and researchers, has been answered through anecdotes and assumptions, and more recently by empirical data. But the findings have been mixed. Police training manuals have focused on the danger of family disputes, citing the high figures reported by the FBI of

law enforcement officers killed. Researchers on family violence (Straus, et al., 1980), violent police-citizen encounters (Lester, 1980), and police response to spouse assaults (Parnas, 1967, and Buchanan and Perry 1985) agree that the domestic disturbance is the most dangerous police activity. Other researchers dispute this contention. Margarita (1980), Konstantin (1984), and Garner and Clemmer (1986) have found that robberies and burglaries are more dangerous than domestic disputes.

The mixed results have occurred because of methodological inconsistencies. Ill-defined terms and a lack of baseline data have led to different results by different researchers. One of the major definitional problems has been the grouping of domestic disturbance incidents with other types of public disturbances by the FBI. For 20 years the FBI publication on officer deaths and assaults showed a categorization of "Disturbances". Police, researchers, and others assumed that these incidents were domestic quarrels, when in fact, they were a broad range of public disputes. As a result, in analyzing the dataset there was a tendency to overestimate the importance of the domestic disturbance. Researchers prior to Konstantin and Garner and Clemmer relied heavily on this categorization.

In Konstantin's re-analysis of the FBI data, he separated domestics from other types of disturbances. As a result he found that robbery ranked much higher in terms of dangerousness. Garner and Clemmer found similar results when they constructed

harm ratios to estimate dangerous police activity.

The second methodological problem, the lack of baseline data, precludes making accurate statements about the least and most dangerous activities of the police. Without baseline information comparative statements are meaningless. Researchers have long recognized this problem but have not made use of measures of police activity in their studies of violence against the police. The lone exception is the study by Garner and Clemmer.

Garner and Clemmer combined two systematic studies of police activity, the Kansas City Response Time Study and the Police Services Study, with data from the FBI and a number of prior studies on police violence. They computed an estimate of the danger rate by dividing deaths, assaults, and injuries by its measure of activity. Once these rates were determined, Garner and Clemmer rank ordered the rates to assess the relative risk of each type of assignment. They found that for officer homicides, domestic disturbances were consistently the least dangerous and that robbery incidents were the most dangerous. For assaults and injuries of police, however, the evidence was "less clear cut" and inconclusive.

Building on these studies, we asked: what are the most dangerous and least dangerous police activities in Baltimore County?

B. Findings

From our frequency distributions and crosstabulations, we found that general disturbances and domestic disturbances accounted for over 50% of the actual circumstances at the scene of the assault. Column one of Table 19 shows the number of assaults by actual circumstances at the scene.

The most common category of circumstances in the sample is the general disturbance (29.4%) followed by domestic disturbances (24.6%). Legal intervention (15%) and traffic problems (12%) also appear relatively common. The remaining categories of circumstances at the scene have low rates of representation.

TABLE 19 ABOUT HERE

To determine how dangerous domestics and general disturbances are to the police we calculated a danger rate. To calculate rates, we collected information on police activity in Baltimore County by tabulating calls for service data. While these data do not purport to measure all activity, they do reflect the type of activity generated by the police. An important caveat should be kept in mind: since most calls for service are citizen-initiated, police-initiated activities are underrepresented. Thus, the danger rate based on calls for service becomes an estimate of danger to the police.

The Baltimore County police retain records of calls for service for 90-day periods. For our purposes, we selected 17

days from the period beginning January 1 and ending March 31, 1987. We analyzed 13,160 calls for service. Variables included time of the call, type of circumstance involved, location, and type of dispatch. For the analysis, the calls for service were classified into categories of circumstance that correspond to categories in the assault data.

The second column of Table 19 shows the types of calls for service received by the police department. In this table, we constructed an index similar to one used by Garner and Clemmer which includes Part I offenses, traffic, domestic disturbances, general disturbances, and a general category of "other". From Table 19 the highest percentage of calls for service fall into the all-encompassing "other" category (54.3%), followed by traffic calls (17.5%), theft (8.0%), public disturbances (7.1%), and domestic disturbances (5.3%).

To estimate a danger rate for police activity, we combined the measures of harm with the calls for service data. In Table 19 we computed the danger rate by dividing the percentage of each category's measures of harm by its percentage of measures of activity. For example, sex offenses represent 0.7% of the assault incidents. In the calls for service data, they represent 0.3% of all calls. Dividing 0.7% by 0.3% results in a value of 2.3. We then placed each of the categories in rank order to assess the relative risk of the type of assignment. Column three of Table 19 shows the values of the danger rate and the rank order of the assignment.

Domestic disturbances are the most dangerous type of activity for police in Baltimore County when placed in this context. The least dangerous situations are those involving auto theft and robbery. These figures are in direct contrast to evidence provided by Garner and Clemmer.

Specifying the "Other" Category

One of the troublesome aspects of prior research has been the broad categorization of the circumstances of homicides and assaults on police. For example, the classification of "other" police activities and frequency of harm is problematic because it lumps together criminal and non-criminal situations. This leads to specification bias in previous analyses. To correct this deficiency we separated the "other" category and general disturbance category into a number of specified areas. Table 20 shows the revised break down of calls for service.

In Table 20 the highest percentage of calls are for burglar and fire alarms at businesses and residences (18.3%) followed by traffic calls (17.4%), non-criminal calls (9.0%), and property disputes (8.5%). General disturbances and domestic disturbances rank seventh and eighth, respectively. Calls for serious crime (Part I offenses), such as burglary, robbery, assault and battery, theft and auto theft represent about 15% of all calls.

TABLE 20 ABOUT HERE

When the danger rate is computed for columns one and two in Table 20, "legal intervention" becomes the most dangerous type of activity for police in Baltimore County. Domestic and general disturbances place third and fifth, respectively, in the danger rankings--still higher than robbery or burglary (which placed 10th and 13th, respectively).

The two most dangerous circumstances--legal intervention and alcohol problems--were lumped in the "other" category in Table 19. The category of legal intervention includes activities such as serving arrest warrants, executing search warrants, and issuing summonses or citations that are not traffic-related. Alcohol-related circumstances involve drunks on the street, barroom incidents, and residential situations that involve alcohol abuse.

The least dangerous calls are for alarms (burglar alarms in businesses and residences), juvenile problems, and unknown trouble. No assaults occurred as a result of these types of calls for service.

An important caveat must be kept in mind when examining and interpreting these findings. As mentioned, police-initiated activities are underrepresented in calls for service. This helps to explain the unusually high danger rate for legal interventions. Serving search warrants and arrest warrants as well as transporting prisoners are not recorded in calls for service. Thus, we may be overestimating danger to police in these circumstances.

Ranking Assaults with Injury

We constructed similar tables to determine the danger rate of assaults with injuries. Tables 21 and 22 show the number of assaults with injury, calls for service, and danger rates for index offenses and for detailed circumstances. Table 21 demonstrates that the domestic situation and the public disturbance are the most dangerous circumstances for injurious assaults. When the activities are more carefully delineated (Table 22) we find that domestics and public disturbances rank third and fourth in terms of dangerousness. Legal interventions and alcohol problems again emerge as the most dangerous situations for police officers.

TABLES 21 AND 22

These findings have important ramifications for researchers and for the police. First, they indicate that researchers should pay careful attention to the way in which circumstances at the scene of the assault are classified by the police and the FBI. The use of broad categories in data collection efforts is problematic because they tend to mask specific behavior.

Second, the findings show that overall, general and domestic disturbances are dangerous to the police, at least in Baltimore County. Domestic situations represent a large percentage of the assaults in our data set. They rank among the highest in danger rates -- number one in our first categorization and number three

in our second classification. When injuries occur to the police during an assault, the findings are exactly the same. While recent research studies indicate that domestic disturbances are not as dangerous as originally believed, our data show that domestics present a high risk of danger to police, at least in terms of assaults.

General disturbances are also dangerous to the police. Situations where individuals are arguing in public, making too much noise, conducting loud parties, and making a nuisance are problematic to the police. Circumstances involving weapons and alcohol, often construed as general disturbances, are also potentially violent situations.

These findings suggest that researchers and police departments re-examine assault and injury data to determine the danger rates of police activities.

C. Degree of Injury

In this section we examine the extent of injury to the police and attempt to determine whether differences exist between assaults with injury and those with no injury. Finding differences between these two groups might assist police administrators in training and in developing new strategies to prepare officers for particular encounters.

Our null hypothesis is that no differences exist between assaults with injury those with no injury. To test this hypothesis assault encounters were dichotomized into those

incidents where no injuries occurred and those in which an officer sustained some type of injury (superficial, strain/sprain, laceration, or fracture).

Officers incurred injuries in 375 encounters. In 1158 assault incidents no injuries were reported. Our analysis follows the same format as earlier sections, describing officer, suspect, and situational or environmental characteristics. In addition, we discuss the five stages of the dynamics of the incident. In the analysis that follows we employ crosstabulations (using chi-square to measure differences), t-tests (where appropriate), and group means which give proportions of encounters that result in injury. The group means (computed through a "breakdown" command in SPSSX) allow us to determine the probability of injury given a particular type of assault encounter.

Officer Characteristics

Overall, little variation in officer characteristics exists in the injury/noninjury groups. Slightly more female officers were in the injured population than in the uninjured group, but not in a significant number. Injured officers tend to be a little older, on the average, than those who escaped injury. Neither educational level nor experience level seem to play a role in whether an officer was injured.

Suspect Characteristics

Younger and older suspects are most likely to injure a police officer. In Table 23, all of the suspects in assault encounters who were 18 years old or younger injured police officers. Almost half of the suspects over the age of 41 injured an officer. Suspects between the ages of 26 and 40 were least likely to harm an officer.

TABLE 23 ABOUT HERE

In two other categories of suspect characteristics, gender and race, no significant differences emerged.

Situational or Environmental Characteristics

No significant differences exist between the injury and non-injury groups with regard to time of day, day of the week, and month of occurrence (Table 24). We did find that higher proportions of injuries occurred during the summer months of July and September (31% and 33% of the assaults resulted in injury, respectively.) In February, injuries were least likely to occur with only 17% of the assaults ending in injury to an officer.

TABLE 24 ABOUT HERE

In the precincts within the county, injuries were reported in higher proportions in Woodlawn, Parkville, Fullarton, and

Dundalk-Edgemere (28%). Table 25 shows that in Cockeysville, only 8% of the assaults resulted in injury.

TABLE 25 ABOUT HERE

In terms of spatial patterns, significant differences emerge in the purposes of the locations of the assaults (Table 26). Injuries were more likely to take place in business areas (e.g., bars, and restaurants) and other areas (e.g., police vehicles) rather than in residential locations (Table 27).

TABLES 26 AND 27 ABOUT HERE

The Dynamics of the Encounter

Anticipation

During the anticipation stage of the encounter, the type of call received by the police makes a significant difference in whether an injury will occur. Police-initiated calls and "no" call encounters differ significantly from the citizen-initiated call. Like Konstantin (1984) we find that injuries to police are more likely to take place during police-invoked calls or no calls than those invoked by citizens. Table 28 shows that 31% of police-initiated calls and 32% of no calls resulted in injury compared to 22% for citizen-invoked calls.

TABLE 28 ABOUT HERE

Phase of Entry and Information Exchange

When an officer arrives at an encounter he/she assesses the situation and asserts authority. During this crucial stage, the officer notes who is present, whether weapons, drugs or alcohol are present, and then takes some action to solve the problem. At times, when officers arrive at the scene they will engage in conversation to gather more information about a situation. We have found that injuries were more likely to occur when officers exchanged words with suspects than when no information was exchanged. A significant difference exists between the injury and non-injury categories when we examine whether a conversation occurred (Table 29). While we do not know the exact words that were exchanged, it appears that a rather heated discussion may have occurred, where the citizen and the officer reacted in a violent manner.

TABLE 29 ABOUT HERE

When the police enter a situation, the presence of both weapons and of drugs significantly affects whether an injury will take place. When a weapon is present, injuries are less likely to occur. Police, it seems, exercise greater caution in dealing with a suspect when a tangible weapon is visible. When drugs are on the scene or when the suspect has used an illegal narcotic, the likelihood of injury increases. Table 30 shows these

differences.

TABLE 30 ABOUT HERE

Types of people at the scene have an effect on injury. When other officers are present the likelihood of injury increases. Perhaps in encounters where it is believed officers are in jeopardy of being injured, other officers arrive to provide assistance. In contrast, injurious encounters have fewer citizens present on the average than noninjurious ones. Perhaps the presence of citizen bystanders acts as a deterrent to suspects' injuring officers. T-Tests were conducted on these ratio-level variables by injury versus non-injury. Table 31 presents the significant differences which were observed.

TABLE 31 ABOUT HERE

Final Decision

As noted in previous sections, the final decision stage involves the type of action that the suspect and police officer engaged in that led to the assault. Weapon use, in particular, is the key variable at this stage. While the firing of shots during encounters is rare, injurious encounters have more shots fired by non-assaulted officers than in incidents with no injury. It appears that officers who assist the assaulted officer by using their firearms do so based on the seriousness of the

assault. Suspects, however, fire shots more often in encounters with no injuries to the officer. Table 32 shows significant differences exist between injury and no injury assaults for these categories.

TABLE 32 ABOUT HERE

Final Outcomes

To explore the relative risks of injuries to officers, given an assault has occurred, it is useful to examine the proportion of encounters which result in injuries. Variables which appear to be important in the examination of this issue were selected for analysis.

Table 33 presents a breakdown of offense type for the one-offense sample by injury. Encounters which involved at least some injury to an officer were coded as 1, otherwise as zero. As is evident for the above Table, the risk of injury varies by offense type. One half of all narcotics and assault and battery cases resulted in some degree of injury, although the number of cases in these offense categories is extremely small. Approximately one third of all breaking and entering, theft, alcohol, and robbery offenses resulted in a situation where an officer sustained injuries. Domestic problems and disturbances resulted in an injury approximately 20% of the time. So, while disturbances and domestic problems appear to have the highest rates of assaults occurring, they are not as likely to result in

injuries than some other types of offenses.

Table 33 also presents the breakdown for multiple offenses. When multiple offenses occur in an encounter, slightly higher proportions of domestic and disturbance calls result in injuries to officers, and slightly lower proportions of traffic, breaking and entering, and theft result in officer injury.

Overall, injurious assaults differ from non-injury assaults along a number of important dimensions. Suspect age, location of the incident, police-initiated calls, presence of drugs and weapons are the primary characteristics that differentiate injury from non-injury encounters.

D. The Domestic Disturbance

The domestic disturbance has received a great deal of attention in the study of danger to police. Our data support the claim that domestic disturbances pose a risk to police in terms of the likelihood of an assault. This section will examine differences between the domestic disturbance and other calls for service. Any encounter that involved family quarrels, family fights, husband-wife disputes, co-habitants' disputes, and any incidents that were labeled domestic disturbances by the police were classified as "domestics." For this analysis, all others circumstances were classified as "non-domestics".

Officer Characteristics

In this section we asked whether officer gender, race, age, years of experience, or rank had an effect more of an effect on domestic or non-domestic encounters. Overall, we found that virtually no differences exist along these dimensions. (In Appendix D tables are presented for all variables in the analysis that showed no significance.)

Suspect Characteristics

Significant differences in suspect characteristics--age, race, and gender--do not appear in the domestic and non-domestic assault encounters.

For officer and suspect characteristics, lack of differences is not surprising given the homogeneous nature of the population

in Baltimore County and within the police department. In an area where little variation exists along racial or ethnic lines, one would not expect to find many differences.

Situational or Environmental Characteristics

Domestic assaults are slightly more likely to occur in January, February, and June, as compared to non-domestics. During the month of September, however, assaults stemming from domestic disturbances occurred at a lower rate than other months (Table 34). Overall, no significant differences emerge in temporal patterns of assaults.

TABLE 34 ABOUT HERE

Within Baltimore County assaults during domestics are over-represented in certain precincts (Dundalk-Edgemere, Woodlawn, Cockeysville, and Essex) and under-represented in Towson (Table 35). When compared to assaults involving non-domestic circumstances, the domestic-related assault is concentrated primarily in private residences (Table 36). This finding is not surprising given the nature of domestic disputes.

TABLES 35 AND 36 ABOUT HERE

Dynamics of the Encounter

Anticipation

There is a significant difference in terms of the type of call in which the assault occurred. Assaults during domestics are overwhelmingly citizen-initiated situations. Table 37 shows a 7 to 1 ratio of citizen-initiated calls to police-initiated calls. This finding is consistent with the logic of the situational characteristics and with domestic encounters generally. Since most domestic disturbances occur indoors and in residences, police are unlikely to view these situations on their own and are more likely to react to citizen complaints.

TABLE 37 ABOUT HERE

Phase of Entry and Information Exchange

During domestic disturbances police are more likely to talk with the disputants compared with non-domestic situations. Table 38 shows a significant difference between the domestic and non-domestic assault categories when police engage in an information exchange. During the domestic dispute the officer attempted to resolve the dispute (58%) or was investigating a complaint (43%). These actions also imply that a conversation occurred and that the police followed departmental policy in attempting to calm the situation.

TABLE 38 ABOUT HERE

At the phase of entry of a domestic disturbance, two or more police officers are likely to confront the complainant and the suspect. Unlike other situations, where police are more likely to respond to a scene alone, in domestic confrontations officers rely on other officers for support (Table 39). At the scene, the complainant is present (Table 40) and there are signs that the suspect had been drinking (Table 41).

TABLES 39, 40, AND 41 ABOUT HERE

While demographic characteristics of suspects across populations appear quite similar, suspect behavior does not. There appears to be much more conversing/yelling in domestics and fewer situations where the assault occurs during an arrest than in non-domestics. Prior to the assault, the suspect is fighting with a family member, or dealing with the police in some manner. Approaching the officer, conversing, or fighting are among the activities undertaken by the suspect (Table 42).

TABLE 42 ABOUT HERE

Final Decision

In terms of weapons used by suspects, fewer domestic encounters involve guns, but more involve objects (sharp, blunt, or kicking/throwing objects) than do non-domestics. Suspects who assault officers during domestics fire shots less often, on the

average, than those who assault during non-domestics, although shooting is rare overall. Officer's are more inclined to use "other" weapons -- nightsticks or mace -- than guns or hands, fists or feet during a domestic-related assault (Table 43).

TABLE 43 ABOUT HERE

Final Outcomes

No significant differences exist between the domestic and non-domestic assaults regarding final outcomes. Injuries to officers are not serious during the domestic disturbances. Of the 84 officers who were injured during a family dispute, two suffered a fracture or dislocation, 22 sustained a laceration, four received a strain or sprain, and the remaining 56 suffered a superficial wound (scratch or bruise). Table 44 shows the types of injuries to officers in domestic and non-domestic situations.

TABLE 44 ABOUT HERE

Summary

Approximately one-quarter of all assaults on police officers in Baltimore County occur during domestic disputes. When placed within the context of all police activity, the family disturbance is one of the most dangerous events for police officers.

Our analysis found that assaults during family quarrels differed from other assaults in a number of ways. First,

domestic disturbances were more likely to be citizen initiated than police invoked. Second, these encounters took place indoors and in residences. Third, at the scene of the incident officers usually engaged in conversation or information exchange with the suspect. The complainant was present and the suspect was likely to have been drinking alcohol. Lastly, officers were more likely to be attacked by persons with sharp or blunt objects as weapons rather than guns or knives. These findings, however, are not surprising given the nature and definition of domestic disputes. Most domestic disturbances take place in the home, where it is likely that both suspects and complainants/victims are present. While these characteristics differentiate the incident from other types of assaults, we need more information regarding non-violent domestic disputes. A comparison between domestics that result in assaults and those that are resolved peaceably would provide the police with information that might lead to violence reduction.

TABLE 19
ASSAULTS, CALLS FOR SERVICE AND DANGER RATES
FOR INDEX OFFENSES AND OTHER CIRCUMSTANCES

Activity	Assaults N	Assaults %	Calls N	Calls %	Danger Rates[1] Value	Danger Rates[1] Rank
Homicide	0	0	0	0	0	11
Sex Offenses	9	.7	36	.3	2.33	3
Robbery	5	.4	57	.4	1.00	4
Assault & Battery	2	.1	207	1.6	.06	10
Burglary/B & E	17	1.3	537	4.1	.32	7
Theft	27	2.0	1044	8.0	.25	8
Auto Theft	1	.1	182	1.4	.07	9
Domestics	350	25.9	694	5.3	4.89	1
Disturbances	349	25.9	929	7.1	3.65	2
Traffic	191	14.2	2291	17.5	.81	5
Other	398	29.5	7103	54.3	.54	6
Totals	1349	100	13,080	100		

[1]The danger rate was calculated by dividing the percentage of assaults by the percentage of calls for service for each activity. Each rate was then rank ordered to determine the dangerousness of each activity.

TABLE 20
ASSAULTS, CALLS FOR SERVICE AND DANGER RATES
DETAILED CIRCUMSTANCES AT THE SCENE

Activity	Assaults		Calls		Danger Rates[1]	
	N	%	N	%	Value	Rank
Sex Offenses	8	.7	36	.3	2.33	6
Narcotics Offenses	12	1.0	63	.5	2.00	7
Disturbances	337	29.4	929	7.1	4.14	5
Domestics	282	24.6	694	5.3	4.64	3
Burglary/B & E	10	.9	537	4.1	.22	13
Fraud/Misuse	1	.1	353	2.7	.04	19
Assault & Battery	2	.2	207	1.6	.13	15
Theft	21	1.8	1044	7.9	.23	12
Suspicious Situations	14	1.2	873	6.6	.18	14
Property Problems	12	1.0	1115	8.5	.12	16
Auto Theft	1	.1	182	1.4	.07	18
Robbery	3	.3	57	.4	.75	10
Juvenile Problems	0	0	243	1.8	---	20
Alarms	0	0	2405	18.3	---	20
Alcohol Problems	38	3.3	92	.7	4.71	2
Traffic	138	12.0	2291	17.4	.69	11
Medical	17	1.9	226	1.7	1.12	9
Noncriminal Other	10	.9	1180	9.0	.10	17
Legal Interventions	172	15.0	171	1.3	11.54	1
Weapons	31	2.7	76	.6	4.50	4
Criminal Other	39	3.4	306	2.3	1.48	8
Unknown Trouble	0	0	80	.5	---	20
Totals	1148	100	13,160	100		

[1]The danger rate was calculated by dividing the percentage of assaults by the percentage of calls for service for each activity. Each rate was then rank ordered to determine the dangerousness of each activity.

TABLE 21
ASSAULTS WITH INJURY, CALLS FOR SERVICE AND DANGER RATES
FOR INDEX OFFENSES AND OTHER CIRCUMSTANCES

Activity	Assaults with Inj. N	%	Calls N	%	Danger Rates[1] Value	Rank
Homicide	0	0	0	0	0	10
Sex Offenses	1	.3	36	.3	1.00	4
Robbery	2	.6	57	.4	1.50	3
Assault & Battery	1	.3	207	1.6	.19	9
Burglary/B & E	4	1.1	537	4.1	.27	8
Theft	9	2.4	1044	8.0	.30	7
Auto Theft	0	0	182	1.4	0	10
Domestics	80	21.7	694	5.3	4.09	1
Disturbances	90	24.4	929	7.1	3.44	2
Traffic	57	15.4	2291	17.5	.89	5
Other	125	33.9	7103	54.3	.63	6
Totals	369	100	13,080	100		

[1]The danger rate was calculated by dividing the percentage of assaults by the percentage of calls for service for each activity. Each rate was then rank ordered to determine the dangerousness of each activity.

TABLE 22
ASSAULTS WITH INJURY, CALLS FOR SERVICE AND DANGER RATES
DETAILED CIRCUMSTANCES AT THE SCENE

Activity	Assaults with Inj.		Calls		Danger Rates[1]	
	N	%	N	%	Value	Rank
Sex Offenses	1	.3	36	.3	1.00	7
Narcotics Offenses	6	1.6	63	.5	3.26	5
Disturbances	90	24.4	929	7.1	3.44	4
Domestics	80	21.7	694	5.3	4.09	3
Burglary/B & E	4	1.1	537	4.1	.27	14
Fraud/Misuse	0	--	353	2.7	---	16
Assault & Battery	1	.3	207	1.6	.19	15
Theft	9	2.4	1044	7.9	.30	13
Suspicious Situations	4	1.1	873	6.6	.16	16
Property Problems	0	--	1115	8.5	---	17
Auto Theft	0	--	182	1.4	---	17
Robbery	1	.3	57	.4	.75	11
Juvenile Problems	0	0	243	1.8	---	17
Alarms	0	0	2405	18.3	---	17
Alcohol Problems	13	3.5	92	.7	5.00	2
Traffic	57	15.4	2291	17.4	.89	9
Medical	5	1.4	226	1.7	.79	10
Noncriminal Other	11	3.0	1180	9.0	.33	12
Legal Interventions	57	15.4	171	1.3	11.85	1
Weapons	2	.6	76	.6	1.00	7
Criminal Other	27	7.3	306	2.3	3.18	6
Unknown Trouble	0	0	80	.6	---	17
Totals	369	100	13,160	100		

[1]The danger rate was calculated by dividing the percentage of assaults by the percentage of calls for service for each activity. Each rate was then rank ordered to determine the dangerousness of each activity.

TABLE 23

Injury and Non-Injury Assaults
by
Suspect Age

Age	Injury Yes	No	Row Totals
18 <	100% (26)	0 (0)	2% (26)
19-25	38 (146)	62 (237)	27 (383)
26-30	16 (77)	84 (405)	34 (482)
31-35	12 (38)	88 (275)	22 (313)
36-40	17 (28)	83 (137)	12 (165)
41 +	46 (30)	54 (35)	5 (65)
Column totals	24% (345)	76% (1089)	100% (1434)

Chi-square = 186.7, 5 d.f., p < .0000, 30 missing cases

TABLE 24

Injury and Non-Injury Assaults
by
Characteristics of the Environment
Temporal Patterns

Day of the Week	Injury: Yes	Injury: No	Row Totals
Sunday	22% (62)	78% (216)	18% (278)
Monday	25 (51)	75 (155)	13 (206)
Tuesday	28 (54)	72 (141)	13 (195)
Wednesday	21 (42)	79 (157)	13 (199)
Thursday	26 (45)	74 (129)	11 (174)
Friday	29 (62)	71 (153)	14 (215)
Saturday	22 (59)	78 (207)	17 (266)
Column Totals	24% (375)	76% (1158)	100% (1533)

Not Significant

Month	Injury: Yes	Injury: No	Row Totals
January	25% (32)	75% (95)	8% (127)
February	17 (19)	83 (92)	7 (111)
March	21 (26)	79 (100)	8 (126)
April	23 (22)	77 (74)	6 (96)
May	23 (31)	77 (102)	9 (133)
June	25 (32)	75 (97)	8 (129)
July	31 (44)	69 (97)	9 (141)
August	27 (41)	73 (110)	10 (151)
September	33 (35)	67 (72)	7 (107)
October	21 (23)	79 (86)	7 (109)
November	21 (30)	79 (111)	9 (141)
December	25 (40)	75 (122)	11 (162)
Column Totals	24% (375)	76% (1158)	100% (1533)

Not Significant

TABLE 25

Injury and Non-Injury Assaults
by
Characteristics of the Encounter
Precincts

Precinct of Occurrence	Injury Yes	No	Row Totals
Wilkins	21% (38)	79% (140)	12% (178)
Woodlawn	28 (43)	72 (112)	10 (155)
Garrison	20 (35)	80 (138)	11 (173)
Towson	19 (23)	81 (101)	8 (124)
Cockeysville	8 (4)	92 (41)	3 (45)
Parkville	28 (24)	72 (62)	6 (86)
Fullarton	28 (18)	72 (50)	4 (68)
Essex	26 (103)	74 (288)	26 (391)
Dundalk-Edgemere	28 (87)	72 (226)	20 (313)
Column Totals	25% (375)	75% (1158)	100% (1533)

Not Significant

TABLE 26

Injury and Non-Injury Assaults
by
Location and Premise

Location of Encounter	Injury Yes	No	Row Totals
Indoors	24% (201)	76% (646)	56% (847)
Outdoors	25 (171)	75 (506)	44 (677)
Column Totals	24% (372)	76% (1152)	100% (1524)

Not Significant

Type of Premise	Injury Yes	No	Row Totals
Street/Alley	24% (107)	76% (332)	29% (439)
Private Dwelling	20 (100)	80 (396)	33 (496)
Commercial	19 (10)	81 (42)	3 (52)
Bar/Restaurant	36 (21)	64 (38)	4 (59)
Parks/Fields	21 (7)	79 (27)	2 (34)
Parking Lot	28 (55)	72 (143)	13 (198)
Crim. Bldg	28 (59)	72 (150)	14 (209)
Police Vehicle	33 (2)	66 (4)	1 (6)
Other	35 (11)	65 (20)	2 (31)
Column Totals	24% (372)	76% (1152)	100% (1524)

Chi-square = 15.42, 7 d. f., p <.0000

TABLE 27

Injury and Non-Injury Assaults
by
Purpose of Premise

Purpose of Premise	Injury Yes	No	Row Totals
Residence	20% (100)	80% (396)	33% (496)
Business	29 (101)	71 (250)	23 (351)
Other	25 (171)	75 (506)	44 (677)
Column Totals	24% (372)	76% (1152)	100% (1524)

Chi-Square = 8.74, 2 d.f., p < .0000

TABLE 28

Injury and Non-Injury Assaults
by
Type of Call for Service

Type of Call	Injury Yes	No	Row Totals
Police-Initiated	31% (81)	69% (181)	25% (262)
Citizen-Initiated	22 (149)	78 (524)	63 (673)
No Call	32 (41)	68 (88)	12 (129)
Column Totals	26% (271)	74 (793)	100% (1064)

Chi-square = 10.8, 2 d.f., $p < .05$

TABLE 29

Injury and Non-Injury Assaults
by
Information Exchange

Information Exchange?	Injury Yes	No	Row Totals
Yes	25% (301)	75% (916)	95% (1217)
No	13 (9)	87 (58)	5 (67)
Column Totals	24% (310)	76% (974)	100% (1284)

Chi-square = 4.43, 1 d.f., $p < .05$

TABLE 30

Injury and Non-Injury Assaults
by
Phase of Entry

Presence of Tangible Weapon by Assailant	Injury Yes	No	Row Totals
Yes	15% (26)	85% (153)	12% (179)
No	26 (349)	74 (1005)	88 (1354)
Column Totals	24% (375)	76% (1158)	100% (1533)

Chi-square = 10.8, 1 d.f., $p < .0000$

Presence of Drugs	Injury Yes	No	Row Totals
Yes	33% (45)	67% (92)	9% (137)
No	25 (322)	75 (1014)	91 (1336)
Column Totals	25% (367)	75% (1106)	100% (1473)

Chi-square = 5.08, 1 d.f., $p < .05$

Drug Use by Suspect?	Injury Yes	No	Row Totals
Yes	54% (19)	46% (16)	3% (35)
No	23 (302)	77 (1002)	97 (1304)
Column Totals	24% (321)	76% (1018)	100% (1339)

Chi-square = 18.1, 1 d.f., $p < .0000$

TABLE 31

Injury and Non-Injury Assaults

T-tests for Other Persons Present

Number of Other Officers Present

T-Test	N	Mean	t-value	2-tail Prob.
No Injury	1018	1.07	-2.25	.024
Injury	337	1.21		

Number of Citizen Bystanders Present

T-Test	N	Mean	t-value	2-tail Prob.
No Injury	745	.85	2.17	.030
Injury	252	.66		

TABLE 32

Injury and Non-Injury Assaults

T-tests for Shots Fired

Shots Fired by Non-Assaulted Officer

T-Test	N	Mean	t-value	2-tail Prob.
No Injury	1155	.00	-2.49	.013
Injury	375	.005		

Shots Fired by Suspect
(One Suspect Sample)

T-Test	N	Mean	t-value	2-tail Prob.
No Injury	1109	.08	2.19	.029
Injury	355	.00		

TABLE 33

"Breakdowns" of Injuries to Officers
Actual Circumstance of the Assault
(One circumstance situations)

Actual Circumstances	Mean	Cases
Disturbances	.21	339
Domestics	.21	284
Legal Interventions	.33	172
Traffic	.30	154
Criminal-Other	.26	38
Alcohol	.34	38
Weapons	.05	40
Theft	.35	20
Medical	.29	17
Suspicious Sits.	.29	14
Property	.00	12
Narcotics	.50	12
Non-criminal Other	.40	10
Breaking & Entering	.30	10
Sex Offenses	.00	8
Robbery	.33	3
Assault & Battery	.50	2
Fraud	.00	1
Auto theft	.00	1

1175 Total cases

"Breakdowns" of Injuries to Officers
Actual Circumstances of the Assault
(Multiple circumstance incidents)

Actual Circumstance	Mean	Cases
Sex Offenses	1.0	1
Robbery	.20	5
Breaking and Entering	.09	11
Theft	.29	7
Domestics	.25	80
Disturbances	.26	74
Traffic	.24	45
Other	.22	111

333 Total Cases

TABLE 34

Domestic and Non-Domestic Assaults
by

Characteristics of the Environment
Temporal Patterns

Month of the Year	Domestic Yes		Domestic No		Row Totals	
January	31%	(40)	69%	(89)	8.3%	(129)
February	30	(34)	70	(79)	7.3	(113)
March	25	(32)	68	(96)	8.3	(128)
April	24	(24)	76	(74)	6.3	(98)
May	26	(34)	74	(99)	8.6	(133)
June	31	(41)	69	(90)	8.4	(131)
July	22	(34)	78	(110)	9.1	(141)
August	22	(34)	78	(118)	9.8	(152)
September	17	(18)	83	(89)	6.9	(107)
October	21	(23)	79	(86)	7.0	(109)
November	27	(39)	73	(107)	9.4	(146)
December	23	(37)	77	(126)	10.5	(163)
Column Total	25%	(387)	75%	(1163)	100%	(1550)

TABLE 35

Domestic and Non-domestic Assaults
by
Characteristics of the Encounter
Precincts

Precinct of Occurrence	Domestic Yes	Domestic No	Row Totals
Wilkins	22% (40)	78% (139)	11.5 (179)
Woodlawn	29 (46)	71 (112)	10.2 (158)
Garrison	20 (35)	80 (142)	11.4 (177)
Towson	15 (19)	85 (105)	8.0 (124)
Cockeysville	28 (13)	72 (33)	3.0 (46)
Parkville	21 (18)	79 (68)	5.5 (86)
Fullarton	21 (18)	79 (57)	4.5 (69)
Essex	27 (105)	73 (290)	25.5 (395)
Dundalk-Edgemere	31 (91)	69 (217)	20.4 (316)
Column Totals	25% (387)	75% (1163	100% (1550)

TABLE 36

Domestic and Non-Domestic Assaults
by
Characteristics of the Environment
Spatial Patterns

Location of Encounter	Domestic Yes	No	Row Total
Indoors	36% (312)	64% (544)	56% (856)
Outdoors	11 (73)	89 (612)	44 (685)
Column Totals	25% (385)	75% (1156)	100% (1541)

Chi-square = 133.7, 1 d.f., p < .0000, 9 missing cases

Purpose of Premise	Domestic Yes	No	Row Total
Residence	58% (291)	42% (207)	32% (498)
Business	6 (21)	94 (337)	23 (358)
Other	11 (73)	89 (612)	45 (685)
Column Totals	25% (385)	75% (1156)	100% (1541)

Chi-square = 442.1, 2 d.f., p < .0000, 9 missing cases

TABLE 37

Domestic and Non-Domestic Assaults
by
Type of Call

Type of Call	Domestic Yes	Domestic No	Row Totals
Police-Initiated	5% (14)	95% (251)	24.7 (265)
Citizen-Initiated	37 (247)	63 (430)	63.1 (677)
No Call	1 (2)	98 (129)	12.2 (131)
Column Totals	24.5% (263)	75.5% (810)	100% (1073

Chi-square = 142.8, 2 d.f., $p < .05$, 477 missing cases

TABLE 38

Domestic and Non-Domestic Assaults
by
Phase of Entry and Information Exchange

Information Exchange?	Domestic Yes	Domestic No	Row Totals
Yes	28% (337)	72% (887)	95% (1224)
No	10 (7)	90 (61)	5 (68)
Column Totals	27% (344)	73% (948)	100% (1292)

Chi-square = 8.94, 1 d.f., p < .003, 258 missing cases

Officer Actions Prior to Assault	Domestic Yes	Domestic No	Row Totals
Investigate Complaint	43% (108)	57% (145)	17.6 (253)
Arrest Suspect	23 (55)	77 (189)	16.9 (244)
Process/Transport Susp.	5 (11)	95 (191)	14.0 (202)
Obtain Information	18 (26)	82 (116)	9.9 (142)
Resolve Dispute	58 (78)	42 (57)	9.4 (135)
Approach Suspect	22 (25)	78 (89)	7.9 (114)
Struggle W/Suspect	31 (34)	69 (75)	7.6 (109)
Handcuff	21 (12)	79 (45)	4.0 (57)
Pursue Suspect	6 (3)	94 (45)	3.3 (48)
Search Susp/Scene	14 (5)	86 (21)	2.5 (36)
Arrest Non-Assaulter	0 (0)	100 (26)	1.8 (26)
Protect/Assist Officer	22 (5)	78 (18)	1.6 (23)
Other	0 (0)	100 (22)	1.5 (22)
Issue Summons	0 (0)	100 (21)	1.5 (21)
Stop/Frisk	44 (4)	56 (5)	.6 (9)
Column Totals	25% (366)	75% (1075)	100% (1441)

Chi-square = 202.4, 16, d.f., p < .0000, 9 missing cases

TABLE 39

Domestic and Non-Domestic Assaults
by
Complainant

Complainant Present?	Domestic Yes	No	Row Totals
Yes	39% (190)	61% (293)	36% (483)
No	20 (177)	80 (702)	64 (879)
Column Totals	27% (367)	73% (995)	100% (1362)

Chi-square = 57.4, 1 d.f., $p < .05$, 188 missing cases

TABLE 40

Domestic and Non-Domestic Assaults
by
Police at the Incident

Was the Assaulted Officer Alone?	Domestic Yes	Domestic No	Row Totals
Yes	20% (72)	80% (283)	26% (355)
No	29% (289)	71% (721)	74% (1010)
Column Totals	26% (361)	74% (1004)	100% (1365)

Chi-square = 8.95, 1.d.f., $p < .05$, 185 missing cases

TABLE 41

Domestic and Non-Domestic Assaults
by
Alcohol Use

Alcohol Use by Suspect	Domestic Yes	No	Row Totals
Sober	24% (86)	76% (270)	28% (356)
Had been Drinking	32 (93)	68 (195)	23 (288)
Intoxicated	23 (148)	77 (487)	49 (635)
Column Totals	26% (327)	74% (952)	100% (1279)

Chi-square = 8.92, 2 d.f., $p < .01$, 271 Missing cases

TABLE 42

Domestic and Non-Domestic Assaults
by
Suspect Actions Prior to Assault

Suspect Action	Domestic Yes		Domestic No		Row Totals	
Converse	31%	(166)	69%	(365)	37%	(531)
Under Arrest	14	(48)	86%	(296)	24	(344)
Fight	31	(82)	69	(180)	19	(262)
Approach Officer	35	(42)	65	(79)	9	(121)
Flee	13	(9)	87	(63)	5	(72)
Commit Crime	32	(9)	68	(19)	2	(28)
Hinder	13	(13)	87	(21)	2	(24)
Fight w/ non-Offr.	46	(5)	54	(6)	1	(11)
Hide	20	(2)	80	(8)	1	(10)
Sleep	0	(0)	100	(7)	.5	(7)
Other	0	(0)	100	(6)	.4	(6)
Summoned	0	(0)	100	(3)	.1	(3)
Column Totals	26%	(366)	74%	(1053)	100%	(1419)

Chi-square = 60.1, 11 d.f., p < .0000, 62 missing cases

TABLE 43

Domestic and Non-Domestic Assaults
by
Final Decision

Weapon used by Suspect and Officer

Officer's Weapon Used	Domestic Yes	No	Row Totals
Gun	34% (20)	66% (38)	3.8% (58)
Personal	14 (3)	86 (10)	1.2 (22)
Other	45 (9)	55 (11)	1.3 (20)
None	25 (354)	75 (1079)	93.4 (1433)
Column Totals	25% (386)	75 (1147)	100 (1533)

Chi-square = 8.56, 3 d.f., $p < .04$

Suspect Weapon Used	Domestic Yes	No	Row Totals
Gun	20% (11)	80% (45)	4% (56)
Sharp Object	56 (18)	44 (14)	2 (32)
Vehicle	0 (0)	100 (29)	2 (29)
Blunt Object	52 (15)	48 (14)	2 (29)
Kick/Throw	37 (32)	63 (55)	6 (87)
Limbs	25 (284)	75 (838)	76 (1122)
Teeth/Mouth	15 (3)	85 (17)	1 (20)
Spitting	9 (4)	91 (43)	3 (47)
Words/Gesture	9 (3)	91 (31)	2 (34)
Other Body	39 (7)	61 (11)	1 (18)
Column Totals	26% (377)	74% (1097)	100% (1474)

Chi-square = 58.4, 9 d.f., $p < .05$, 7 missing cases

TABLE 44

Domestic and Non-Domestic Assaults
by
Injury to Officer

Final Outcomes

Type of Injury	Domestic Yes		Domestic No		Row Totals	
None	26%	(297)	74%	(861)	76%	(1158)
Superficial	25%	(56)	75%	(169)	15%	(225)
Strain/Sprain	15%	(4)	85%	(23)	2%	(27)
Laceration	20%	(22)	80%	(87)	7%	(109)
Fracture/Dislocate	14%	(2)	86%	(12)	1%	(14)
Column Total	25%	(381)	75%	(1152)	100%	(1533)

Chi-square = 3.96, 4 d.f., (not significant)

VII. CONCLUSIONS, POLICY IMPLICATIONS, AND REMAINING ISSUES

Conclusions

A number of important conclusions can be drawn from this study. First and foremost, we have found that domestic and general disturbances are dangerous in Baltimore County. Second, in situations involving domestic disturbances, a number of elements can be differentiated from non-domestic situations that can lead to a reduction in assaults. Third, we discovered significant differences in injury versus non-injury assaults.

Domestic Disturbances and the Baltimore County Police

These are the findings of our study:

- Domestic and general disturbances are among the most dangerous situations to police officers in Baltimore County in terms of both injury and non-injury assaults.

Based on this finding, we compared assaults during domestic disturbances to assaults during non-domestics to determine whether significant differences existed. These are our findings:

- Virtually no differences exist in terms of officer or suspect characteristics or in temporal patterns.
- In four precincts (Dundalk-Edgemere, Woodlawn, Cockeysville, and Essex) domestics are overrepresented. In one precinct -- Towson -- assaults during domestics were underrepresented.
- Private residences were the primary location of the

domestic-related assaults.

- o Assaults during domestics were overwhelmingly citizen-initiated encounters (7 to 1 over police-initiated contacts).
- o During the domestic encounter, officers were more likely to engage in conversation with the suspect than in non-domestics.
- o More people were at the scene of domestic disturbances than other situations -- police arrived in pairs at these occurrences; the complainant was more likely to be present than in other situations.
- o Weapons used during domestic encounters were more likely to be blunt objects than any other situations.
- o The type of officer injuries during domestics were comparable to non-domestic situations. Of the 387 officers assaulted during domestics, 84 (21.7%) received some type of injury. Of the 84 injuries, 28 (33%) involved a fracture, laceration, or sprain.

The findings regarding the dangerousness of domestics have important ramifications for the police. Domestic situations represent a large percentage of the assaults in our data set. They rank among the highest in danger rates for injury and non-injury -- number one in our first categorization and number threein our second classification. While recent research studies indicate that domestic disturbances are not as dangerous

as originally believed, our data show that domestics present a high risk of danger to police, at least in terms of assaults.

General disturbances are also dangerous. Situations where individuals are arguing in public, making too much noise, conducting loud parties, and making a nuisance are problematic to the police. Circumstances involving weapons and alcohol, often construed as general disturbances, are also potentially violent situations.

These findings suggest that researchers and police departments re-examine assault and injury data to determine the danger rates of police activities.

We also maintain that it is premature to de-emphasize the dangerousness of domestic disturbances in police training academies. While Garner and Clemmer (1986: 4) state, "the evidence is sufficiently clear that . . . training materials should be revised to portray more accurately the low level of danger currently associated with this assignment," we disagree.

It may very well be that traditional wisdom and training regarding domestic disturbances have a great deal of influence on the way officers handle such situations. The traditional emphasis on danger may lead officers to exercise extra caution when answering domestic calls. This, in turn, may contribute to the low level of officer deaths stemming from domestics as well as the relatively low levels of assaults and injuries found in some studies. Goolkasian (1986) has observed that, "... we do not know whether the high level of officer concern about their

own safety in domestic disturbances affects the low rates of officer deaths, assaults and injuries in these cases..." Similarly, Garner and Clemmer concede, "We simply do not know the extent to which the current risk of death in domestic disturbances stems from precautionary measures taken by police whne responding to domestic disturbances" (Garner and Clemmer, 1986:5). Hence, it is possible that removing or downplaying the training emphasis on danger will lead to less caution on the part of police, and, consequently, an increase in police deaths and injuries.

A research question that should be examined in the future is the extent to which different police methods affect the number of officer deaths and injuries taking place during domestic disturbances. This question is especially important today, given the increasing demand for police departments to adopt an arrest approach for dealing with domestic disturbances.

For the last two decades police have been criticized for responding inadequately to the needs of domestic violence victims. Recently, critics have demanded more legal action against domestic violence offenders. Researchers have criticized the police for not making as many arrests as are justified in domestic violence cases. In some jurisdictions, legislation has been passed mandating arrest in cases where a felony assault has occurred and giving police greater powers of arrest in misdemeanor cases.

Arguments for the arrest approach have been strengthened by

studies conducted by the Police Foundation (Sherman and Berk, 1984) and by Berk and Newton (1985). These studies examined the effect of an arrest approach on recidivism in domestic violence cases. Both provided evidence that an arrest approach has a deterrent effect on domestic violence offenders.

Yet considering the potentially volatile socio-psychological aspects of domestic disturbances, it is possible that greater use of the arrest approach will lead to more violence against the police. Ironically, what is best for victims may be more dangerous for police.

At the same time, other researchers argue that one of the benefits of an arrest approach is that it reduces the potential for violence against the police. The argument here is that police will not become targets of aggression while trying to act as mediators in domestic disputes. Also, an arrest approach may encourage officers to treat domestics in a more serious and cautious manner.

Another approach to domestics, which emerged during the 1970s and is still in use today, is the crisis intervention approach. The crux of this method is to teach police about both the dynamics of family violence and how to defuse such situations. Proponents of this approach argue tthat it provides a better response to victims and facilitates officer safety.

Evidence so far has not shown that crisis intervention is safer for police. In an examination of crisis intervention programs, Buchanan and Chasnoff (1986) found that only one city,

Washington, D.C., had experienced a decrease in assaults on police officers following family crisis intervention training.

Overall, the dangerousness of domestic disturbances should not be underestimated in police policy and training. At this point, a recommendation that police departments de-emphasize the dangerousness of domestics may jeopardize officer safety.

Injuries to Police

In assault encounters in Baltimore County, differences emerge between those situations that result in injury to police and those that do not. Differences are significant when we examine the following characteristics of individuals, situations, and their interactions:

-- suspects who are 18 or younger and over the age of 41 caused more injury to officers than individuals between the ages of 19 and 40;

-- injuries were more likely to occur in business areas than in residential locations;

-- injuries were more likely to occur during police-invoked calls than in citizen invoked calls;

-- when officers and suspects exchanged words, injuries were more likely to occur to the officer;

-- officers were less likely to be injured when a suspect had a tangible weapon;

-- injuries to officers were more likely to occur when an illegal narcotic was present;

-- when more officers were present, the likelihood of injury increases; when the number of citizens present was low, the likelihood of injury was high; and

-- non-assaulted officers were more likely to fire their weapons when an injury occurred than in no injury encounters; suspects fired shots more often in encounters with no injuries to officers.

These findings suggest that officers need to be more careful in situations that they initiate themselves, particularly when drugs are present and when the suspect is a young adult. The findings also raise questions about tactical approaches by the police.

Remaining Research Questions

A number of important research questions emerge as a result of this study. Substantive and methodological issues still need to be resolved before we can make definitive statements about violence against the police. For example, we might ask, how do different police practices affect the dangerousness of domestic disturbances? That is, what has been the effect of a mandatory arrest policy on violence against the police? Does the policy lead to more danger? less?

Future research should also focus on the following issues:

o Are there differences between domestic disturbances that lead to assaults and those that are resolved peaceably? Are some officers better equipped to deal with domestic situations than

other officers?

Methodological questions continue to abound. We need to examine police departments in urban centers more closely with regard to assaults generally. This study examined a police department that serves a suburban county and therefore, may not reflect conditions in inner cities where crime rates are higher and where situations are, perhaps, more violent.

REFERENCES

Bannon, James.
1977 "Assaults Upon Police Officers: A Sociological Study of the Definition of the Situation," (Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, School of Sociology, Wayne State University at Detroit.)

Binder, Arnold and Peter Scharf.
1980 "The Violent Police-Citizen Encounter," Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, vol. 452, November: 111-121.

Chapman, Samuel G.
1976 Police Murders and Effective Counter Measures. Santa Cruz: Davis Publishing.

Dykstra, Larry.
1984 Illinois Law Enforcement Officers Assaulted or Killed: 1972-1982. State of Illinois.

Federal Bureau of Investigation.
1983 Law Enforcement Officers Killed (1972-1981). Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office.

Fyfe, James J.
1978 "Shots Fired: A Typological Examination of New York City Police Firearms Discharges, 1971-1975," (Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, School of Criminal Justice, SUNY at Albany.)

_____.
1980 "Always Prepared: Police Off-Duty Guns," Annals of the Academy of Political and Social Sciences, vol. 452, November: 72-81.

Garner, Joel and Elizabeth Clemmer.
1986 "Danger to Police in Domestic Disturbances--A New Look," Research in Brief, National Institute of Justice, U.S. Department of Justice, November.

Geller, William A. and Kevin J. Karales.
1981 Split Second Decisions: Shootings of and by Chicago Police. Chicago: Chicago Law Enforcement Study Group.

Hale, Charles H. and William Wilson.
1974 Characteristics of Assaulted and Non-Assaulte Officers. Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press.

Konstantin, David N.
1984 "Homicides of American Law Enforcement Officers, 1978-1980," Justice Quarterly, vol. 1, no. 1, March: 29-45.

Lester, David.
1981 "An Alternative Perspective: The Use of Deadly Force by Police and Civilians," The Police Chief, December: 56-57.

Margarita, Mona.
1980 "Killing the Police: Myths and Motives," Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Sciences, vol. 452, November: 63-71.

Meyer, C. Kenneth, Thomas C. Magedanz, David C. Kieselhorst, and Samuel Chapman.
1978 A Social-Psychological Analysis of Police Assailants. Norman OK: Bureau of Government Research, University of Oklahoma.

_____.
1979 "Violence and the Police: The Special Case of the Police Assailant," Journal of Police Science and Administration, vol. 7, no. 2, June: 160-170.

Morrison, Patton N. and Cheryl K. Meyer.
1974 A Microanalysis of Assaults on Police in Austin, Texas. Norman, OK: Bureau of Government Research, University of Oklahoma.

Regens, J.J., C. Kenneth Meyers, Cheryl G. Swanson, and Samuel Chapman.
1974 An Analysis of Assaults on Municipal Police Officers in 46 South Central Cities. Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma.

Sherman, Lawrence W.
1980 "Perspectives on Police and Violence," Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Sciences, vol. 452, November: 1-12.

APPENDIX A

CRIME AND ARREST REPORT FORMS

BALTIMORE COUNTY POLICE DEPARTMENT · **FORM 10 · CRIME REPORT**

1 DIV	2 PC	3 C C NUMBER

4 OFFENSE/INCIDENT	5 LOCATION CITY-STATE-ZIP	6 TYPE OF PREMISE

7 TIME OCCURRED	M	D	Y	T	DAY	8 TIME REPORTED	M	D	Y	T	DAY

9 VICTIM/FIRM NAME (LAST, FIRST, MIDDLE) SEX-RACE-DOB	10 VICTIM/FIRM ADDRESS CITY-STATE-ZIP

11 VICTIM EMPLOYMENT/SCHOOL	12 OCCUPATION - HOURS	13 SBR	14 RESIDENCE PHONE	15 BUSINESS PHONE	16 NO OF VICTIMS

17 NATURE OF INJURY(S) CONDITION	18 FORCE/WEAPON USED	19 VICTIM HOSPITALIZED - WHERE? PHYSICIAN

20 CID INVESTIGATOR	21 MEDICAL EXAMINER	22 PROPERTY DISPOSITION	23 BODY DISPOSITION

24. INVESTIGATIVE INTERVIEWS:

INTERVIEWS CONDUCTED? YES [ ] NO [ ] IF NO EXPLAIN BLOCK #56

W - WITNESS, V - VICTIM, C - COMPLAINANT P - PARENT G - GUARDIAN I - INTERVIEWED

NAME SEX-RACE-AGE	ADDRESS	RESIDENCE PHONE	BUSINESS PHONE	FACTOR(S)	RELATION

SUSPECT(S) A.

25-1. SUSPECT ONE: ARRESTED YES ☐ NO ☐ WEAPON-DESCRIPTION

NAME (LAST, FIRST, MIDDLE) ALIAS

ADDRESS PHONE

SEX	RACE	DOB OR AGE	HT	WT	BLD	EYES	COMP	HAIR & STYLE

CLOTHING - CHARACTERISTICS

MISCELLANEOUS

25-2. SUSPECT TWO: ARRESTED YES ☐ NO ☐ WEAPON-DESCRIPTION

NAME (LAST FIRST, MIDDLE) ALIAS

ADDRESS PHONE

SEX	RACE	DOB OR AGE	HT	WT	BLD	EYES	COMP	HAIR & STYLE

CLOTHING - CHARACTERISTICS

MISCELLANEOUS

SUSPECT VEHICLE B.

26 VEHICLE(S)
- SUSPECT ☐
- TARGET ☐
- STOLEN ☐
- RECOVERY ☐
- OTHER ☐

27 YEAR	28 MAKE	29 MODEL	30 STYLE	31 COLOR (TOP/BOTTOM)	32 EQUIPMENT - CHARACTERISTICS

33. VIN:

34 REGISTRATION INFORMATION STATE YEAR TAG

35 I ☐ LOST G ☐ STOLEN

36 METHOD OF THEFT/EVIDENCE OF TAMPERING | 37 VEH OWNER | 38 LOSS VALUE

39 LOCATION OF RECOVERY PC | 40 RECOVERY BY | 41 RECOVERY VALUE

42 TOW CO./STORAGE LOCATION DATE-TIME-DRIVER | 43 VEH PROCESSED | 44 VEHICLE HELD | 45 TELETYPE NUMBER

46. CRIME SCENE TECHNICAL WORK: NONE ☐ CRIME LAB ☐ FIELD ☐ TYPE

PHYSICAL EVIDENCE C.

47 POINT OF ENTRY	48 DIRECTION - MEANS OF TRAVEL	49 PROPERTY DESTROYED	50 LOSS VALUE

51 TOOLS - MEANS USED (BE SPECIFIC)

52 SECURITY SURVEY INFORMATION REQUESTED [ ] COMPLETED [ ] REFUSED [ ] OTHER [ ]

STOLEN PROPERTY D.

53 ITEM	PROPERTY TAKEN	BRAND-DESCRIPTION-IDENTIFYING MARKS, ETC	LOCATION	MODEL	SERIAL NUMBER	VALUE

54. ARE SIMILAR CRIME/SUSPECT ACTION(S) KNOWN? YES ☐ NO ☐ IF YES, LIST C C NUMBER

55. TOTAL LOSS VALUE:

IS ANY FORM OR TYPE OF M.O. PRESENT? IF YES, DESCRIBE E.

INVESTIGATING OFFICER: CAN CRIME BE SOLVED WITH INVESTIGATION AT FIELD LEVEL? F.

56. MISCELLANEOUS (CONTINUATION, CLARIFICATION, AND ANY PERTINENT DATA NOT CONTAINED ABOVE)

57 CASE ASSIGNMENT

58 CASE STATUS
- OPEN ☐
- EX CLEAR ☐
- SUSP ☐

59 TOTAL SCREENING FACTORS

60 Distribution Cent. Rec. ____ Juv ____	61 INVESTIGATING OFFICER ID NO	62 APPROVAL - INVESTIGATION COMPLETE YES ☐ NO ☐	63 DATE

ALTIMORE COUNTY POLICE
RREST REPORT Form #166

1. Defendant's Name (Last, First, Middle) | 2. D.O.B. | 3. B.C.I. No.

4. Sex | 5. Race | 6. Place of Birth | 7. Defendant's Address | 8. Arrest No.

9. Age | 10. Ht. | 11. Wgt. | 12. Build | 13. Hair | 14. Eyes | 15. Scars/Marks | 16. Teeth | 17. Speech | 18. Mustache, Beard, Etc. | 19. Amp./Deform.

20. Occupation | 21. Place of Employment/School and Address | 22. Home Phone | 23. Work Phone | 24. Alias

25. Date of Arrest Day Mo. Day Yr. | 26. Time | 27. Location of Arrest (Address) | 28. Describe Type of Premises

29. Arresting Officer | I.D. No. | 30. Div./Pct. | 31. C.A.R. Date Mo. Day Yr. | 32. Time | 33. Person Contacted-Rec. Sect. | 34. Transport Officer

35. Date Booked Mo. Day Yr. | 36. Time Booked | 37. Booking Officer | I.D. No. | 38. Div./Pct. | 39. Searched By | I.D. No.

40. Drug Information
A. ☐ User B. ☐ Seller
A. ☐ B. ☐ Dangerous Drugs
A. ☐ B. ☐ Narcotics
A. ☐ B. ☐ Hallucinogens
A. ☐ B. ☐ Marijuana

DEFENDANT'S VEHICLE INFORMATION | 41. Soundex No. | 42. Social Security No.

43. Make | 44. Model | 45. Year | 46. Color(s) | 47. V.I.N. | 48. License No. | State | Year

49. Towed. (Name of Company, Address, Driver, Date and Time) | 49a. T T. Number | 49b. T T. Cancelled Yes None

50. Previous Arrest Yes ☐ No ☐ | 51. For Same Offense Balto. Co. ☐ Other Jur. ☐ | 52. For Other Offense Balto. Co. ☐ Other Jur. ☐ | 53. Escapee Yes ☐ No ☐

54. Presently on Parole/Probation Yes ☐ No ☐ | 55. Previous Conviction Yes ☐ No ☐ | 56. Right Index

Item No.	57. Narrative

Print Cards Submitted ☐ Yes ☐ No

58. Name of Officer Present During Processing

Photographed ☐ Yes ☐ No

59. Data Processing Use Only

COURT INFORMATION

	60. CHARGE: Article/Section	61. Warrant/Summons Citation Number Statement of Charges	62. C C Number	63. Div. Pct.	64. Records Section Use

65.

66. Bail Hearing ☐ Yes ☐ No | 67. Before Commissioner Name | 68. Date | 69. Time | 70. Court Location

71. Court Case No. | 72. Bail Amount | 73. Trial Date Mo. Day Year | Time | 74. Trial Location

75. Status of Defendant
☐ To Jail ☐ Released on Bail ☐ Released on Own Recognizance ☐ Released Without Charge
☐ Arrested for Other Agency - Name of Agency _____ ☐ Other (Explain)

76. Distribution:
Legal _____
Data Process _____
C.I.D. _____
Intell. _____

77. Approved By | I.D. No. | 78. Div./Pct. | 79. Date Submitted | 80. Status ☐ Closed ☐ Open

81. Report Review | 82. Reporting Area | 83. Received Records Section

84. Records Section

APPENDIX B

CODING INSTRUMENT AND CODEBOOK FOR CRIME AND ARREST REPORTS

VIOLENCE AGAINST POLICE CODESHEET

CRIME REPORT

Coder # ___ Grant ID# _____ Single Off.? ___ (ref. Grant ID_____)

PC ___ CC# __-_____ Loc. _____

Premise ___ Date Occ.: Mo. ___ Date ___ Year ___ Time ____ Day ___

Date Rep.: Mo. ___ Date ___ Year ___ Time ____ Day ___

Officer/Victim:
Name: _____ ID# _____ Sex ___ Race ___

DOB ___/___/___ Injury ___1 ___2 ___3 Force ___ Hosp. ___

Suspect/Assaulter:
Arrested? ___1 ___2 ___3

Name: _____1 _____2

_____3 Sex: ___1 ___2 ___3 Race: ___1 ___2 ___3

DOB: ___/___/___ 1 ___/___/___ 2 ___/___/___ 3 Hgt: ___/___ 1 ___/___ 2

___/___ 3 Wgt. ___1 ___2 ___3

Nonassaulter/Offender:
Arrested? ___1 ___2 ___3

Name: _____1 _____2

_____3 Sex: ___1 ___2 ___3 Race: ___1 ___2 ___3

DOB: ___/___/___ 1 ___/___/___ 2 ___/___/___ 3 Hgt: ___/___ 1 ___/___ 2

___/___ 3 Wgt. ___1 ___2 ___3

Narrative:
Type Call ___ Comp? ___ Comp. Sex ___1 ___2 ___3 Comp. Race ___1 ___2 ___3

Comp. Age ___1 ___2 ___3 Relat. ___1 ___2 ___3 Antic. Inc. ____

Duty ___ Armed? ___ Dress ___ Act. Inc. ___1 ___2 ___3 ___4 Vehicle ___

Off. Assign. ___ Off. Type ___ Type Premise ___ Part Premise ___

Susp/Ass. ___ # Nonass. Offend. ___ # Other Offic. ___ # Cits. ___ #Supers. ___

Coder # ___ Grant ID# _____ Single Off.? ___ (ref. Grant ID_____)

PC ___ CC# __-_____ Loc. _____

Premise ___ Date Occ.: Mo. ___ Date ___ Year ___ Time ____ Day ___

Date Rep.: Mo. ___ Date ___ Year ___ Time ____ Day ___

Officer/Victim:
Name: _____ ID# _____ Sex ___ Race ___

DOB ___/___/___ Injury ___1 ___2 ___3 Force ___ Hosp. ___

Suspect/Assaulter:
Arrested? ___1 ___2 ___3

Name: _____1 _____2

_____3 Sex: ___1 ___2 ___3 Race: ___1 ___2 ___3

DOB: ___/___/___ 1 ___/___/___ 2 ___/___/___ 3 Hgt: ___/___ 1 ___/___ 2

___/___ 3 Wgt. ___1 ___2 ___3

Nonassaulter/Offender:
Arrested? ___1 ___2 ___3

Name: _____1 _____2

_____3 Sex: ___1 ___2 ___3 Race: ___1 ___2 ___3

DOB: ___/___/___ 1 ___/___/___ 2 ___/___/___ 3 Hgt: ___/___ 1 ___/___ 2

___/___ 3 Wgt. ___1 ___2 ___3

Narrative:
Type Call ___ Comp? ___ Comp. Sex ___1 ___2 ___3 Comp. Race ___1 ___2 ___3

Comp. Age ___1 ___2 ___3 Relat. ___1 ___2 ___3 Antic. Inc. ___

Duty ___ Armed? ___ Dress ___ Act. Inc. ___1 ___2 ___3 ___4 Vehicle ___

Off. Assign. ___ Off. Type ___ Type Premise ___ Part Premise ___

Susp/Ass. ___ # Nonass. Offend. ___ # Other Offic. ___ # Cits. ___ #Supers. ___

Ass. Offic. ___ Weap. Pres. ___ Phase Entry ___ Info. ___

Susp/Ass. Act ___1 ___2 ___3 Offic. Pos. ___ Susp/Ass. Pos. ___1 ___2 ___3

Dist. ___1 ___2 ___3 Susp/Ass. Weap. Used ___1 ___2 ___3

Susp/Ass. Conceal ___1 ___2 ___3 Offic. Weap ___ Offic. Inj. ___1 ___2 ___3

Loc. Offic. Inj ___ Susp/Ass. Inj. ___1 ___2 ___3

Loc. Susp/Ass. Inj. ___1 ___2 ___3 # Shots by Ass. Offic. ___

Shots by Other Offic. ___ # Shots by Susp/Ass. ___1 ___2 ___3

Sobriety Susp/Ass. ___1 ___2 ___3 Drugs Pres.? ___

Drug Infl. Susp/Ass. ___1 ___2 ___3 Status Susp/Ass. ___1 ___2 ___3

Status Nonass. Offend. ___1 ___2 ___3

ARREST REPORT:

Suspect/Assaulters:
Date of Arrest: ___/___/___ 1 ___/___/___ 2 ___/___/___ 3

BCI # _____1 _____2 _____3 Arrest # _____1 _____2

_____3 Offic. Assign. ___

Charges:
_____1 _____2 _____3

_____1 _____2 _____3

_____1 _____2 _____3

_____1 _____2 _____3

Nonassaultive Offenders:
Date of Arrest: ___/___/___ 1 ___/___/___ 2 ___/___/___ 3

BCI # _____1 _____2 _____3 Arrest # _____1 _____2

_____3 Offic. Assign. ___

Charges:
_____1 _____2 _____3

_____1 _____2 _____3

_____1 _____2 _____3

VIOLENCE AGAINST POLICE

Codebook

CRIME REPORT

Coder:
1. Roxie
2. Doug
3. Laure
4. Craig

Grant ID # (1000-4999 Roxie; 5000-9999 Doug)

Single Officer:
1. yes
2. no, cross reference Grant ID#

Precinct:
01. Wilkins
02. Woodlawn
03. Garrison
06. Towson
07. Cockeysville
08. Parkville
09. Fullarton
11. Essex
12. Dundalk
13. Edgemere
-8. n/a
-9. Missing

CC# __-__ __ __ __ __ __

Location (list address and zipcode)

Type of Premise:
01. street/sidewalk
02. alleyway
03. apt. house
04. private house
05. office building
06. bar
07. restaurant
08. commercial
09. park/playground/amusement
10. parking lot
11. school or university
12. hotel or motel
13. jail
14. police station
15. police vehicle
16. hospital

17. church
18. bank
19. field/woods
30-60 Roxie
61-97 Doug
-8. n/a
-9. missing

Date Occurred (-8=n/a,-9=missing)
Month (1-12)
Day (1-31)
Year (83-86)
Military Time
Day of Week (1-7 with Sunday as 1)

Date Reported (-8=n/a,-9=missing)
Month (1-12)
Day (1-31)
Year (83-86)
Military Time
Day of Week (1-7 with Sunday as 1)

Officer/Victim Name: (-8=n/a, -9=missiny)

Officer/Victim ID# (-8 n/a, -9 missing)

Officer/Victim - Sex:
01. male
02. female
-8. n/a
-9. missing

Officer/Victim - Race:
01. white
02. black
03. hispanic
04. other (specify)
-8. n/a
-9. missing

Officer/Victim - Date of Birth
Month (1-12) (-8=n/a, -9=missing)
Day (1-31) (-8=n/a, -9=,issing)
Year (00-86) (last 2 digits) (-8=n/a, -9=missing)

Nature of Injury: ____1 ___2 ___3
01. none
02. superficial (bruises, scratches)
03. strains/sprains
04. lacerations (cuts, puntures)
05. fractures, broken bones
06. gunshot
07. death
08. destruction of police property

30-60 Roxie
61-97 Doug
-8. n/a
-9. missing

Force/Weapon used by Offender: (separate by commas if multiple)
01. handgun
02. shotgun
03. rifle
04. hands
05. feet
06. both hands and feet
07. knife
08. other sharp instrument (specify)
09. vehicle
10. officer's gun
11. officer's club or stick
12. other blunt stick
13. bomb or explosive
14. air gun (BB)
15. machine gun
16. teeth/mouth
17. spitting
18. none (words or gestures only)
30-60 Roxie
61-97 Doug
-8. n/a
-9. missing

Did Officer/Victim go to Hospital?
01. yes
02. no
-8. n/a
-9. missing

Suspect/Assaulter Arrested? _____1 _____2 _____3
01. yes
02. no
-8. n/a (only used if less than 3 suspects)
-9. no suspect

Suspect - Sex: _____1 _____2 _____3
01. male
02. female
-8. n/a
-9. missing

Suspect - Race _____1 _____2 _____3
01. white
02. black
03. hispanic
04. other (specify)
-8. n/a
-9. missing

Suspect - Date of Birth (check arrest report if listed as age)
month/date/year _____1 (-8/-8/-8=n/a; -9/-9/-9=missing)
month/date/year _____2
month/date/year _____3

Suspect - Height: (-8/-8=n/a; -9/-9=missing)
feet/inches _____1
feet/inches _____2
feet/inches _____3

Suspect - Weight (in pounds) _____1 _____2 _____3
-8. n/a
-9. missing

Nonassaulter/Offender Arrested?
01. yes
02. no
-8. n/a (if less than 3)
-9. missing

Nonassaultive Offender - Sex: _____1 _____2 _____3
01. male
02. female
-8. n/a
-9. missing

Nonassaultive Offender- Race _____1 _____2 _____3
01. white
02. black
03. hispanic
04. other (specify)
-8. n/a
-9. missing

Nonassaultive Offender - Date of Birth
month/date/year _____1 (-8/-8/-8=n/a; -9/-9/-9=missing)
month/date/year _____2
month/date/year _____3

Nonassaultive Offender - Height: (-8/-8=n/a; -9/-9=missing)
feet/inches _____1
feet/inches _____2
feet/inches _____3

Nonassaultive Offender - Weight (in pounds) _____1 _____2 _____3
-8. n/a
-9. missing

(Narrative Information)

Type of Call:
01. police-initiated (surveill., observation, invest., warrant)
02. citizen-initiated- dispatched
03. citizen-initiated-flagged down

04. citizen-initiated-other
05. backup
-8. n/a
-9. missing

Citizen Complainant
01. yes
02. no
-8. n/a
-9. missing

Complainant - Sex: _____1 _____2 _____3
01. male
02. female
-8. N/A
-9. missing

Complainant - Race _____1 _____2 _____3
01. white
02. black
03. hispanic
04. other (specify)
-8. n/a
-9. missing

Complainant - Age (in years) _____1 _____2 _____3
-8. n/a
-9. missing

Relationship of Complainant to Suspect/Assaulter: ___1 ___2 ___3
01. none
02. spouse
03. girlfriend/boyfriend
04. parent
05. child
06. other relative
07. neighbor
08. acquaintance/friend
09. business
30-60 Roxie
61-97 Doug
-8. n/a
-9. missing

Type of Incident as Anticipated by Officer (only if specifically stated)
01. domestic arguing
02. domestic physical fighting
03. domestic (no distinction made between arguing and fighting)
04. public arguing
05. public physical fighting
06. public disturbance (general or no distinction made " ")
07. Burglary
08. Robbery
09. Drugs

10. Investigate Suspicious Person
11. atempting arrest
12. issue summons/citation (not traffic)
13. ambush/sniper
14. mentally ill
15. traffic
16. homicide
17. assault
18. processing or handling a prisoner
19. officer in trouble
20. larceny
21. person with weapon
22. shots fired
23. sex assault
24. arson
25. service call (cats in trees, etc)
26. missing person
27. suicide
28. DWI
29. vandalism/property damage
30-60 Roxie
61-97 Doug
98. no problem
-8. n/a
-9. missing

Officer Duty Status: (assume on-duty)
01. on duty
02. off duty
-8. n/a
-9. missing

Officer Armed? (assume yes if on-duty)
01. yes
02. no
-8. n/a
-9. missing

Officer's Dress: (assume uniform)
01. uniform
02. plainclothes/street clothes
03. SWAT-type uniform
-8. n/a
-9. missing

Actual Incident: _____1 _____2 _____3 _____4
01. domestic arguing
02. domestic physical fighting
03. domestic (no distinction made between arguing and fight)
04. public arguing
05. public physical fighting
06. public disturbance (general or no distinction made " ")
07. burglary

08. robbery
09. drugs
10. Investigate Suspicious Person
11. atempting arrest
12. issue summons/citation (not traffic)
13. ambush/sniper
14. mentally ill
15. traffic
16. homicide
17. assault
18. processing or handling a prisoner
19. officer in trouble
20. larceny
21. person with weapon
22. shots fired
23. sex assault
24. arson
25. service call (cats in trees, etc)
26. missing person
27. suicide
28. DWI
29. vandalism/property damage
30-60 Roxie
61-97 Doug
98. no problem
-8. n/a
-9. missing

Officer Vehicle Status at Scene of Assault: (assume marked)
01. marked
02. unmarked
03. none
-8. n/a
-9. missing

Officer Assignment:
01. alone
02. partner
-8. n/a
-9. missing

Assaulted Officer Type:
01. responding
02. back-up
-8. n/a
-9. missing

Type of Premise:
01. street/sidewalk
02. alleyway
03. apt. house
04. private house
05. office building
06. bar

07. restaurant
08. commercial
09. park/playground/amusement
10. parking lot
11. school or university
12. hotel or motel
13. jail
14. police station
15. police vehicle
16. hospital
17. church
18. bank
19. field/woods
30-60 Roxie
61-97 Doug
-8. n/a
-9. missing

Part of Premise:
01. roof
02. hallway
03. office
04. elevator
05. stairwell/landing
06. garage
07. yard
08. basement
09. locker room
10. kitchen
11. living room/dining room
12. bedroom
13. bathroom
14. study
30-60 Roxie
61-97 Doug
-8. n/a (not "inside")
-9. missing

Number of Suspect/Assaulters: (-8=n/a, -9=missing)

Number of Nonassaultive Offenders (not including assaulters) (" ")

Number of Officers Present During Assault (not counting victim): (" ")

Number of Citizen Bystanders During Assault: (" ")

Number of Supervisors Present During Assault: (" ")

Number of Officers Assaulted: (" ")

Tangible Weapon Present (other than officers)?
01. yes
02. no

-8. n/a
-9. missing

Phase of Entry Preceding Attack
01. approach suspect or vehicle
02. search scene of crime
03. struggling with suspect
04. processing prisoner
05. pursuing suspect
06. investigating complaint
07. stopping and frisking
08. arresting suspect/assaulter
09. arresting nonasaultive offender
10. issuing summons or citiation
11. handcuffing
12. attempting to resolve a dispute
13. obtaining information from suspect
14. searching offender
15. protecting fellow officer
30-60 Roxie
61-97 Doug
-8. n/a
-9. missing

Information Exchange:
Were words spoken between assaulted officer and suspect/assaulter?
01. yes
02. no
-8. n/a
-9. missing

Suspect/Assaulter's Action Immediately Preceding Assault:
____1 _____2 ____3
01. approaching officer
02. conversing with officer (includes yelling, profanity, etc.)
03. fleeing from officer
04. hiding from officer
05. fighting/arguing with officer
06. committing a crime
07. under arrest / being arrested
08. summoned
09. self injurious behavior
30-60 Roxie
61-97 Doug
-8. n/a
-9. missing

Assaulted Officer's Position at Attack:
01. walking/standing
02. kneeling
03. lying down
04. sitting
05. climbing
06. exiting vehicle

07. running
30-60 Roxie
61-97 Doug
-8. n/a
-9. missing

Suspect/Assaulter's Position at Attack: ___1 ___2 ___3
01. walking/standing
02. kneeling
03. lying down
04. sitting
05. climbing
06. exiting vehicle
07. running
30-60 Roxie
61-97 Doug
-8. n/a
-9. missing

Distance Between Suspect/Assaulter & Assaulted Officer During Assault:
___1 ___2 ___3
01. 0-less than 4 feet
02. 4 ft to less than 11 feet
03. 11 ft to less than 21 feet
04. 21 ft +
-8. n/a
-9. missing

Suspect/Assaulter's Weapon USED in Assault: ___1 ___2 ___3
(separate by comma if multiple weapons)
01. handgun
02. shotgun
03. rifle
04. hands/arms
05. feet/legs
06. both hands and feet
07. knife
08. other sharp instrument (specify)
09. vehicle
10. officer's gun
11. officer's club or stick
12. other blunt stick
13. bomb or explosive
14. air gun (BB)
15. machine gun (uzi's, etc.)
16. teeth/mouth
17. spitting
18. none (words or gestures only)
30-60 Roxie
61-97 Doug
-8. n/a
-9. missing

Suspect/Assaulter's Weapon Concealed: ___1 ___2 ___3

01. yes
02. no
03. no weapon
-8. n/a
-9. missing

Assaulted Officer's Weapon Used in Assault:
01. service revolver
02. back-up revolver
03. shotgun
04. rifle
05. hands
06. feet
07. hands and feet
08. club or stick
09. mace
10. slapjack
11. no weapon
30-60 Roxie
61-97 Doug
-8. n/a
-9. missing

Assaulted Officer's Injury: ___1 ___2 ___3 (several injuries may occur for one officer)
01. none
02. superficial (bruises, scratches)
03. strains/sprains
04. lacerations (cuts, puntures)
05. fractures, broken bones
06. gunshot
07. death
08. destruction of police property
30-60 Roxie
61-97 Doug
-8. n/a
-9. missing

Location of Assaulted Officer's Injury: (if more than 1, use comma)
01. front head or neck
02. back of head or neck
03. front torso
04. back torso
05. arms, hands, fingers
06. legs, feet, toes
07. groin
30-60 Roxie
61-97 Doug
98. no injury
-8. n/a
-9. missing

Suspect/Assaulter's Injury: _____1 _____2 _____3

(if multiple, separate by commas)
01. none
02. superficial (bruises, scratches)
03. strains/sprains
04. lacerations (cuts, puntures)
05. fractures, broken bones
06. gunshot
07. death
30-60 Roxie
61-97 Doug
-8. n/a
-9. missing

Location of Suspect/Assaulter's Injury: _____1 _____2 _____3
(if multiples, separate by comma)
01. front head or neck
02. back of head or neck
03. front torso
04. back torso
05. arms, hands, fingers
06. legs, feet, toes
07. groin
30-60 Roxie
61-97 Doug
98. no injury
-8. n/a
-9. missing

Number of Shots Fired by Assaulted Officer: (-8=n/a, -9=missing)

Number of Shots Fired by Other Officers: (" ")

Number of Shots Fired by Suspect/Assaulter: _____1 ____2 ____3
(-8=n/a,-9=missing)

Sobriety of Suspect/Assaulter: ____1 ____2 ____3
(use arrest report; if none and no mention it is missing)
01. sober
02. had been drinking
03. intoxicated
-8. n/a
-9. missing

Were Drugs Present at Encounter?
01. yes
02. no
-8. n/a
-9. missing

Was Suspect/Assaulted Under Influence of Drugs? ___1 ___2 ___3
01. yes
02. no
-8. n/a
-9. missing

Status Of Suspect/Assaulter: ____1 ____2 ____3
01. arrested
02. fled, whereabouts unknown
03. killed at scene
04. no arrest made but suspect present
05. no arrest made--suspect is unknown to police
-8. n/a
-9. missing

Status Of Nonassaultive Offender: ____1 ____2 ____3
01. arrested
02. fled, whereabouts unknown
03. killed at scene
04. no arrest made but offender present
05. no arrest made--offender is unknown to police
-8. n/a
-9. missing

ARREST REPORT

Date of Arrest of Suspect/Assaulter: (-8/-8/-8=n/a; -9/-9/-9=missing)
month/date/year _____1
month/date/year _____2
month/date/year _____3

BCI # Suspect/Assaulter_____1 _____2 _____3
(-8=n/a,-9=missing)

Arrest # Suspect Assaulter: _____1 _____2 _____3
(-8=n/a,-9=missing)

Officer Assignment:
01. patrol
02. traffic
03. vice/narcotics
04. criminal investigation
05. special operations (tactical, K-9, auxilliary)
06. youth services
07. PCR
08. crime prevention
09. other (specify)
-8. n/a
-9. missing

Charges Filed Against Suspect/Assaulter (list)
1._____ 2._____ 3._____
_____ _____ _____
_____ _____ _____
_____ _____ _____

-8.n/a
-9.missing

Charges Filed Against Nonassultive Offender (list)

1.	2.	3.

-8. n/a
-9. missing

APPENDIX C

CROSSTABULATIONS OF DOMESTICS BY SELECTED CHARACTERISTICS

CROSSTABS OF REPORTED YEAR BY DOMESTIC

COUNT / ROW PCT	DOM: YES (1.00)	DOM: NO (2.00)	ROW TOTAL
REPYEAR 84	141	398	539
	26.2	73.8	34.8
85	112	402	514
	21.8	78.2	33.2
86	134	363	497
	27.0	73.0	32.1
COLUMN TOTAL	387	1163	1550
	25.0	75.0	100.0

CHI-SQUARE	D.F.	SIGNIFICANCE	MIN E.F.	CELLS WITH E.F.< 5
4.23433	2	.1204	124.090	NONE

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 0

CROSSTABS OF REPORTED MONTH BY DOMESTIC

REPMONTH	DOM YES 1.00	DOM NO 2.00	ROW TOTAL
1	40	89	129
	31.0	69.0	8.3
2	34	79	113
	30.1	69.9	7.3
3	32	96	128
	25.0	75.0	8.3
4	24	74	98
	24.5	75.5	6.3
5	34	99	133
	25.6	74.4	8.6
6	41	90	131
	31.3	68.7	8.5
7	31	110	141
	22.0	78.0	9.1
8	34	118	152
	22.4	77.6	9.8
9	18	89	107
	16.8	83.2	6.9
10	23	86	109
	21.1	78.9	7.0
11	39	107	146
	26.7	73.3	9.4
12	37	126	163
	22.7	77.3	10.5
COLUMN TOTAL	387	1163	1550
	25.0	75.0	100.0

CHI-SQUARE	D.F.	SIGNIFICANCE	MIN E.F.	CELLS WITH E.F.< 5
13.49463	11	.2622	24.468	NONE

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 0

CROSSTABS OF OFFICER RACE BY DOMESTIC

COUNT / ROW PCT	DOM: YES (1.00)	DOM: NO (2.00)	ROW TOTAL
COPRACE 1 WHITE	358 / 24.9	1079 / 75.1	1437 / 94.1
COPRACE 2 BLACK	26 / 28.9	64 / 71.1	90 / 5.9
COLUMN TOTAL	384 / 25.1	1143 / 74.9	1527 / 100.0

CHI-SQUARE	D.F.	SIGNIFICANCE	MIN E.F.	CELLS WITH E.F.< 5
.51572	1	.4727	22.633	NONE
.71126	1	.3990	(BEFORE YATES CORRECTION)	

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 23

CROSSTABS OF OFFICER SEX BY DOMESTIC

COPSEX	COUNT / ROW PCT	DOM YES 1.00	DOM NO 2.00	ROW TOTAL
MALE	1	359	1075	1434
		25.0	75.0	92.9
FEMALE	2	28	82	110
		25.5	74.5	7.1
	COLUMN TOTAL	387	1157	1544
		25.1	74.9	100.0

CHI-SQUARE	D.F.	SIGNIFICANCE	MIN E.F.	CELLS WITH E.F.< 5
.00000	1	1.0000	27.571	NONE
.00958	1	.9220	(BEFORE YATES CORRECTION)	

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 6

CROSSTABS OF OFFICER DRESS BY DOMESTIC

COUNT / ROW PCT	DOM: YES (1.00)	DOM: NO (2.00)	ROW TOTAL
DRESS			
1 UNIFORM	384	1102	1486
	25.8	74.2	97.4
2 PLAIN		35	35
		100.0	2.3
3 SWAT		4	4
		100.0	.3
COLUMN TOTAL	384	1141	1525
	25.2	74.8	100.0

CHI-SQUARE	D.F.	SIGNIFICANCE	MIN E.F.	CELLS WITH E.F.< 5
13.46980	2	.0012	1.007	2 OF 6 (33.3%)

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 25

CROSSTABS OF OFFICER RANK BY DOMESTIC

COPRANK	COUNT / ROW PCT	DOM YES 1.00	DOM NO 2.00	ROW TOTAL
0.0 CADET			1 100.0	1 .1
1.00 PATROL		351 25.6	1020 74.4	1371 93.0
2.00 CORPORAL		12 20.3	47 79.7	59 4.0
3.00 SGT		8 22.2	28 77.8	36 2.4
4.00 LT +		2 28.6	5 71.4	7 .5
	COLUMN TOTAL	373 25.3	1101 74.7	1474 100.0

CHI-SQUARE	D.F.	SIGNIFICANCE	MIN E.F.	CELLS WITH E.F.< 5
1.39295	4	.8454	.253	3 OF 10 (30.0%)

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 76

CROSSTABS OF DUTY STATUS BY DOMESTIC

DUTY	COUNT / ROW PCT	DOM YES 1.00	DOM NO 2.00	ROW TOTAL
ON	1	384	1131	1515
		25.3	74.7	98.6
OFF	2	1	20	21
		4.8	95.2	1.4
	COLUMN TOTAL	385	1151	1536
		25.1	74.9	100.0

CHI-SQUARE	D.F.	SIGNIFICANCE	MIN E.F.	CELLS WITH E.F.< 5
3.64107	1	.0564	5.264	NONE
4.67276	1	.0306	(BEFORE YATES CORRECTION)	

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 14

CROSSTABS OF OFFICER ALONE BY DOMESTIC

ALONE	COUNT / ROW PCT	DOM YES 1.00	DOM NO 2.00	ROW TOTAL
1.00		72	283	355
		20.3	79.7	26.0
2.00		289	721	1010
		28.6	71.4	74.0
COLUMN TOTAL		361	1004	1365
		26.4	73.6	100.0

CHI-SQUARE	D.F.	SIGNIFICANCE	MIN E.F.	CELLS WITH E.F.< 5
8.95127	1	.0028	93.886	NONE
9.37471	1	.0022	(BEFORE YATES CORRECTION)	

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 185

CROSSTABS OF UNIT BY DOMESTIC

UNIT1	COUNT / ROW PCT	DOM YES 1.00	DOM NO 2.00	ROW TOTAL
PATROL	1	364	965	1329
		27.4	72.6	94.5
TRAFFIC	2	5	36	41
		12.2	87.8	2.9
VICE-NARC	3		2	2
			100.0	.1
CRIM INVEST	4		2	2
			100.0	.1
SPECIAL	5	4	24	28
		14.3	85.7	2.0
YOUTH	6		1	1
			100.0	.1
OTHER	9	1	2	3
		33.3	66.7	.2
	COLUMN TOTAL	374	1032	1406
		26.6	73.4	100.0

CHI-SQUARE	D.F.	SIGNIFICANCE	MIN E.F.	CELLS WITH E.F.< 5
8.83743	6	.1829	.266	8 OF 14 (57.1%)

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 144

CROSSTABS OF OFFICER ASSIGNMENT BY DOMESTIC

COPASSGN	DOM	YES (1.00)	NO (2.00)	ROW TOTAL
PRIMARY	1	272	864	1136
		23.9	76.1	96.4
BACKUP	2	8	35	43
		18.6	81.4	3.6
	COLUMN TOTAL	280	899	1179
		23.7	76.3	100.0

CHI-SQUARE	D.F.	SIGNIFICANCE	MIN E.F.	CELLS WITH E.F.< 5
.39067	1	.5319	10.212	NONE
.65218	1	.4193	(BEFORE YATES CORRECTION)	

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 371

CROSSTABS OF ASSAULTER'S RACE BY DOMESTIC

ASSRACE1	COUNT / ROW PCT	DOM YES 1.00	DOM NO 2.00	ROW TOTAL
1 WHITE		321	939	1260
		25.5	74.5	85.7
2 BLACK		56	151	207
		27.1	72.9	14.1
4 OTHER			4	4
			100.0	.3
	COLUMN TOTAL	377	1094	1471
		25.6	74.4	100.0

CHI-SQUARE	D.F.	SIGNIFICANCE	MIN E.F.	CELLS WITH E.F.< 5
1.61415	2	.4462	1.025	2 OF 6 (33.3%)

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 10

CROSSTABS OF ASSAULTER'S SEX BY DOMESTIC

		DOM		
COUNT / ROW PCT		YES	NO	ROW TOTAL
		1.00	2.00	
ASSSEX1				
1 MALE		319	921	1240
		25.7	74.3	84.2
2 FEMALE		58	175	233
		24.9	75.1	15.8
COLUMN TOTAL		377	1096	1473
		25.6	74.4	100.0

CHI-SQUARE	D.F.	SIGNIFICANCE	MIN E.F.	CELLS WITH E.F.< 5
.03443	1	.8528	59.634	NONE
.07149	1	.7892	(BEFORE YATES CORRECTION)	

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 8

CROSSTABS OF TANGIBLE WEAPON BY DOMESTIC

TANGWEAP	COUNT / ROW PCT	DOM YES 1.00	DOM NO 2.00	ROW TOTAL
YES	1	53	128	181
		29.3	70.7	11.7
NO	2	334	1035	1369
		24.4	75.6	88.3
	COLUMN TOTAL	387	1163	1550
		25.0	75.0	100.0

CHI-SQUARE	D.F.	SIGNIFICANCE	MIN E.F.	CELLS WITH E.F.< 5
1.78347	1	.1817	145.192	NONE
2.03585	1	.1536	(BEFORE YATES CORRECTION)	

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 0

CROSSTABS OF ASSAULTER'S DRUG INFLUENCE BY DOMESTIC

		DOM		
COUNT / ROW PCT		YES 1.00	NO 2.00	ROW TOTAL
DRUGINF1				
YES	1	5 14.3	30 85.7	35 2.6
NO	2	349 26.5	970 73.5	1319 97.4
COLUMN TOTAL		354 26.1	1000 73.9	1354 100.0

CHI-SQUARE	D.F.	SIGNIFICANCE	MIN E.F.	CELLS WITH E.F.< 5
2.02434	1	.1548	9.151	NONE
2.61683	1	.1057	(BEFORE YATES CORRECTION)	

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 127

CROSSTABS OF OFFICER INJURY BY DOMESTIC

TOTINJRY	COUNT / ROW PCT	DOM YES 1.00	DOM NO 2.00	ROW TOTAL
1.00 NONE		297	861	1158
		25.6	74.4	75.5
2.00 SUPER=BRUI-SCRAT		56	169	225
		24.9	75.1	14.7
3.00 STRAIN-SPRAIN		4	23	27
		14.8	85.2	1.8
4.00 LACERATION		22	87	109
		20.2	79.8	7.1
5.00 FRACT-DISLOC		2	12	14
		14.3	85.7	.9
	COLUMN TOTAL	381	1152	1533
		24.9	75.1	100.0

CHI-SQUARE	D.F.	SIGNIFICANCE	MIN E.F.	CELLS WITH E.F.< 5
3.95807	4	.4117	3.479	1 OF 10 (10.0%)

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 17

CROSSTABS OF OFFICER INJURY LOCATION BY DOMESTIC

TOTLOCIN	COUNT / ROW PCT	DOM YES 1.00	DOM NO 2.00	ROW TOTAL
1.00 FRONT HEAD-NECK		20 / 25.3	59 / 74.7	79 / 5.2
2.00 BACK HEAD-NECK		2 / 33.3	4 / 66.7	6 / .4
3.00 FRONT TORSO		4 / 19.0	17 / 81.0	21 / 1.4
4.00 BACK TORSO		4 / 36.4	7 / 63.6	11 / .7
5.00 ARMS-HANDS-FINGE		38 / 21.8	136 / 78.2	174 / 11.5
6.00 LEGS-FEET-TOES		9 / 14.8	52 / 85.2	61 / 4.0
7.00 GROIN		1 / 12.5	7 / 87.5	8 / .5
98.00 NO INJURY		296 / 25.5	863 / 74.5	1159 / 76.3
	COLUMN TOTAL	374 / 24.6	1145 / 75.4	1519 / 100.0

CHI-SQUARE	D.F.	SIGNIFICANCE	MIN E.F.	CELLS WITH E.F.< 5
6.51999	7	.4805	1.477	4 OF 16 (25.0%)

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 31

CROSSTABS OF HOSPITALIZATION OF OFFICER BY DOMESTIC

HOSPITAL	COUNT / ROW PCT	DOM YES 1.00	DOM NO 2.00	ROW TOTAL
YES	1	14	64	78
		17.9	82.1	5.1
NO	2	369	1090	1459
		25.3	74.7	94.9
	COLUMN TOTAL	383	1154	1537
		24.9	75.1	100.0

CHI-SQUARE	D.F.	SIGNIFICANCE	MIN E.F.	CELLS WITH E.F.< 5
1.75923	1	.1847	19.437	NONE
2.13362	1	.1441	(BEFORE YATES CORRECTION)	

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 13

CROSSTABS OF ASSAULTER'S INJURY BY DOMESTIC

ASSINJ1	COUNT / ROW PCT	DOM: YES (1.00)	DOM: NO (2.00)	ROW TOTAL
1 NONE		368	1060	1428
		25.8	74.2	97.7
2 SUPER=BRUI-SCRAT			5	5
			100.0	.3
3 STRAIN-SPRAIN		1	2	3
		33.3	66.7	.2
4 LACERATION		2	16	18
		11.1	88.9	1.2
6 GUNSHOT		2	5	7
		28.6	71.4	.5
COLUMN TOTAL		373	1088	1461
		25.5	74.5	100.0

CHI-SQUARE	D.F.	SIGNIFICANCE	MIN E.F.	CELLS WITH E.F.< 5
3.85594	4	.4259	.766	6 OF 10 (60.0%)

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 20

CROSSTABS OF ASSAULTER'S INJURY LOCATION BY DOMESTIC

ASSLOCI1	COUNT / ROW PCT	DOM: YES (1.00)	DOM: NO (2.00)	ROW TOTAL
1 FRONT HEAD-NECK		3	12	15
		20.0	80.0	1.0
3 FRONT TORSO			1	1
			100.0	.1
4 BACK TORSO			2	2
			100.0	.1
5 ARMS-HANDS-FINGE		4	9	13
		30.8	69.2	.9
6 LEGS-FEET-TOES			4	4
			100.0	.3
98 NO INJURY		368	1061	1429
		25.8	74.2	97.6
	COLUMN TOTAL	375	1089	1464
		25.6	74.4	100.0

CHI-SQUARE	D.F.	SIGNIFICANCE	MIN E.F.	CELLS WITH E.F.< 5
2.85411	5	.7225	.256	8 OF 12 (66.7%)

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 17

CROSSTABS OF ASSAULTER'S STATUS BY DOMESTIC

STATASS1	COUNT / ROW PCT	DOM YES 1.00	DOM NO 2.00	ROW TOTAL
1 ARREST		368	1028	1396
		26.4	73.6	94.6
2 FLED-WHERE UNK		5	22	27
		18.5	81.5	1.8
4 NO ARREST-DIS		4	39	43
		9.3	90.7	2.9
5 NO ARREST-SUP UN			7	7
			100.0	.5
7 SUMMONS			3	3
			100.0	.2
COLUMN TOTAL		377	1099	1476
		25.5	74.5	100.0

CHI-SQUARE	D.F.	SIGNIFICANCE	MIN E.F.	CELLS WITH E.F.< 5
10.95166	5	.0523	.255	5 OF 12 (41.7%)

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 5

APPENDIX D

CROSSTABULATIONS OF INJURY BY SELECTED CHARACTERISTICS

CROSSTABS OF REPORTED DAY BY INJURY

REPDAY	COUNT / ROW PCT	INJDV NONE (0.0)	INJURY (1.00)	ROW TOTAL
SUN	1	216	62	278
		77.7	22.3	18.1
MON	2	155	51	206
		75.2	24.8	13.4
TUES	3	141	54	195
		72.3	27.7	12.7
WED	4	157	42	199
		78.9	21.1	13.0
THURS	5	129	45	174
		74.1	25.9	11.4
FRI	6	153	62	215
		71.2	28.8	14.0
SAT	7	207	59	266
		77.8	22.2	17.4
	COLUMN TOTAL	1158	375	1533
		75.5	24.5	100.0

CHI-SQUARE	D.F.	SIGNIFICANCE	MIN E.F.	CELLS WITH E.F.< 5
6.18729	6	.4025	42.564	NONE

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 17

CROSSTABS OF REPORTED YEAR BY INJURY

REPYEAR	COUNT / ROW PCT	INJDV NONE 0.0	INJDV INJURY 1.00	ROW TOTAL
84		394	141	535
		73.6	26.4	34.9
85		370	137	507
		73.0	27.0	33.1
86		394	97	491
		80.2	19.8	32.0
COLUMN TOTAL		1158	375	1533
		75.5	24.5	100.0

CHI-SQUARE	D.F.	SIGNIFICANCE	MIN E.F.	CELLS WITH E.F.< 5
8.72120	2	.0128	120.108	NONE

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 17

CROSSTABS OF REPORTED MONTH BY INJURY

REPMONTH	INJDV NONE (0.0)	INJURY (1.00)	ROW TOTAL
1	95	32	127
	74.8	25.2	8.3
2	92	19	111
	82.9	17.1	7.2
3	100	26	126
	79.4	20.6	8.2
4	74	22	96
	77.1	22.9	6.3
5	102	31	133
	76.7	23.3	8.7
6	97	32	129
	75.2	24.8	8.4
7	97	44	141
	68.8	31.2	9.2
8	110	41	151
	72.8	27.2	9.8
9	72	35	107
	67.3	32.7	7.0
10	86	23	109
	78.9	21.1	7.1
11	111	30	141
	78.7	21.3	9.2
12	122	40	162
	75.3	24.7	10.6
COLUMN TOTAL	1158	375	1533
	75.5	24.5	100.0

CHI-SQUARE	D.F.	SIGNIFICANCE	MIN E.F.	CELLS WITH E.F.< 5
13.95127	11	.2357	23.483	NONE

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 17

CROSSTABS OF PRECINCT BY INJURY

PC	COUNT / ROW PCT	INJDV NONE (0.0)	INJURY (1.00)	ROW TOTAL
WILKINS	1	140 78.7	38 21.3	178 11.6
WOODLAWN	2	112 72.3	43 27.7	155 10.1
GARRISON	3	138 79.8	35 20.2	173 11.3
TOWSON	6	101 81.5	23 18.5	124 8.1
COCKEYS	7	41 91.1	4 8.9	45 2.9
PARKVILLE	8	62 72.1	24 27.9	86 5.6
FULLARTON	9	50 73.5	18 26.5	68 4.4
ESSEX	11	288 73.7	103 26.3	391 25.5
DUN-EDGE	12	226 72.2	87 27.8	313 20.4
	COLUMN TOTAL	1158 75.5	375 24.5	1533 100.0

CHI-SQUARE	D.F.	SIGNIFICANCE	MIN E.F.	CELLS WITH E.F.< 5
15.09677	8	.0573	11.008	NONE

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 17

CROSSTABS OF PURPOSE OF PREMISE BY INJURY

RESBUSO	COUNT / ROW PCT	INJDV NONE 0.0	INJURY 1.00	ROW TOTAL
RESIDENCE	1.00	396	100	496
		79.8	20.2	32.5
BUSINESS	2.00	250	101	351
		71.2	28.8	23.0
OTHER	3.00	506	171	677
		74.7	25.3	44.4
	COLUMN TOTAL	1152	372	1524
		75.6	24.4	100.0

CHI-SQUARE	D.F.	SIGNIFICANCE	MIN E.F.	CELLS WITH E.F.< 5
8.74111	2	.0126	85.677	NONE

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 26

CROSSTABS OF LOCATION OF PREMISE BY INJURY

INOUT	COUNT / ROW PCT	INJDV NONE 0.0	INJDV INJURY 1.00	ROW TOTAL
INSIDE	1.00	646 / 76.3	201 / 23.7	847 / 55.6
OUTSIDE	2.00	506 / 74.7	171 / 25.3	677 / 44.4
	COLUMN TOTAL	1152 / 75.6	372 / 24.4	1524 / 100.0

CHI-SQUARE	D.F.	SIGNIFICANCE	MIN E.F.	CELLS WITH E.F.< 5
.39672	1	.5288	165.252	NONE
.47591	1	.4903	(BEFORE YATES CORRECTION)	

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 26

CROSSTABS OF OFFICER SEX BY INJURY

COPSEX	COUNT / ROW PCT	INJDV NONE (0.0)	INJDV INJURY (1.00)	ROW TOTAL
MALE	1	1077	340	1417
		76.0	24.0	92.8
FEMALE	2	75	35	110
		68.2	31.8	7.2
	COLUMN TOTAL	1152	375	1527
		75.4	24.6	100.0

CHI-SQUARE	D.F.	SIGNIFICANCE	MIN E.F.	CELLS WITH E.F.< 5
2.96346	1	.0852	27.014	NONE
3.37253	1	.0663	(BEFORE YATES CORRECTION)	

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 23

CROSSTABS OF OFFICER ALONE BY INJURY

		INJDV		
	COUNT / ROW PCT	INONE 0.0	INJURY 1.00	ROW TOTAL
ALONE				
YES	1.00	271	79	350
		77.4	22.6	25.8
NO	2.00	747	257	1004
		74.4	25.6	74.2
	COLUMN TOTAL	1018	336	1354
		75.2	24.8	100.0

CHI-SQUARE	D.F.	SIGNIFICANCE	MIN E.F.	CELLS WITH E.F.< 5
1.11683	1	.2906	86.854	NONE
1.27386	1	.2590	(BEFORE YATES CORRECTION)	

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 196

CROSSTABS OF OFFICER DRESS BY INJURY

DRESS	COUNT / ROW PCT	INJDV NONE (0.0)	INJURY (1.00)	ROW TOTAL
UNIFORM	1	1112	357	1469
		75.7	24.3	97.4
PLAIN	2	23	12	35
		65.7	34.3	2.3
SWAT	3	4		4
		100.0		.3
	COLUMN TOTAL	1139	369	1508
		75.5	24.5	100.0

CHI-SQUARE	D.F.	SIGNIFICANCE	MIN E.F.	CELLS WITH E.F.< 5
3.14288	2	.2077	.979	2 OF 6 (33.3%)

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 42

CROSSTABS OF OFFICER RACE BY INJURY

COUNT / ROW PCT	INJDV: NONE (0.0)	INJURY (1.00)	ROW TOTAL
COPRACE			
1 WHITE	1075 / 75.6	347 / 24.4	1422 / 94.2
2 BLACK	66 / 75.0	22 / 25.0	88 / 5.8
COLUMN TOTAL	1141 / 75.6	369 / 24.4	1510 / 100.0

CHI-SQUARE	D.F.	SIGNIFICANCE	MIN E.F.	CELLS WITH E.F.< 5
.00000	1	1.0000	21.505	NONE
.01604	1	.8992	(BEFORE YATES CORRECTION)	

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 40

CROSSTABS OF OFFICER RANK BY INJURY

COPRANK	COUNT / ROW PCT	INJDV: NONE (0.0)	INJURY (1.00)	ROW TOTAL
0.0		1		1
CADET		100.0		.1
1.00		1022	332	1354
PATROL		75.5	24.5	92.9
2.00		47	12	59
CORPORAL		79.7	20.3	4.0
3.00		27	9	36
SGT		75.0	25.0	2.5
4.00		7		7
LT +		100.0		.5
	COLUMN TOTAL	1104	353	1457
		75.8	24.2	100.0

CHI-SQUARE	D.F.	SIGNIFICANCE	MIN E.F.	CELLS WITH E.F.< 5
3.11863	4	.5382	.242	3 OF 10 (30.0%)

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 93

CROSSTABS OF UNIT BY INJURY

UNIT1	COUNT / ROW PCT	INJDV NONE (0.0)	INJURY (1.00)	ROW TOTAL
PATROL	1	996	317	1313
		75.9	24.1	94.5
TRAFFIC	2	28	12	40
		70.0	30.0	2.9
VICE-NARC	3	2		2
		100.0		.1
CRIM INVEST	4	1	1	2
		50.0	50.0	.1
SPECIAL	5	22	6	28
		78.6	21.4	2.0
YOUTH	6	1		1
		100.0		.1
OTHER	9	1	2	3
		33.3	66.7	.2
	COLUMN TOTAL	1051	338	1389
		75.7	24.3	100.0

CHI-SQUARE	D.F.	SIGNIFICANCE	MIN E.F.	CELLS WITH E.F.< 5
5.45192	6	.4873	.243	8 OF 14 (57.1%)

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 161

CROSSTABS OF OFFICER DUTY STATUS BY INJURY

DUTY	COUNT / ROW PCT	INJDV 0.0 NONE	INJDV 1.00 INJURY	ROW TOTAL
ON	1	1131	367	1498
		75.5	24.5	98.6
OFF	2	15	6	21
		71.4	28.6	1.4
	COLUMN TOTAL	1146	373	1519
		75.4	24.6	100.0

CHI-SQUARE	D.F.	SIGNIFICANCE	MIN E.F.	CELLS WITH E.F.< 5
.03072	1	.8609	5.157	NONE
.18537	1	.6668	(BEFORE YATES CORRECTION)	

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 31

CROSSTABS OF OFFICER ASSIGNMENT BY INJURY

COPASSGN	COUNT / ROW PCT	INJDV NONE 0.0	INJURY 1.00	ROW TOTAL
PRIMARY	1	849	278	1127
		75.3	24.7	96.4
BACKUP	2	29	13	42
		69.0	31.0	3.6
	COLUMN TOTAL	878	291	1169
		75.1	24.9	100.0

CHI-SQUARE	D.F.	SIGNIFICANCE	MIN E.F.	CELLS WITH E.F.< 5
.55237	1	.4574	10.455	NONE
.85552	1	.3550	(BEFORE YATES CORRECTION)	

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 381

CROSSTABS OF OFFICER WEAPON BY INJURY

COPWEAP	COUNT / ROW PCT	INJDV INONE 0.0	INJURY 1.00	ROW TOTAL
GUN	1	43	15	58
		74.1	25.9	3.8
LIMB	2	14	6	20
		70.0	30.0	1.3
OTHER	3	17	2	19
		89.5	10.5	1.3
NO WEAPON	11	1071	349	1420
		75.4	24.6	93.6
	COLUMN TOTAL	1145	372	1517
		75.5	24.5	100.0

CHI-SQUARE	D.F.	SIGNIFICANCE	MIN E.F.	CELLS WITH E.F.< 5
2.39368	3	.4948	4.659	2 OF 8 (25.0%)

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 33

CROSSTABS OF OFFICER HOSPITALIZATION BY INJURY

		INJDV		
COUNT / ROW PCT		NONE 0.0	INJURY 1.00	ROW TOTAL
HOSPITAL				
YES	1	6 8.1	68 91.9	74 4.8
NO	2	1152 79.1	304 20.9	1456 95.2
COLUMN TOTAL		1158 75.7	372 24.3	1530 100.0

CHI-SQUARE	D.F.	SIGNIFICANCE	MIN E.F.	CELLS WITH E.F.< 5
189.13753	1	.0000	17.992	NONE
192.97718	1	.0000	(BEFORE YATES CORRECTION)	

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 20

CROSSTABS OF PRESENCE OF DRUGS BY INJURY

		INJDV		
COUNT / ROW PCT		NONE 0.0	INJURY 1.00	ROW TOTAL
DRUGPRES				
YES	1	92	45	137
		67.2	32.8	9.3
NO	2	1014	322	1336
		75.9	24.1	90.7
COLUMN TOTAL		1106	367	1473
		75.1	24.9	100.0

CHI-SQUARE	D.F.	SIGNIFICANCE	MIN E.F.	CELLS WITH E.F.< 5
4.62279	1	.0316	34.134	NONE
5.07949	1	.0242	(BEFORE YATES CORRECTION)	

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 77

CROSSTABS OF ASSAULTER'S DRUG INFLUENCE BY INJURY

DRUGINF1	COUNT / ROW PCT	INJDV NONE 0.0	INJURY 1.00	ROW TOTAL
YES	1	16	19	35
		45.7	54.3	2.6
NO	2	1002	302	1304
		76.8	23.2	97.4
	COLUMN TOTAL	1018	321	1339
		76.0	24.0	100.0

CHI-SQUARE	D.F.	SIGNIFICANCE	MIN E.F.	CELLS WITH E.F.< 5
16.45110	1	.0001	8.391	NONE
18.11865	1	.0000	(BEFORE YATES CORRECTION)	

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 142

CROSSTABS OF ASSAULTER'S SOBRIETY BY INJURY

		INJDV		
COUNT / ROW PCT		NONE 0.0	INJURY 1.00	ROW TOTAL
SOBER1				
SOBER	1	253 / 71.7	100 / 28.3	353 / 27.9
HBD	2	216 / 76.1	68 / 23.9	284 / 22.5
INTOX	3	486 / 77.5	141 / 22.5	627 / 49.6
COLUMN TOTAL		955 / 75.6	309 / 24.4	1264 / 100.0

CHI-SQUARE	D.F.	SIGNIFICANCE	MIN E.F.	CELLS WITH E.F.< 5
4.22127	2	.1212	69.427	NONE

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 217

CROSSTABS OF TYPE OF CALL BY INJURY

COUNT / ROW PCT	INJDV NONE 0.0	INJURY 1.00	ROW TOTAL
TYPECALL 1 POLICE-INIT	181 / 69.1	81 / 30.9	262 / 24.6
2 CIT-INIT	524 / 77.9	149 / 22.1	673 / 63.3
6 NO CALL	88 / 68.2	41 / 31.8	129 / 12.1
COLUMN TOTAL	793 / 74.5	271 / 25.5	1064 / 100.0

CHI-SQUARE	D.F.	SIGNIFICANCE	MIN E.F.	CELLS WITH E.F.< 5
10.73400	2	.0047	32.856	NONE

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 486

CROSSTABS OF ANTICIPATED INCIDENT BY INJURY

ANTCAT1	COUNT / ROW PCT	INJDV NONE 0.0	INJDV INJURY 1.00	ROW TOTAL
1.00 SEX		3 / 75.0	1 / 25.0	4 / .4
2.00 NARCOTICS		6 / 50.0	6 / 50.0	12 / 1.1
3.00 DISTURBANCES		251 / 78.4	69 / 21.6	320 / 28.3
4.00 DOMESTICS		206 / 77.7	59 / 22.3	265 / 23.5
5.00 B & E		8 / 80.0	2 / 20.0	10 / .9
6.00 FRAUD-MISUSE		7 / 70.0	3 / 30.0	10 / .9
7.00 ASS & BATT		16 / 94.1	1 / 5.9	17 / 1.5
8.00 THEFT		14 / 63.6	8 / 36.4	22 / 1.9
9.00 SUSP. SITS		15 / 75.0	5 / 25.0	20 / 1.8
10.00 PROPERTY		21 / 80.8	5 / 19.2	26 / 2.3
11.00 AUTO THEFT		2 / 100.0		2 / .2
12.00 ROBBERY		6 / 85.7	1 / 14.3	7 / .6
15.00 ALCOHOL		28 / 73.7	10 / 26.3	38 / 3.4
16.00 TRAFFIC		79 / 67.5	38 / 32.5	117 / 10.4
17.00 MEDICAL		13 / 76.5	4 / 23.5	17 / 1.5
18.00 NONCRIM-OTHER		7 / 58.3	5 / 41.7	12 / 1.1

	19.00	103	56	159
LEGAL		64.8	35.2	14.1
	20.00	19	1	20
WEAPON		95.0	5.0	1.8
	21.00	27	7	34
CRIM-OTHER		79.4	20.6	3.0
	23.00	9	8	17
UNKNOWN TROUB		52.9	47.1	1.5
	COLUMN TOTAL	840 74.4	289 25.6	1129 100.0

CHI-SQUARE	D.F.	SIGNIFICANCE	MIN E.F.	CELLS WITH E.F.< 5
36.15342	19	.0101	.512	12 OF 40 (30.0%)

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 421

CROSSTABS OF INFORMATION EXCHANGE BY INJURY

		INJDV		
COUNT / ROW PCT		NONE 0.0	INJURY 1.00	ROW TOTAL
INFOEXCH				
1 YES		916 / 75.3	301 / 24.7	1217 / 94.8
2 NO		58 / 86.6	9 / 13.4	67 / 5.2
COLUMN TOTAL		974 / 75.9	310 / 24.1	1284 / 100.0

CHI-SQUARE	D.F.	SIGNIFICANCE	MIN E.F.	CELLS WITH E.F.< 5
3.83216	1	.0503	16.176	NONE
4.42767	1	.0354	(BEFORE YATES CORRECTION)	

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 266

CROSSTABS OF PHASE OF ENTRY BY INJURY

PHASEENT	COUNT / ROW PCT	INJDV NONE (0.0)	INJURY (1.00)	ROW TOTAL
1 APPROACH		91 / 80.5	22 / 19.5	113 / 7.9
2 SEARCH SCENE		10 / 90.9	1 / 9.1	11 / .8
3 STRUGGLE		66 / 61.7	41 / 38.3	107 / 7.5
4 PROCESS-TRANSP		141 / 71.2	57 / 28.8	198 / 13.9
5 PURSUE		33 / 70.2	14 / 29.8	47 / 3.3
6 INV COMPL		222 / 88.4	29 / 11.6	251 / 17.6
7 STOP-FRISK-DETAI		8 / 88.9	1 / 11.1	9 / .6
8 ARREST SUSP		155 / 64.0	87 / 36.0	242 / 17.0
9 ARREST NONSUSP		22 / 84.6	4 / 15.4	26 / 1.8
10 ISSUE SUMMONS		14 / 66.7	7 / 33.3	21 / 1.5
11 HANDCUFF		38 / 66.7	19 / 33.3	57 / 4.0
12 RESOLVE DISP		110 / 82.1	24 / 17.9	134 / 9.4
13 OBTAIN INFO		106 / 76.3	33 / 23.7	139 / 9.8
14 SEARCH PERSON		16 / 64.0	9 / 36.0	25 / 1.8
15 PROT COP-ASSIST		17 / 77.3	5 / 22.7	22 / 1.5
34 COMM. W-CJS		3 / 100.0		3 / .2

OTHER	37	I I	18 94.7	I I	1 5.3	I I	19 1.3
COLUMN TOTAL			1070 75.1		354 24.9		1424 100.0

CHI-SQUARE	D.F.	SIGNIFICANCE	MIN E.F.	CELLS WITH E.F.< 5
70.89841	16	.0000	.746	5 OF 34 (14.7%)

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 126

CROSSTABS OF TANGIBLE WEAPON BY INJURY

TANGWEAP	INJDV: INONE (0.0)	INJURY (1.00)	ROW TOTAL
1 YES	153	26	179
	85.5	14.5	11.7
2 NO	1005	349	1354
	74.2	25.8	88.3
COLUMN TOTAL	1158	375	1533
	75.5	24.5	100.0

CHI-SQUARE	D.F.	SIGNIFICANCE	MIN E.F.	CELLS WITH E.F.< 5
10.22913	1	.0014	43.787	NONE
10.82942	1	.0010	(BEFORE YATES CORRECTION)	

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 17

CROSSTABS OF PART OF PREMISE BY INJURY

PARTPREM	COUNT / ROW PCT	INJDV NONE (0.0)	INJURY (1.00)	ROW TOTAL
ROOF	1	1	1	2
		50.0	50.0	.6
HALL	2	19	2	21
		90.5	9.5	6.6
OFFICE	3	6	1	7
		85.7	14.3	2.2
STAIR-STEPS	5	9	12	21
		42.9	57.1	6.6
YARD-DRIVE	7	54	13	67
		80.6	19.4	21.2
BASEMENT	8	4	1	5
		80.0	20.0	1.6
LOCKER ROOM	9	1	1	2
		50.0	50.0	.6
KITCHEN	10	9	1	10
		90.0	10.0	3.2
LIVING	11	23		23
		100.0		7.3
BEDROOM	12	30	8	38
		78.9	21.1	12.0
BATHROOM	13	3	2	5
		60.0	40.0	1.6
CELLBLOCK	31	37	21	58
		63.8	36.2	18.4
PORCH-DOORWAY	33	41	8	49
		83.7	16.3	15.5
CJ OFFICE	34	1	1	2
		50.0	50.0	.6
LOBBY-AISLE	37	3	3	6
		50.0	50.0	1.9
	COLUMN TOTAL	241	75	316
		76.3	23.7	100.0

CHI-SQUARE	D.F.	SIGNIFICANCE	MIN E.F.	CELLS WITH E.F.< 5
36.49516	14	.0009	.475	16 OF 30 (53.3%)

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 1234

CROSSTABS OF CITIZEN COMPLAINANT BY INJURY

CITCOMP	COUNT / ROW PCT	INJDV NONE 0.0	INJURY 1.00	ROW TOTAL
YES	1	379	99	478
		79.3	20.7	35.5
NO	2	646	224	870
		74.3	25.7	64.5
	COLUMN TOTAL	1025	323	1348
		76.0	24.0	100.0

CHI-SQUARE	D.F.	SIGNIFICANCE	MIN E.F.	CELLS WITH E.F.< 5
4.02196	1	.0449	114.536	NONE
4.29391	1	.0382	(BEFORE YATES CORRECTION)	

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 202

CROSSTABS OF COMPLAINANT'S SEX BY INJURY

COMSEX1	COUNT / ROW PCT	INJDV: INONE 0.0	INJURY 1.00	ROW TOTAL
1		145	38	183
		79.2	20.8	38.7
2		229	61	290
		79.0	21.0	61.3
COLUMN TOTAL		374	99	473
		79.1	20.9	100.0

CHI-SQUARE	D.F.	SIGNIFICANCE	MIN E.F.	CELLS WITH E.F.< 5
.00000	1	1.0000	38.302	NONE
.00492	1	.9441	(BEFORE YATES CORRECTION)	

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 1077

CROSSTABS OF COMPLAINANT'S RACE BY INJURY

COMRACE1		INJDV NONE (0.0)	INJURY (1.00)	ROW TOTAL
WHITE	1	339	84	423
		80.1	19.9	89.8
BLACK	2	32	15	47
		68.1	31.9	10.0
OTHER	4	1		1
		100.0		.2
COLUMN TOTAL		372	99	471
		79.0	21.0	100.0

CHI-SQUARE	D.F.	SIGNIFICANCE	MIN E.F.	CELLS WITH E.F.< 5
3.97063	2	.1373	.210	2 OF 6 (33.3%)

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 1079

CROSSTABS OF COMPLAINANT'S RELATIONSHIP BY INJURY

RELT1	COUNT / ROW PCT	INJDV INONE (0.0)	INJURY (1.00)	ROW TOTAL
1		128	39	167
		76.6	23.4	40.4
2		54	18	72
		75.0	25.0	17.4
3		40	4	44
		90.9	9.1	10.7
4		44	16	60
		73.3	26.7	14.5
5		6	1	7
		85.7	14.3	1.7
6		15	3	18
		83.3	16.7	4.4
7		13	3	16
		81.3	18.8	3.9
8		17	1	18
		94.4	5.6	4.4
9		2	1	3
		66.7	33.3	.7
33		7	1	8
		87.5	12.5	1.9
	COLUMN TOTAL	326	87	413
		78.9	21.1	100.0

CHI-SQUARE	D.F.	SIGNIFICANCE	MIN E.F.	CELLS WITH E.F.< 5
9.80556	9	.3665	.632	7 OF 20 (35.0%)

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 1137

CROSSTABS OF REPEATER OFFICER BY INJURY

REPEAT	COUNT / ROW PCT	INJDV NONE 0.0	INJDV INJURY 1.00	ROW TOTAL
1-3	1.00	601	185	786
		76.5	23.5	51.3
4+	2.00	557	190	747
		74.6	25.4	48.7
	COLUMN TOTAL	1158	375	1533
		75.5	24.5	100.0

CHI-SQUARE	D.F.	SIGNIFICANCE	MIN E.F.	CELLS WITH E.F.< 5
.64763	1	.4210	182.730	NONE
.74683	1	.3875	(BEFORE YATES CORRECTION)	

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 17

CROSSTABS OF TYPE OF PREMISE BY INJURY

TYPEPREM	COUNT / ROW PCT	INJDV: INONE (0.0)	INJURY (1.00)	ROW TOTAL
1 STREET-SIDE-ROOF		318	102	420
		75.7	24.3	27.6
2 ALLEY		14	5	19
		73.7	26.3	1.2
3 APT HOUSE		122	33	155
		78.7	21.3	10.2
4 PRIV. HOUSE		274	67	341
		80.4	19.6	22.4
5 OFFICE BLDG		2		2
		100.0		.1
6 BAR		31	17	48
		64.6	35.4	3.1
7 RESTAURANT		7	4	11
		63.6	36.4	.7
8 COMMERCIAL		40	10	50
		80.0	20.0	3.3
9 PK-PLAY-AMUSE		15	2	17
		88.2	11.8	1.1
10 PARK LOT		143	55	198
		72.2	27.8	13.0
11 SCHOOL		3	3	6
		50.0	50.0	.4
12 HOTEL-MOTEL		6	1	7
		85.7	14.3	.5
13 JAIL			1	1
			100.0	.1
14 CJ BLDG		150	58	208
		72.1	27.9	13.6
15 POLICE VEH		4	2	6
		66.7	33.3	.4
16 HOSPITAL		11	7	18
		61.1	38.9	1.2

	19	12	5	17
FIELD-WOODS		70.6	29.4	1.1
COLUMN TOTAL		1152 75.6	372 24.4	1524 100.0

CHI-SQUARE	D.F.	SIGNIFICANCE	MIN E.F.	CELLS WITH E.F.< 5
22.42646	16	.1299	.244	14 OF 34 (41.2%)

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 26

CROSSTABS OF ASSAULTER'S SEX BY INJURY

ASSSEX1	COUNT / ROW PCT	INJDV NONE 0.0	INJURY 1.00	ROW TOTAL
1 MALE		928	301	1229
		75.5	24.5	84.4
2 FEMALE		175	52	227
		77.1	22.9	15.6
	COLUMN TOTAL	1103	353	1456
		75.8	24.2	100.0

CHI-SQUARE	D.F.	SIGNIFICANCE	MIN E.F.	CELLS WITH E.F.< 5
.18261	1	.6691	55.035	NONE
.26175	1	.6089	(BEFORE YATES CORRECTION)	

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 25

CROSSTABS OF ASSAULTER'S RACE BY INJURY

ASSRACE1	COUNT / ROW PCT	INJDV NONE (0.0)	INJURY (1.00)	ROW TOTAL
WHITE	1	955	291	1246
		76.6	23.4	85.7
BLACK	2	144	60	204
		70.6	29.4	14.0
OTHER	4	3	1	4
		75.0	25.0	.3
	COLUMN TOTAL	1102	352	1454
		75.8	24.2	100.0

CHI-SQUARE	D.F.	SIGNIFICANCE	MIN E.F.	CELLS WITH E.F.< 5
3.50650	2	.1732	.968	2 OF 6 (33.3%)

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 27

CROSSTABS OF ASSAULTER'S WEAPON BY INJURY

ASSWEAP1	COUNT / ROW PCT	INJDV INONE 0.0	INJURY 1.00	ROW TOTAL
1 GUNS		53	2	55
		96.4	3.6	3.8
2 LIMBS		812	299	1111
		73.1	26.9	76.1
3 SHARP		31	1	32
		96.9	3.1	2.2
4 VEHICLE		19	9	28
		67.9	32.1	1.9
5 BLUNT		22	7	29
		75.9	24.1	2.0
16 TEETH-MOUTH		4	16	20
		20.0	80.0	1.4
17 SPITTING		47		47
		100.0		3.2
18 WORDS-GESTURES		34		34
		100.0		2.3
30 KICK-THROW		72	13	85
		84.7	15.3	5.8
31 OTHER BODY		12	6	18
		66.7	33.3	1.2
70 DOG		1		1
		100.0		.1
	COLUMN TOTAL	1107	353	1460
		75.8	24.2	100.0

CHI-SQUARE	D.F.	SIGNIFICANCE	MIN E.F.	CELLS WITH E.F.< 5
90.52358	10	.0000	.242	4 OF 22 (18.2%)

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 21

CROSSTABS OF ASSAULTER'S ACTION BY INJURY

ASSACT1 / COUNT / ROW PCT	INJDV NONE (0.0)	INJURY (1.00)	ROW TOTAL
1 APROACH COP	106 / 88.3	14 / 11.7	120 / 8.5
2 CONVERSE-YELL	437 / 82.8	91 / 17.2	528 / 37.6
3 FLEE	49 / 69.0	22 / 31.0	71 / 5.1
4 HIDE	10 / 100.0	/	10 / .7
5 FIGHT	175 / 67.3	85 / 32.7	260 / 18.5
6 COMMIT CRIME	21 / 80.8	5 / 19.2	26 / 1.9
7 UNDER ARREST	228 / 67.5	110 / 32.5	338 / 24.1
8 SUMMONED	1 / 33.3	2 / 66.7	3 / .2
32 FIGHT W-NONCOP	8 / 72.7	3 / 27.3	11 / .8
33 SLEEPING	5 / 71.4	2 / 28.6	7 / .5
37 HINDERING	20 / 83.3	4 / 16.7	24 / 1.7
40 OTHER NONCRIM	4 / 66.7	2 / 33.3	6 / .4
COLUMN TOTAL	1064 / 75.8	340 / 24.2	1404 / 100.0

CHI-SQUARE	D.F.	SIGNIFICANCE	MIN E.F.	CELLS WITH E.F.< 5
56.68477	11	.0000	.726	7 OF 24 (29.2%)

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 77

CROSSTABS OF ASSAULTER'S INJURY LOCATION BY INJURY

ASSLOCI1	COUNT / ROW PCT	INJDV NONE (0.0)	INJDV INJURY (1.00)	ROW TOTAL
1 FRONT HEAD-NECK		9	4	13
		69.2	30.8	.9
3 FRONT TORSO		1		1
		100.0		.1
4 BACK TORSO		2		2
		100.0		.1
5 ARMS-HANDS-FINGE		8	5	13
		61.5	38.5	.9
6 LEGS-FEET-TOES		3	1	4
		75.0	25.0	.3
98 NO INJURY		1074	340	1414
		76.0	24.0	97.7
COLUMN TOTAL		1097	350	1447
		75.8	24.2	100.0

CHI-SQUARE	D.F.	SIGNIFICANCE	MIN E.F.	CELLS WITH E.F.< 5
2.72570	5	.7422	.242	8 OF 12 (66.7%)

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 34

CROSSTABS OF ASSAULTER'S INJURY BY INJURY

ASSINJ1	COUNT / ROW PCT	INJDV NONE 0.0	INJURY 1.00	ROW TOTAL
NONE	1	1074	339	1413
		76.0	24.0	97.9
SUPER=BRUI-SCRAT	2	3	2	5
		60.0	40.0	.3
STRAIN-SPRAIN	3	1	1	2
		50.0	50.0	.1
LACERATION	4	10	7	17
		58.8	41.2	1.2
GUNSHOT	6	7		7
		100.0		.5
	COLUMN TOTAL	1095	349	1444
		75.8	24.2	100.0

CHI-SQUARE	D.F.	SIGNIFICANCE	MIN E.F.	CELLS WITH E.F.< 5
6.35021	4	.1745	.483	6 OF 10 (60.0%)

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 37

CROSSTABS OF ASSAULTER'S STATUS BY INJURY

STATASS1	COUNT / ROW PCT	INJDV NONE (0.0)	INJURY (1.00)	ROW TOTAL
1 ARREST		1046	333	1379
		75.8	24.2	94.5
2 FLED-WHERE UNK		21	6	27
		77.8	22.2	1.9
4 NO ARREST-DIS		30	13	43
		69.8	30.2	2.9
5 NO ARREST-SUP UN		6	1	7
		85.7	14.3	.5
7 SUMMONS		3		3
		100.0		.2
COLUMN TOTAL		1106	353	1459
		75.8	24.2	100.0

CHI-SQUARE	D.F.	SIGNIFICANCE	MIN E.F.	CELLS WITH E.F.< 5
2.56404	5	.7668	.242	5 OF 12 (41.7%)

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 22

CROSSTABS OF ACTUAL INCIDENT BY INJURY

ACTIND1	COUNT / ROW PCT	INJDV 0.0 NONE	INJDV 1.00 INJURY	ROW TOTAL
2.00 SEX OFFENSES		8	1	9
		88.9	11.1	.6
3.00 ROBBERY		6	2	8
		75.0	25.0	.5
4.00 ASS. & BATT		1	1	2
		50.0	50.0	.1
5.00 B & E		17	4	21
		81.0	19.0	1.4
6.00 THEFT		18	9	27
		66.7	33.3	1.8
7.00 AUTO THEFT		1		1
		100.0		.1
8.00 DOMESTICS		283	81	364
		77.7	22.3	24.1
9.00 DISTURB		324	89	413
		78.5	21.5	27.4
10.00 TRAFFIC		142	57	199
		71.4	28.6	13.2
11.00 OTHER		341	124	465
		73.3	26.7	30.8
	COLUMN TOTAL	1141	368	1509
		75.6	24.4	100.0

CHI-SQUARE	D.F.	SIGNIFICANCE	MIN E.F.	CELLS WITH E.F.< 5
9.36030	9	.4047	.244	6 OF 20 (30.0%)

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 41

CROSSTABS OF MULTIPLE ACTUAL INCIDENTS BY INJURY

		INJDV		
COUNT / ROW PCT		NONE 0.0	INJURY 1.00	ROW TOTAL
MULTACT				
ONE	1.00	903	296	1199
		75.3	24.7	78.2
MANY	2.00	255	79	334
		76.3	23.7	21.8
COLUMN TOTAL		1158	375	1533
		75.5	24.5	100.0

CHI-SQUARE	D.F.	SIGNIFICANCE	MIN E.F.	CELLS WITH E.F.< 5
.10050	1	.7512	81.703	NONE
.15131	1	.6973	(BEFORE YATES CORRECTION)	

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 17