Assessing The Evolution Of Police Brutality Over The Past Several Years

Posted on September 16, 2019

Reasons for Using Secondary Data

This research will use secondary data to assess how police brutality and excessive force have changed over time. Secondary data are records originally collected by governments, researchers, courts, journalists, oversight bodies, or civil-rights organizations for purposes other than this particular paper. They include official use-of-force reports, police-public contact surveys, mortality records, court decisions, consent decrees, inspector-general findings, academic studies, policy documents, and carefully verified incident databases. The original essay correctly identifies time, cost, and geographical scope as major reasons for preferring this approach. A global or multijurisdictional study would require access to thousands of officers, residents, departments, courts, hospitals, and families. One researcher could not gather comparable primary interviews across all those settings within an ordinary academic schedule.

Secondary evidence is also necessary because the research question concerns evolution across several years. Past events cannot be recreated for direct observation, and many witnesses may be unavailable. Historical datasets permit the researcher to examine changes before and after policy reforms, major public controversies, body-camera adoption, training changes, court intervention, or shifts in reporting practice. They can also reveal whether apparent increases reflect more force, better documentation, broader media attention, or a combination of these factors. A single contemporary interview cannot establish a long-term trend.

The statement that secondary data are automatically more informative than primary data should be qualified. Their value depends on how they were collected. Official data may use standardized definitions and large samples, but agencies may fail to report, classify incidents differently, or omit important circumstances. Interviews can provide experiences and explanations absent from numerical records, although they may be limited by memory, fear, sampling, and researcher access. The strongest design uses secondary data because they fit the historical and geographical question while openly evaluating their limitations.

Defining Police Brutality and Excessive Force

The research must define its central concept before collecting cases. “Police brutality” is a moral and political expression commonly used for cruel, unnecessary, discriminatory, or excessive conduct by law-enforcement personnel. “Excessive force” is often a legal term evaluated under the law governing a particular jurisdiction. In the United States, constitutional analysis may ask whether force was objectively reasonable under the circumstances known to the officer. A news report, complaint, injury, firearm discharge, or death does not by itself establish that a court would find the force unlawful. Conversely, the absence of a criminal conviction does not prove that conduct was necessary, ethical, or consistent with departmental policy.

For this study, incidents will be coded through observable categories rather than classified immediately as brutality. Categories may include firearm discharge, electronic-control weapon use, strikes, chemical agents, restraints, vehicle actions, canine use, positional force, and other physical tactics. Additional coding will record injury severity, death, perceived threat, weapon information, reason for encounter, resistance, pursuit, mental-health crisis, age, race or ethnicity where reliably available, officer characteristics, and the outcome of administrative or judicial review. The final analysis can then distinguish reported force, serious force, policy violations, civil findings, criminal findings, and broader public allegations.

Longitudinal and Comparative Value

Secondary data allow repeated measurements across time. The researcher can compare periods before and after a policy change while recognizing that correlation does not prove causation. For example, a rise in recorded incidents after mandatory reporting may indicate improved visibility rather than worsening behavior. A decline after reform may reflect real change, reduced public contact, altered classification, or incomplete reporting. Trend interpretation therefore requires information about the data system itself.

Comparison among jurisdictions can identify variation in training, supervision, disciplinary systems, union rules, community conditions, crime patterns, and legal standards. Yet a global comparison must not assume that "police," "arrest," and "use of force" mean the same thing everywhere. Countries differ in firearm availability, policing structure, protest law, detention practices, data transparency, and judicial review. The study should compare like measures where possible and explain where definitions prevent direct ranking. (National Academies of Sciences, 2018)

Practical and Ethical Advantages

Using existing public records reduces the need to expose participants to difficult interviews about injury, death, discrimination, or trauma. It can also protect officers and residents from unnecessary identification when aggregate data answer the question. Secondary analysis is not ethically risk-free, however. Incident-level records may contain names, addresses, medical information, video, or graphic descriptions. The researcher should minimize personal detail, avoid sensational repetition, and follow any licensing, privacy, or institutional-review requirements.

The method also permits triangulation. A department's account can be compared with court records, medical findings, video, independent investigation, and community reporting. No source should be presumed neutral merely because it is official or critical. Each institution has purposes and incentives that shape what it records.

Sources of Secondary Data

The research will use several categories of evidence. Official national sources are important because they provide standardized definitions and broad coverage. In the United States, the Federal Bureau of Investigation's National Use-of-Force Data Collection gathers information about incidents involving death, serious bodily injury, or firearm discharge at or toward a person. The program offers useful variables, but participation is voluntary and national coverage has not always reached the level needed to release complete incident estimates. The absence of a record may therefore mean no force occurred, no qualifying force occurred, or the agency did not submit data. (Federal Bureau of Investigation, 2025)

The Bureau of Justice Statistics Police-Public Contact Survey offers a different perspective. It samples residents and asks about contact with police, including traffic stops, calls for service, street encounters, threats, and nonfatal force. Survey data can capture experiences that never become administrative complaints. They also include a denominator—the number of contacts—so researchers can examine force relative to opportunities for interaction. Limitations include self-report, recall, sample size for rare events, and the exclusion of fatal encounters. (Bureau of Justice Statistics, 2024)

Mortality records provide another source. The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention's National Violent Death Reporting System integrates death certificates, coroner or medical-examiner reports, and law-enforcement information. The category "legal intervention" is a public-health classification and does not declare that an action was legally justified. Mortality data are valuable for fatal outcomes but cannot describe the much larger number of nonfatal encounters. (Centers for Disease Control & Prevention, 2024)

Departmental and Local Records

Local departments may publish annual force reports, complaint statistics, disciplinary outcomes, body-camera policies, demographic information, and tactical breakdowns. These records can provide detail unavailable nationally. The researcher should examine whether definitions changed during the study period, whether incidents are counted by event, officer, or use-of-force action, and whether independent review exists. A report showing twenty uses of force might refer to twenty encounters or twenty officers involved in fewer encounters.

Emergency medical records, hospital studies, and coroner reports can provide injury information, although access and coding differ. Civilian oversight boards and inspectors general may identify patterns in investigations and complaint handling. Their findings are particularly useful for understanding institutional response, not merely the initial encounter.

Court Records and Department of Justice Findings

Civil and criminal cases can clarify legal standards and provide tested evidence, but litigated cases are not representative of every encounter. Many complaints never reach trial, settlements may contain no admission, and court records may be incomplete. The research should code the procedural stage carefully rather than treating every allegation as a judgment.

United States Department of Justice pattern-or-practice investigations provide detailed analyses of departments where investigators found systemic constitutional violations. These reports often examine force incidents, supervision, training, documentation, discipline, crisis response, and discrimination. They are valuable case studies of institutional mechanisms, but departments selected for investigation are not a random sample of all agencies. (U.S. Department of Justice, Civil Rights Division, 2025)

Peer-Reviewed Research

Academic journals will provide statistical methods, theoretical frameworks, and independent evaluations. Relevant studies may analyze racial disparities, officer-involved shootings, traffic stops, mental-health encounters, body cameras, de-escalation, organizational justice, and legal reform. The researcher should distinguish descriptive studies from causal evaluations and avoid combining estimates that use incompatible definitions.

Systematic reviews and National Academies reports can summarize evidence across studies, though their conclusions depend on the quality of included research. Publication bias may make significant findings more visible than null results.

Journalism and Independent Databases

Investigative journalism can identify incidents and institutional patterns before official systems release data. It can also provide interviews, video, and document analysis. Articles must be checked against primary records where possible because media selection favors unusual, dramatic, or well-documented events.

Independent incident databases can improve visibility, particularly for fatal encounters, but their inclusion rules must be reviewed. Researchers should examine how duplicate reports are reconciled, how identities and circumstances are verified, and whether historical coverage changed. A database created after a prominent event may appear to show an increase simply because earlier years were reconstructed less completely.

Source-Appraisal Criteria

Every source will be assessed for authority, purpose, definition, coverage, completeness, update frequency, geographic scope, and potential bias. Official status does not guarantee completeness, while advocacy status does not make evidence unreliable. The question is whether the source documents its method and supports the specific claim being made.

Sources that use vague labels, unattributed statistics, or unclear time periods will not be relied upon for trend estimates. The original references to a generic WordPress page and a commercial career website are insufficient for a serious research project and should be replaced by government reports, peer-reviewed studies, legal records, and established scholarly books.

How the Data Will Be Used to Test the Research Hypothesis

Research Hypothesis

The proposed hypothesis is that public documentation of serious police force has increased over the study period because of improved reporting, digital video, public scrutiny, and independent data collection, while the underlying incidence of excessive force varies by jurisdiction and is influenced by institutional accountability, supervision, policy, and encounter conditions. This formulation avoids claiming in advance that brutality has universally increased or decreased. It separates visibility from prevalence and identifies organizational factors that can be tested.

A secondary hypothesis is that jurisdictions with clear force policies, meaningful supervisory review, reliable reporting, de-escalation requirements, early-intervention systems, and credible discipline will show fewer repeated patterns of unnecessary or disproportionate force after relevant differences are considered. The study may not establish causation if reforms were adopted in response to serious problems, but it can identify associations and case-study evidence.

Study Period and Scope

The paper should define a period long enough to observe change but short enough to maintain comparable data. A ten- or fifteen-year United States study may be more defensible than an unrestricted global review. If a cross-national component is retained, it should use selected countries with sufficiently documented data and describe each legal and institutional context separately.

The unit of analysis may be an incident, agency-year, jurisdiction-year, court finding, or reform case. Mixing these units without explanation would produce invalid conclusions. National trend analysis can use agency-year or population estimates, while detailed qualitative analysis can examine selected incidents and official investigations.

Coding the Incidents

Each incident will be coded for date, jurisdiction, initiating reason, type and level of force, injury, fatality, subject weapon, officer-reported threat, resistance, mental-health indicators, number of officers, number of civilians, available video, demographic variables, complaint, administrative finding, civil outcome, criminal outcome, and policy change. Missing information will be marked as missing rather than guessed.

Resistance and threat are relevant because proportional force depends on circumstances, but they must not be used to suggest that civilians "drive" officers into brutality. Officers have professional and legal duties to use force proportionately, follow policy, provide medical aid, and stop when the justification ends. A person's conduct may explain why some force was considered; it does not automatically justify every tactic or transfer responsibility for an excessive response.

Denominators and Rate Calculation

Raw incident totals can mislead. A large city may report more force because it has more residents, officers, calls, arrests, or contacts. Rates can be calculated per population, police contact, arrest, or officer, but each denominator answers a different question. Population rates describe community burden, while contact rates describe risk during encounters. Arrest-based rates can be distorted if arrest practices differ by race or neighborhood.

The analysis should present more than one denominator where data permit. It should also avoid interpreting demographic disparity as proof of individual officer intent without examining exposure, enforcement policy, neighborhood assignment, and institutional discrimination. Statistical control can clarify patterns but cannot make unequal exposure morally neutral.

Analyzing Change Over Time

The researcher will graph or describe annual rates and identify breaks associated with changes in reporting coverage, definitions, law, public-health emergencies, protest activity, or reform. Sensitivity analysis can test whether conclusions remain when agencies with incomplete reporting are excluded. Qualitative evidence can explain why a numerical change occurred.

For selected departments, the study can compare periods before and after a consent decree, policy revision, or supervisory reform. The analysis should include implementation, because a written policy may not change practice if training, monitoring, staffing, and discipline remain weak.

Training, Ethics, and Organizational Culture

Training records and policies will be used to assess whether officers receive instruction in de-escalation, crisis intervention, medical response, constitutional standards, bias, reporting, and duty to intervene. Training hours alone are not sufficient. Scenario quality, supervision, field reinforcement, and consequences determine whether instruction affects behavior.

Ethical conduct will be evaluated through transparency, accurate reporting, treatment of vulnerable people, proportionality, medical care, complaint handling, and protection for officers who report misconduct. Organizational culture may be inferred from repeated findings, communications, supervision, and disciplinary patterns, but claims should be tied to evidence rather than stereotypes about all police.

Limitations

The principal limitation is missing and inconsistent data. Voluntary national reporting, local definition changes, sealed records, underreporting by civilians, and incomplete demographic information make precise trend claims difficult. Fatal incidents receive more documentation than nonfatal force, and high-profile cases receive more attention than routine encounters.

Secondary sources also cannot capture every perception or decision in the moment. Officer reports may emphasize threat; civilian accounts may emphasize harm; video may omit events outside the frame. Triangulation improves confidence but may not resolve every disagreement. The final paper should distinguish confirmed facts, disputed claims, findings by particular institutions, and the researcher’s interpretation.

Ethical Presentation

Victims, officers, families, and communities should not be reduced to data points or sensational examples. Graphic material should be used only when analytically necessary. The research should avoid publishing personal information beyond what is already public and relevant. It should also avoid language that assumes guilt before evidence or treats institutional criticism as hostility toward every officer.

Conclusion

Secondary data are appropriate for assessing the evolution of police brutality because the question spans multiple years, institutions, and locations. Official datasets, public-contact surveys, mortality systems, departmental records, court files, Department of Justice investigations, peer-reviewed studies, journalism, and independent databases can provide complementary evidence. Their value depends on careful definitions and transparent appraisal.

The research will not assume that every use of force is brutality or that citizens cause officers to use excessive force. It will code observable circumstances, legal and administrative findings, institutional practices, and outcomes. Rates will use appropriate denominators, missing information will remain explicit, and changes in reporting will be separated from changes in underlying conduct.

The likely conclusion is that the visibility of police force has increased substantially, while actual trends differ across jurisdictions and cannot be measured through one incomplete dataset. Institutional leadership, supervision, policy, reporting, discipline, and community accountability are central to explaining variation. A credible study will therefore be systematic, cautious, and attentive both to public safety and to the rights and dignity of people who encounter police.

References

Bureau of Justice Statistics. (2024). *Contacts between police and the public, 2022*. U.S. Department of Justice.

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. (2024). *National Violent Death Reporting System, 50 states, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico, 2022*.

Federal Bureau of Investigation. (2025). *National Use-of-Force Data Collection*.

National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine. (2018). *Proactive policing: Effects on crime and communities*. National Academies Press.

U.S. Department of Justice, Civil Rights Division. (2025). *Conduct of law enforcement agencies: Pattern-or-practice investigations*.

