GET INTERNATIONAL RESEARCH JOURNAL

Factors Affecting Reasonable Use of Force and Observance of Miranda Warning during Arrest by PNP Personnel

Mark Anthony L. Refugio
Emilio Aguinaldo College

Corresponding Email: refugiomarkanthony27@gmail.com

Available Online: August 2024
Revised: June 2024
Accepted: June 2024
Received: July 2024

Volume II Issue 3 (2024)
DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.13858669
E-ISSN: 2984-7184
P-ISSN: 2984-7176
https://getinternational.org/research/

Abstract

The authority to use force, including lethal force is a defining feature of the police profession. The emergence and incorporation of the Miranda doctrine in our criminal law, and its attached misconceptions made it inevitable to determine the understandings of the Philippine law enforcers. There is a limited number of research studies conducted that are connected with the PNP. This implies demand studies centralizing on the use of reasonable force and observance of Miranda Warnings in effecting the arrest of suspected criminals. The study is a quantitative analysis of the relationship between the individual, situational, and organizational predictors to the use of reasonable force and observance of Miranda Warnings among PNP personnel particularly the Police Patrol Personnel assigned as Beat Patrol Personnel, Compact Personnel, and Arresting Officers, during police-civilian encounters. Utilizing Google survey forms as the primary tool to gather and evaluate data, the self-constructed survey to be utilized is anchored on the Deference Exchange Theory, Naturalistic Decision Making (NDM) approach, and the Police-Public Contact Survey (PPCS). The findings of this study imply that factors affecting the use of reasonable force and observance of Miranda warnings significantly influence the enhancement of law enforcement interventions. From the results of the study, it may be concluded that the factors affecting the use of reasonable force and observance of Miranda warnings are more likely to contribute interventions to the Philippine National Police, as an organization, a significant enhancement in law enforcement. Recommendations were proposed based on the findings and conclusion of this study. Based on the findings of this study, the following recommendations are proposed for the PNP leadership to provide written policy to be used as operational guidelines for all PNP personnel during the conduct of arrest of suspected criminals: (a) When conducting police operations and apprehending criminal suspects, male police officers shall use reasonable force; (b) Continuous education and training for law enforcement personnel; (c) Active aggression coupled with the present ability to carry out the threat or assault, which reasonably indicates that an assault or injury to a person appears imminent by crime suspects should be physically restrained with force"; (d) To be quick to use physical force in situations where the incident is critical and dangerous; (e) The arresting police officer informs the suspect that he/she has the right to remain silent"; and (f) The Arresting Police Officer informs.

Keywords: Use of Reasonable Force, Individual Predictors, Situational Predictors, Organizational Predictors, Miranda Doctrine, Law Enforcement

Recommended citations:

Refugio, M. A. L. (2024). Factors Affecting Reasonable Use of Force and Observance of Miranda Warning during Arrest by PNP Personnel. GUILD OF EDUCATORS IN TESOL INTERNATIONAL RESEARCH JOURNAL, 2(3), 240–254. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.13858669

INTRODUCTION

The case of Miranda v. Arizona established the requirement for the "Miranda Warning" or Miranda Rights after Ernesto Miranda confessed to robbery, kidnapping, and rape during interrogation, but his conviction was later overturned due to the harsh conditions of the interrogation. This case led to the mandate that all criminal suspects must be informed of their rights. In the Philippines, the right to counsel, as outlined in the Miranda doctrine, was reinforced by landmark cases like People v. Galit and Morales Jr. v. Enrile, and is

incorporated into the current Constitution. The 1987 Constitution specifies that suspects have the right to competent counsel, preferably of their own choice, and any waiver of this right must be done in writing and in the presence of a lawyer. Article 3, Section 12(1) of the Philippine Constitution details that anyone under investigation for a crime must be informed of their rights, including the right to remain silent and to have competent and independent legal counsel. These rights cannot be waived except in writing and with legal counsel present. Philippine law mandates stricter requirements compared to the Miranda v. Arizona standards, emphasizing the need for competent and independent counsel of the suspect's choice. Any confession obtained in violation of these requirements is inadmissible in court, as stated in Article 3, Section 12(3) of the Constitution.

Arrests typically require a warrant, but there are exceptions for warrantless arrests under Rule 113, Section 5 of the Revised Rules on Criminal Procedure. These include arrests made in flagrante delicto (when an offense is committed in the presence of the arresting officer) and arrests in hot pursuit (when an offense has just been committed, and the officer has probable cause based on personal knowledge). Failure to read Miranda Rights to an arrested person can result in penalties for police officers, including up to 10 years of imprisonment under RA 7438.

A study conducted in the United States assessed Miranda misconceptions among over 799 detainees, ranging in age from 11 to 67. The study found that adults had fewer misconceptions about Miranda Rights compared to juveniles. Serious misconceptions were common even among detainees with good verbal abilities and extensive arrest histories. Miranda Rights originated from the 1966 U.S. Supreme Court case Miranda v. Arizona, which mandated that police must inform a person in custody about their Fifth Amendment protection against self-incrimination and their right to an attorney. The rights include remaining silent, the potential use of statements against them in court, and the provision of an attorney if they cannot afford one. Miranda Warnings must be given before custodial interrogation, during which statements or confessions are presumed involuntary if the suspect was not informed of their rights. Any evidence resulting from such statements or confessions would likely be inadmissible in court.

A police officer's decision to use force during their duties is critical, as it carries significant consequences and is a notable aspect of modern policing, despite its infrequent use. Improper use of force can have serious, adverse outcomes for both the suspect and the officer involved. As noted, “These encounters, even with careful consideration, can have severe consequences, such as serious injury or death to either the suspect or officer” (Morrow, Nuño, & Mulvey, 2018). Determining when the use of force is necessary or excessive is a key issue, as force may sometimes be required even though most interactions between police and civilians are non-violent. The Supreme Court has established that an objective reasonableness standard should be applied to claims of excessive force by police. However, even with this standard, determining the appropriate level of force can be challenging and subjective (United States Commission on Civil Rights, 2018). High-profile cases like the deaths of Eric Garner, Jamar Clark, and Freddie Gray highlight the severe consequences of police force and underscore the need for further research into the factors influencing police use of force. Studies have examined various factors, including suspect characteristics (e.g., race, age, mental health), officer attributes (e.g., gender, age, rank), situational aspects (e.g., demeanor, resistance), organizational policies, and neighborhood conditions (e.g., crime rates, racial demographics, socio-economic status) (Morrow, Nuño, & Mulvey, 2018).

A survey by Human Rights Watch revealed that between October 2017 and May 2018, 880 people were killed in "riding-in-tandem" attacks, but only 63 suspects were arrested. Human Rights Watch issued a call for credible investigations into the over 12,000 deaths linked to President Rodrigo Duterte’s "war on drugs" and highlighted 4,279 deaths during police operations from July 1, 2016, to May 21, 2018. The organization urged Director General Albayalde to address the rise in "riding-in-tandem killings," often connected to local officials and police. Phelim Kine, Deputy Asia Director, emphasized the challenge for Albayalde to reform the Philippine National Police from perceived predators to true protectors of public safety and rule of law. He stated that Albayalde must show a commitment to human rights by stopping summary killings and holding those responsible accountable (Human Rights Watch, 2018). Human rights, fundamental to every individual, mandate that everyone, including those in police custody, be treated with dignity and respect. These rights are protected by the 1987 Philippine Constitution, which asserts that “No person shall be deprived of life, liberty, or property without due process of law, nor shall any person be denied the equal protection of the laws.”

The Philippine National Police plays a crucial role in maintaining law and order and reducing crime rates in the country. Police forces are expected to uphold values such as fairness, consistency, and tolerance of diverse viewpoints. As the embodiment of state authority, the police must ensure their actions respect individual liberties and avoid infringing on the basic rights of suspects in their custody. Issues of police misconduct, including the use of excessive force or torture, are frequently reported in the media. Even when legally justified, police use of force can challenge public perception of police legitimacy, as citizens may view such interventions as intrusive or unjust. Implicit biases and other personal factors can influence reactions to police encounters. This study adopts a quantitative approach to analyze police decision-making in the context of police-citizen interactions and the implementation of national and local laws.

The Miranda warnings and associated laws have evolved significantly in recent years, particularly within law enforcement. The study aims to empirically verify how various factors—**individual predictors** (e.g., rank, gender, education, years of service, functional assignment), **situational predictors** (e.g., suspect’s age, gender, resistance, substance influence, weapon presence), and

organizational predictors (e.g., workplace environment)—affect police decisions to use force. The exercise of discretion in using force is complex and depends on a range of factors including the actions and characteristics of both the police officer and the suspect, as well as the situational context (Morgan, Logan, & Olma, 2020; Engel, et al., 2019). Few theoretical frameworks adequately explain police-civilian interactions.

The study, which utilized a self-constructed survey to gather and analyze the relationship between individual, situational, and organizational predictors and the use of reasonable force, was grounded in the Deference Exchange Theory (Paoline, Gau, & Terrill, 2018) and the Naturalistic Decision Making (NDM) approach (Hine et al., 2018). These theories suggest that police-civilian behavior is shaped more by normative and interpersonal constructs than psychological ones. Sykes and Clark's theory of deference exchange in police-citizen interactions forms the foundation of this approach, demonstrating that the rules for showing respect during such encounters are asymmetrical due to police officers' legal authority to enforce the law and maintain order. A more recent approach, NDM, examines police decisions under pressure by understanding thought processes in dynamic, real-world settings. Official data from the Queensland Police Service in Australia analyzed 202 police-citizen encounters involving police use of force, exploring how individual and situational factors influenced officers' use of varying levels of force through chi-square and multinomial logistic regression analysis (Hine et al., 2018). Recent findings revealed that recruits assessed suspect and situation factors to determine the threat level and appropriate use of force. Regression analysis concluded that officers were less likely to use higher force on suspects who were physically aggressive or armed and in encounters with female suspects. The NDM framework highlights the importance of experience and potential predictors in helping police officers make quick, effective decisions in high-pressure situations.

Police Patrol Personnel: The study focused on police patrol personnel in Davao City, including Beat Patrol, Compact Personnel, Mobile Patrollers, and Arresting Officers. These officers, being the most frequent point of contact between citizens and law enforcement, are responsible for conducting surveys to ensure neighborhood safety and responding to calls for assistance. They enhance community safety by increasing police visibility and bridging the gap between police and citizens. Patrol officers may use reasonable force when apprehending suspects during their duties, but little is known about their decision-making processes in such situations (Hine et al., 2018).
Individual Predictors: Upon completing police academy training, officers are deployed to stations where they are expected to perform fieldwork requiring endurance. The organization regularly recruits new officers. Prior research shows that race, sex, and age are strongly correlated with exposure to the criminal justice system (Edwards, Lee, & Esposito, 2019) and influence how police decisions on force are made (Soss & Weaver, 2017; Ward, 2018). While in-service training is intended to enhance officer skills, research on its effectiveness is limited (Huey, 2018). Studies have found that the race and gender of officers may influence the likelihood of force being used, with male officers more likely to face excessive force complaints compared to female officers (Johnson, Gilbert, & Ibrahim, 2018). Research by Deller & Deller (2019) found that female officers were no more likely than male officers to use force when suspects were armed but that male officers were more likely to use physical force in such cases.

Situational Predictors: Research has found that situational factors such as arrests for violent offenses and suspect behavior are highly correlated with police use of force (Garner et al., 2018). Encounters involving youths and armed suspects often result in higher levels of force due to their perceived threat (Morrow et al., 2018). Studies also show that disrespectful or confrontational behavior from suspects is more likely to result in police use of force (Morrow et al., 2018). Armed suspects, in particular, are more likely to face higher levels of force, including lethal or less-than-lethal forms (Morrow et al., 2018).

Organizational Predictors: The study focuses on workplace environment factors as organizational predictors, including job location, occupational hazards, and organizational management practices. Research suggests that organizational policies restricting the use of lethal force can reduce police shootings and racial disparities (Terrill & Paoline III, 2017).

Use of Reasonable Force: Police officers can use both verbal and physical forms of force. Resistance is often used as justification for force, with Rule 8, Section 1 of the Philippine National Police Manual requiring officers to issue a warning before using force, except when their life is in immediate danger. Despite numerous studies on police-citizen interactions, few have examined how individual, situational, and organizational factors together influence the use of force. This study addresses this gap by exploring how these factors affect the reasonable use of force.

The research was conducted to determine the factors affecting reasonable force use and the observance of Miranda warnings during arrests by PNP personnel, with the aim of improving law enforcement strategies. The study specifically sought to answer questions related to individual, situational, and organizational factors influencing the use of force, differences in the assessment of these factors, and the relationship between force use and Miranda warning observance. The research hypotheses tested whether significant differences existed in these assessments and whether a significant relationship existed between the factors affecting force use and Miranda warnings. Based on the findings, recommendations will be made to enhance law enforcement strategies.

METHODOLOGY

This study conducted a quantitative analysis to explore the relationship between individual, situational, and organizational predictors and the use of reasonable force among PNP personnel, specifically Police Patrol Personnel assigned as Beat Patrol Personnel,

Compact Personnel, and Arresting Officers during encounters with civilians. It employed a descriptive-correlational research design to assess the significance of these predictors and their impact on the use of reasonable force by police patrol personnel in the Davao City Police Office. The goal was to provide insights for improving law enforcement strategies. The descriptive approach aimed to offer an accurate depiction of the situation or the relationship between variables, enabling conclusions about certain groups or populations. In this study, the descriptive correlation linked individual, situational, and organizational predictors to police officers' use of reasonable force. A correlational method, specifically multiple regression analysis, was applied to estimate how the variables related to one another in the targeted population.

This exploratory study sought to identify key predictors influencing the use of reasonable force during police-civilian interactions and to examine how Davao City Police officers addressed these predictors. The multiple regression analysis used the enter method, which examines the relationship between independent and dependent variables. This research design was appropriate for explaining how the identified predictors affected police officers' decisions regarding the use of reasonable force in performing their duties. The survey was based on Deference Exchange Theory (Paoline, Gau, & Terrill, 2018), the Naturalistic Decision-Making (NDM) approach (Hine K. A., Porter, Westera, Alpert, & Allen, 2018), and the Police-Public Contact Survey (PPCS) (Morrow, Nuño, & Mulvey, 2018).

The study was conducted at the police stations of the Davao City Police Office, as shown in Table 1. Data analysis began with data collection. The study's respondents were police officers stationed in Davao City with ranks ranging from Patrolman to Police Executive Master Sergeant (police patrol personnel), including Beat Patrol Personnel, Compact Personnel, and Arresting Officers. These Non-Commissioned Officers, as front-line personnel, are often responsible for arrests and the potential use of reasonable force, unlike Police Commissioned Officers who typically hold higher management positions. The main distinction between the two ranks lies in their level of authority, with Non-Commissioned Officers following orders from Commissioned Officers. Non-Commissioned Officers at police stations play a crucial role in police work, which includes patrolling, investigating, and managing traffic, and they frequently interact with the public, particularly criminals or offenders.

Table 1.

The population of the Police Non-Commissioned Officers (Per Police Station) assigned in Davao City Police Office

STATION	Pat	PCpl	PSSg	PMSg	PSMS	PCMS	PEMS	TOTAL
PS1 STA ANA	28	45	16	5	5		6	**105**
PS2 SAN PEDRO	37	34	21	5	11	3	1	**112**
PS3 TALOMO	39	55	16	5	11	7	9	**142**
PS4 SASA	26	26	18	5	5	1	7	**88**
PS5 BUHANGIN	22	36	23	3	6	2	1	**93**
PS6 BUNAWAN	14	35	15	5	4	2	3	**78**
PS7 PAQUIBATO	8	22	2	2	5	1	1	**41**
PS8 TORIL	14	32	21	7	12	1	6	**93**
PS9 TUGBOK	8	25	18	6	16	4	7	**84**
PS10 CALINAN	10	24	22	7	6	5	4	**78**
PS11 BAGUIO	2	9	10	7	4		3	**35**
PS12 MARILOG	7	14	11	4	2	1	2	**41**
PS13 MANDUG	27	11	5	2	3	2		**50**
PS15 ECOLAND	36	10	7	2	4	2	2	**63**
PS17 BALIOK	33	7	9	2	4	2	2	**59**
TOTAL	**311**	**385**	**214**	**67**	**98**	**33**	**54**	**1,162**

The purposive sampling technique was used and abled to reach a total of 287 PNP personnel who were patrol officers, compact personnel, and mobile patrollers from Davao City Police Station 1 to Police Station 17 (except PS 7). The participants were selected as sample respondents of the study (Table 2). The researcher selected Police Station 7: Paquibato as respondents in conducting the consistency test or Cronbach's alpha, thus it was not being included in the official conduct of the survey for the study.

Table 2.

Frequency and percentage distribution of actual participants/respondents per station

Actual Participants Per Station	Frequency	Percentage	Actual Participants Per Station	Frequency	Percentage
PS1 STA ANA	27	9%	PS9 TUGBOK	22	7%
PS2 SAN PEDRO	29	10%	PS10 CALINAN	20	7%
PS3 TALOMO	36	13%	PS11 BAGUIO	9	3%
PS4 SASA	23	8%	PS12 MARILOG	10	4%
PS5 BUHANGIN	24	8%	PS13 MANDUG	13	4%
PS6 BUNAWAN	20	7%	PS15 ECOLAND	16	6%
PS8 TORIL	24	8%	PS17 BALIOK	15	5%
			Total	**287**	**100%**

Google survey forms were used as the primary tool for data collection and evaluation. The self-developed survey was based on the Deference Exchange Theory, the Naturalistic Decision Making (NDM) approach, and the Police-Public Contact Survey (PPCS). It was divided into two sections: Part I gathered information about the police officers' profiles, including their rank, gender, educational background, years of service, and functional assignment. Part II assessed respondents' views, which helped in identifying and measuring the impact of individual, situational, and organizational predictors on the use of reasonable force. A four-point Likert scale, ranging from "strongly disagree" (1) to "strongly agree" (4), was used. Reliability and internal consistency tests, including Cronbach's Alpha, along with validation by a panel of experts, ensured that all survey items accurately measured the same underlying variable. The survey was distributed through Google Forms to the target respondents—compact personnel, beat patrol officers, and arresting officers assigned to Davao City Police Stations—ensuring an efficient and effective data collection process.

Table 3.

Frequency and percentage distribution of actual participants/respondents as to the types of respondents

Respondents	Frequency	Percentage
Beat Patrol Personnel	90	31%
Compact personnel	133	46%
Arresting Officers	64	22%
Total	**287**	**100.00**

Table 4.

Frequency and percentage distribution of actual participants/respondents as to rank classifications

Rank classification	Frequency	Percentage	Rank classification	Frequency	Percentage
Pat	84	29%	PSMS	5	2%
PCpl	94	33%	PCMS	6	2%
PSSg	14	5%	**Total**	**287**	**100.00**
PMSg	30	10%			

Table 5.

Frequency and percentage distribution of actual participants/respondents as to educational attainment

Educational attainment	Frequency	Percentage	Educational Attainment	Frequency	Percentage
College degree	284	99%	With Ph.D units	0	0%
With Masteral units	2	1%	PhD degree	0	0%
Masteral degree	1	0%	**Total**	**287**	**100.00**

Table 6.

Frequency and percentage distribution of actual participants/respondents as to number of years in service

Number of years in service	Frequency	Percentage	Number of years in service	Frequency	Percentage
5 years and bellow	77	27%	16-20 years	29	10%
6-10 years	116	40%	Over 20 years	15	5%
11-15 years	50	17%	**Total**	**287**	**100.00**

The Pearson correlation coefficient (Pearson r) was used to examine the significant relationships between variables, identifying the influence and connection among individual predictors, situational predictors, and organizational predictors on the use of reasonable force. Pearson r revealed the most predictive factors for officers dealing with physically aggressive suspects and instances where police used lower levels of force in response to suspect resistance (Hine et al., 2018). Significant effects were also observed for crime events and suspect-related variables. The enter method was applied in multiple regression analysis to examine the relationships between the independent and dependent variables.

The following statistical tools were used to analyze the collected data:

1. To address Problems 1 and 3, Weighted Mean and Rank were employed to assess and interpret respondents' evaluations of the factors affecting reasonable use of force and the adherence to the Miranda warning during arrest by PNP personnel. The weighted average considers the varying significance of data points within a set (Gong & Goksel, 2019).
2. To answer Problems 2 and 4, the T-test was utilized to determine differences. The T-test is a statistical hypothesis test where the test statistic follows a Student's t-distribution under the null hypothesis (Singh et al., 2019).
3. For Problem 5, the correlation test was analyzed using the Pearson r, with the significance level set at .05.

Regarding ethical considerations, the gathered data were kept strictly confidential. Informed consent was obtained from respondents before they completed the survey. Participants were informed that they could withdraw from the study at any time if they no longer wished to participate due to personal reasons.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

The assessment of the Beat Patrol, Compact personnel, and Arresting Officer respondents on the Factors Affecting Reasonable Use of Force during arrest by PNP personnel are presented in Table No. 5 to 7.

Table 7.

Summary of mean values, verbal interpretations, standard deviations of the assessment of the Beat Patrol, Compact personnel, and Arresting Officer respondents on the Factors Affecting Reasonable Use of Force during arrest by PNP personnel in terms of individual predictors

Individual Predictors	Beat Patrol Personnel			Compact personnel			Arresting Officers		
	WM	VI	SD	WM	VI	SD	WM	VI	SD
1) Rank difference impacts my use reasonable of force during the conduct of police operations and apprehension of crime suspects	3.06	A	.719	2.80	A	.721	3.10	A	.619
2) Junior ranked patrol personnel (PAT-PSSG) are more likely to use reasonable force during the conduct of police operations and apprehension of crime suspects.	2.95	A	.710	2.90	A	.687	3.25	A	.617
3) Senior ranked patrol personnel (PMSG-PEMS) are more likely to use reasonable force during the conduct of police operations and apprehension of crime suspects.	2.89	A	.718	2.74	A	.768	3.25	A	.597
4) Female Police Patrol Personnel are more likely to use reasonable force when conducting police operations and apprehension of crime suspects.	2.74	A	.768	3.00	A	.681	2.97	A	.641
5) When conducting police operations and apprehending criminal suspects, male police officers are more likely to use reasonable force.	3.08	A	.694	2.60	A	.768	3.03	A	.638

6) Education, particularly having a college diploma as a minimal prerequisite, has an impact on police disposition when conducting police operations and apprehending criminal suspects.	3.02		.721	3.06		.644	2.98		.633
7) Those with more years in the service (11-35 years) are more likely to use reasonable force during police operations and the arrest of criminal suspects.	2.83	A	.728	3.16	A	.616	3.05	A	.639
8) Those with fewer years of service (1-10 years) are more likely to use reasonable force during police operations and the arrest of criminal suspects.	2.90	A	.731	2.93	A	.665	3.15	A	.597
9) As a Patrol Personnel, I am more likely to use reasonable force when conducting police operations and apprehending criminal suspects.	3.01	A	.681	3.05	A	.682	3.24	A	.592
10) Being a Compact Personnel increases the likelihood of using reasonable force during police operations and the arrest of criminal suspects.	2.92	A	.689	3.25	A	.680	3.21	A	.587
Overall	**2.94**	**A**		**2.63**	**A**		**3.12**	**A**	

Legend: 3.51-4.00 – Strongly Agree (SA)/Always Affect (AA), 2.51-3.50 – Agree (A)/Sometimes Affect (SA), 1.51-2.50 – Disagree (DA)/Rarely Affect (RA), 1.00-1.50 – Strongly Disagree (SDA)/Not Affect (NA)

Table 7 shows that Individual predictors were factors that at times affect reasonable use of force during arrest by PNP personnel as can be gleaned from the assessment of the Beat Patrol, Compact personnel, and Arresting Officer respondents, with overall mean ratings of 2.94; 2.63; and 3.12, respectively which are under verbal interpretations of all agree (A). As presented, of all the indicators on individual predictors, the number 1 statement, which states that "1) Rank difference impacts my use reasonable of force during the conduct of police operation and apprehension of crime suspects" was rated by the three groups of respondents the highest, [Beat patrol, WM=3.06; Compact personnel, WM=2.80; and Arresting officers, WM=3.10]. On the other hand, two statements were rated the lowest among the ten indicators, to wit: "5) When conducting police operations and apprehending criminal suspects, male police officers are more likely to use reasonable force", [Beat patrol, WM=3.08; Compact personnel, WM=2.60; and Arresting officers, WM=3.03]; and "6) Education, particularly having a college diploma as a minimal prerequisite, has an impact on police disposition when conducting police operations and apprehending criminal suspects." [Beat patrol, WM=3.02; Compact personnel, WM=3.06; and Arresting officers, WM=2.98].

Table 8.

Summary of mean, verbal interpretations, standard deviations assessment of the Beat Patrol, Compact personnel, and Arresting Officer respondents on the Factors Affecting Reasonable Use of Force during arrest by PNP personnel in terms of situational predictors

Situational Predictors	**Beat Patrol Personnel**			**Compact personnel**			**Arresting Officers**		
	WM	VI	SD	WM	VI	SD	WM	VI	SD
1) When the crime suspects were juveniles (7 to 35 years old), I was more likely to use reasonable force during the police operation and apprehension of the crime suspects.	3.28	A	.573	3.33	A	.685	3.08	A	.694
2) I was more likely to use reasonable force when the crime suspects were in their middle age (36 to 55 years old) during a police operation and arrest a crime suspect.	3.63	SA	.543	3.53	A	.520	3.02	A	.721
3) When conducting a police operation and apprehending a crime suspect, I am more likely to use reasonable force if the suspects are female.	3.48	A	.619	3.45	A	.582	2.83	A	.728
4) When conducting a police operation and apprehending a crime suspect, I am more likely to use reasonable force if the suspects are male.	3.50	A	.566	3.29	A	.693	2.89	A	.731

5) Verbally disrespectful crime suspects deserve physical force.	3.45	A	.600	3.29	A	.682	3.01	A	.681
6) Active aggression coupled with the present ability to carry out the threat or assault, which reasonably indicates that an assault or injury to a person appears imminent by crime suspects should be physically restrained with force.	3.18		.781	3.20		.765	2.91		.689
7) I am quick to apply reasonable force when the searching and handcuffing techniques were resisted by the suspect.	3.57	SA	.529	2.17	A	.732104	2.80	A	.721
8) During a police operation and the arrest of a crime suspect, I use reasonable physical force on liquor-intoxicated suspects.	3.52	SA	.547	1.98	A	.736	2.90	A	.687
9) During a police operation and the apprehension of criminal suspects, I use reasonable physical force on those who are under the influence of illegal drugs.	3.51	SA	.540	2.19	A	.768	2.74	A	.768
10) I am quick to use physical force when the crime suspect is armed with a weapon during the conduct of police operations and apprehension of crime suspects.	3.27	A	.711	2.17	A	.814	3.00	A	.681
Overall	**3.44**	**A**		**2.86**	**A**		**2.92**	**A**	

Legend: 3.51-4.00 – Strongly Agree (SA)/Always Affect (AA), 2.51-3.50 – Agree (A)/Sometimes Affect (SA), 1.51-2.50 – Disagree (DA)/Rarely Affect (RA), 1.00-1.50 – Strongly Disagree (SDA)/Not Affect (NA)

Table 8 shows that Situational predictors were factors that sometimes affect reasonable use of force during arrest by PNP personnel as can be gleaned from the assessment of the Beat Patrol, Compact personnel, and Arresting Officer respondents, with overall mean ratings of 3.44; 2.86; and 2.97, respectively, which are under verbal interpretations of all agree (A). As presented, of all the indicators on individual predictors, number 2 statement, which states that "2) I was more likely to use reasonable force when the crime suspects were in their middle age (36 to 55 years old) during a police operation and arrest a crime suspect" was rated by the three groups of respondents the highest, [Beat patrol, WM=3.63; Compact personnel, WM=3.53; and Arresting officers, WM=3.02]. On the other hand, one statement was rated the lowest among the ten indicators, to wit: "6) Active aggression coupled with the present ability to carry out the threat or assault, which reasonably indicates that an assault or injury to a person appears imminent by crime suspects should be physically restrained with force", [Beat patrol, WM=3.18; Compact personnel, WM=3.20; and Arresting officers, WM=2.91].

Table 9.

Summary of mean, verbal interpretations, standard deviations assessment of the Beat Patrol, Compact personnel, and Arresting Officer respondents on the Factors Affecting Reasonable Use of Force during arrest by PNP personnel in terms of organizational predictors

Organizational Predictors	**Beat Patrol Personnel**			**Compact personnel**			**Arresting Officers**		
	WM	VI	SD	WM	VI	SD	WM	VI	SD
1) The location of my assignment has an impact on my decision-making abilities in the use of reasonable force in everyday situations.	2.89	A	.718	2.74	A	.768	3.25	A	.597
2) I am quick to use physical force in situations where the incident is critical and dangerous.	2.74	A	.768	3.00	A	.681	2.97	A	.641
3) When I use reasonable force to arrest a criminal suspect, it is usually because the operation was carried out in high-risk areas.	3.08	A	.694	2.60	A	.768	3.03	A	.638
4) In some areas of this city, an aggressive demeanor is more useful to a patrol officer on the beat than a courteous demeanor.	3.02	A	.721	3.06	A	.644	2.98	A	.633
5) Following the PNP's rigid and restrictive policies framework on the arrest of criminal suspects is more likely to influence me to refrain from using reasonable force during police operations and arrests.	2.83	A	.728	3.16	A	.616	3.05	A	.639
6) The PNP's lethal force policies are more likely to influence me to refrain from using reasonable force during police operations and arrests.	3.48		.619	3.45		.582	2.83		.728

7) The PNP's promotional policies on the arrest of high-value criminal suspects are more likely to influence me to use reasonable force during police operations and arrests.	3.50	A	.566	3.29	A	.693	2.89	A	.731
8) PNP training and educational activities for its members play a role in the use of reasonable force during the arrest of criminal suspects.	3.45	A	.600	3.29	A	.682	3.01	A	.681
9) When it comes to resolving community problems and conflicts, the police and residents work well together.	3.18	A	.781	3.20	A	.765	2.91	A	.689
10) Residents in our jurisdiction have faith in the police patrol personnel and what they are capable of accomplishing.	3.57	A	.529	3.17	A	.732	2.95	A	.721
Overall	**3.17**	**A**		**2.67**	**A**		**2.97**	**A**	

Legend: 3.51-4.00 – Strongly Agree (SA)/Always Affect (AA), 2.51-3.50 – Agree (A)/Sometimes Affect (SA), 1.51-2.50 – Disagree (DA)/Rarely Affect (RA), 1.00-1.50 – Strongly Disagree (SDA)/Not Affect (NA)

Table 9 shows that Organizational predictors are factors that sometimes affect the reasonable use of force during arrest by PNP personnel as can be gleaned from the assessment of the Beat Patrol, Compact personnel, and Arresting Officer respondents, with overall mean ratings of 3.17; 2.67; and 2.97, respectively, which are under verbal interpretations of all agree (A). As presented, of all the indicators on individual predictors, the number 10 statement, which states that "10) Residents in our jurisdiction have faith in the police patrol personnel and what they are capable of accomplishing" was rated by the three groups of respondents the highest, [Beat patrol, WM=3.57; Compact personnel, WM=3.17; and Arresting officers, WM=2.95]. On the other hand, there is one statement was rated the lowest among the ten indicators, to wit: "2) I am quick to use physical force in situations where the incident is critical and dangerous", [Beat patrol, WM=2.74; Compact personnel, WM=3.00; and Arresting officers, WM=2.97]. The significant difference in the assessment of the Beat Patrol, Compact personnel, and Arresting Officer respondents on the Factors Affecting Reasonable Use of Force by PNP personnel in terms of individual, situational; and organizational factors is presented in Table 10 below.

Table 10.

*ANOVA shows a significant difference in the assessment of the Beat Patrol, Compact personnel, and Arresting Officer respondents on the Factors Affecting Reasonable Use of Force by PNP personnel in terms of individual, situational; and organizational factors***.**

ANOVA[a]

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	1.892	4	.473	1.374	.243[b]
	Residual	97.462	283	.344		
	Total	99.355	287			

a. Dependent Variable: LE_MEAN

b. Predictors: (Constant), MR_MEAN, SP_MEAN, OP_MEAN, IP_MEAN

The R-squared value is used to determine how much of the dependent's variance is explained or predicted by the model (Smith, 2018). The significant independent variables account for 19% of the variances. Specifically, Situational Predictors and Individual Predictors. In some fields, it is entirely expected that the R-squared value will be low such as studies that attempt to predict human behavior, which typically has a value of lower than 50% (Aisyah, 2018). Furthermore, if the R-squared value is low but has statistically significant predictors, it can still draw important conclusions about how changes in the predictor values are associated with changes in the response value (Chicco, et al., 2021). Thus, the result shows that the significant independent variables (Situational Predictors and Individual Predictors), can practically explain the outcome of the dependent variable (Enhanced Law Enforcement). The regression for both Situational Predictors and Individual Predictors explains the coefficient of determination of 20.9%.

The assessment of the Beat Patrol, Compact personnel, and Arresting Officer respondents on the observance of Miranda warning during arrest by the PNP personnel in terms of: informing the arrestee to remain silent; informing the arrestee to counsel; and informing the arrestee to be provided with counsel if he cannot afford are presented in Table 11 to 13.

Table 11.

Summary of mean, verbal interpretations, standard deviations of assessment of the Beat Patrol, Compact personnel, and Arresting Officer respondents on the observance of Miranda warning during arrest by PNP personnel in terms of Informing the suspect to remain silent

Informing the suspect to remain silent	**Beat Patrol Personnel**			**Compact personnel**			**Arresting Officers**		
	WM	VI	SD	WM	VI	SD	WM	VI	SD
1)The arresting police officer informs the suspect that he/she has the right to remain silent	3.02	A	.721	3.06	A	.644	2.98	A	.633
2)The arresting police officer informs the suspect that if he/she wants to remain silent, then it shall be granted	2.83	A	.728	3.16	A	.616	3.05	A	.639
3)The arresting police officer informs the suspect that should he/she wants to speak only to an attorney, then it shall be granted	2.90	A	.731	2.93	A	.665	3.15	A	.597
4)The arresting police officer informs the suspect that he/she has the right to talk to an attorney before talking to anyone else	3.01	A	.681	3.05	A	.682	3.24	A	.592
5)The arresting police officer informs the suspect that he/she wants to discontinue the custodial investigation, then it shall be granted	2.92	A	.689	3.25	A	.680	3.21	A	.587
Overall	**2.94**	**A**		**3.09**	**A**		**3.13**		**A**

Legend: 3.51-4.00 – Strongly Agree (SA)/Always Observed (AO), 2.51-3.50 – Agree (A)/Sometimes Observed (SO), 1.51-2.50 – Disagree (DA)/Rarely Observed (RO), 1.00-1.50 – Strongly Disagree (SDA)/Not Observed (NO)

Table 11 shows that PNP personnel sometimes observed the Miranda warning of Informing the suspect to remain silent, as per the assessment of the Beat Patrol, Compact personnel, and Arresting Officer respondents, with overall mean ratings of 2.94; 3.09; and 3.13, respectively, which are under verbal interpretations of all agree (A). As presented, of all the indicators of Informing the suspect to remain silent, number 4 statement, states that "4) The arresting police officer informs the suspect that he/she has the right to talk to an attorney before talking to anyone else" was rated by the three groups of respondents the highest, [Beat patrol, WM=3.01; Compact personnel, WM=3.05; and Arresting officers, WM=3.24]. On the other hand, there is one statement was rated the lowest among the five indicators, to wit: "1) The arresting police officer informs the suspect that he/she has the right to remain silent", [Beat patrol, WM=3.02; Compact personnel, WM=3.06; and Arresting officers, WM=2.98].

Table 12.

Summary of mean, verbal interpretations, standard deviations assessment of the Beat Patrol, Compact personnel, and Arresting Officer respondents on the observance of Miranda warning during arrest by PNP personnel in terms of Informing the arrested to his right to a counsel

Informing the arrested to his right to a counsel	**Beat Patrol Personnel**			**Compact personnel**			**Arresting Officers**		
	WM	VI	SD	WM	VI	SD	WM	VI	SD
1)The arresting police officer informs the suspect that he/she has the right to be informed of his or right to counsel	3.63	A	.543	3.53	A	.520	3.02	A	.721
2)The arresting police officer informs the suspect that he/she has the right to be represented by an independent counsel	3.48	A	.619	3.45	A	.582	2.83	A	.728
3)The arresting police officer informs the suspect that he/she has the preferential choice of a counsel	3.50	A	.566	3.29	A	.693	2.89	A	.731
4)The arresting police officer informs the suspect that he/she has the right to terminate his/her counsel should bias is detected	3.45	A	.600	3.29	A	.682	3.01	A	.681
5)The arresting police officer informs the suspect that he/she can change the counsel at any time	3.18	A	.781	3.20	A	.765	2.91	A	.689
Overall	**3.45**	**A**		**3.35**	**A**		**2.93**	**A**	

Legend: 3.51-4.00 – Strongly Agree (SA)/Always Observed (AO), 2.51-3.50 – Agree (A)/Sometimes Observed (SO), 1.51-2.50 – Disagree (DA)/Rarely Observed (RO), 1.00-1.50 – Strongly Disagree (SDA)/Not Observed (NO)

Table 8 shows that PNP personnel sometimes observed the Miranda warning of Informing the arrested to his right to a counsel, as per the assessment of the Beat Patrol, Compact personnel, and Arresting Officer respondents, with overall mean ratings of 3.45; 3.35; and 2.93, respectively, which are under verbal interpretations of all agree (A). As presented, of all the indicators on Informing the arrested to his right to a counsel, number 3 statement, which state that, "3) The arresting police officer informs the suspect that he/she has the preferential choice of a counsel" was rated by the three groups of respondents the highest, [Beat patrol, WM=3.50; Compact personnel, WM=3.29; and Arresting officers, WM=2.89]. On the other hand, there is one statement was rated the lowest among the five indicators, to wit: "5) The arresting police officer informs the suspect that he/she can change the counsel at any time", [Beat patrol, WM=3.18; Compact personnel, WM=3.20; and Arresting officers, WM=2.91].

Table 13.

Summary of mean, verbal interpretations, standard deviations assessment of the Beat Patrol, Compact personnel, and Arresting Officer respondents on the observance of Miranda warning during arrest by PNP personnel in terms of Informing the arrestee to be provided with counsel if he cannot afford

Informing the arrestee to be provided with counsel if he cannot afford	**Beat Patrol Personnel**			**Compact personnel**			**Arresting Officers**		
	WM	VI	SD	WM	VI	SD	WM	VI	SD
1)The Arresting Police Officer informs the suspect of his/her entitlement to be provided with a counsel if he/she cannot afford to have one	2.74	A	.768	3.00	A	.681	2.97	A	.641
2) The Arresting Police Officer informs the suspect that the counsel to be provided to him/her shall be free of charge	3.08	A	.694	2.60	A	.768	3.03	A	.638
3) The Arresting Police Officer informs the suspect that he/she has the right to terminate the counsel if bias is manifested	3.02	A	.721	3.06	A	.644	2.98	A	.633
4) The Arresting Police Officer informs the suspect that he/she has the right to change the counsel at any time	2.83	A	.728	3.16	A	.616	3.05	A	.639
5) The Arresting Police Officer informs the suspect that he/she has the right to recant any statement should he/she wish to	3.48	A	.619	3.45	A	.582	2.83	A	.728
Overall	**3.48**	**A**		**3.45**	**A**		**2.83**	**A**	

Legend: 3.51-4.00 – Strongly Agree (SA)/Always Observed (AO), 2.51-3.50 – Agree (A)/Sometimes Observed (SO), 1.51-2.50 – Disagree (DA)/Rarely Observed (RO), 1.00-1.50 – Strongly Disagree (SDA)/Not Observed (NO)

Table 13 shows that PNP personnel sometimes observed the Miranda warning of Informing the arrestee to be provided with counsel if he cannot afford as per the assessment of the Beat Patrol, Compact personnel, and Arresting Officer respondents, with overall mean ratings of 3.45; 3.35; and 2.93, respectively, which are under verbal interpretations of all agree (A). As presented, of all the indicators on Informing the arrestee to be provided with counsel if he cannot afford it, number 3 statement, which states that "3) The Arresting Police Officer informs the suspect that he/she has the right to terminate the counsel if biased is manifested" was rated by the three groups of respondents the highest, [Beat patrol, WM=3. 02; Compact personnel, WM=3.06; and Arresting officers, WM=2.98]. On the other hand, there is one statement was rated the lowest among the five indicators, to wit: "2) The Arresting Police Officer informs the suspect that the counsel to be provided to him/her shall be free of charge", [Beat patrol, WM=3.08; Compact personnel, WM=2.60; and Arresting officers, WM=3.03]. The significant difference in the assessment of the Beat Patrol, Compact personnel, and Arresting Officer respondents on the observance of Miranda warning by PNP personnel in terms of informing the arrestee to remain silent, informing the arrestee to counsel, and informing the arrestee to be provided with counsel if he cannot afford it is presented in **Table 14** below.

Table 14.

ANOVA shows the significant difference in the assessment of the Beat Patrol, Compact personnel, and Arresting Officer respondents on the Factors Affecting Reasonable Use of Force by PNP personnel in terms of individual, situational; and organizational factors.

ANOVA[a]

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	1.892	4	.473	1.374	.243[b]
	Residual	97.462	283	.344		
	Total	99.355	287			

a. Dependent Variable: LE_MEAN

b. Predictors: (Constant), MR_MEAN, SP_MEAN, OP_MEAN, IP_MEAN

The significant relationship in the assessment of the Beat Patrol, Compact personnel, and Arresting Officer respondents on the factors of the use of reasonable force and observance of Miranda warning during arrest by the PNP personnel is presented in Table 15.

Table 15.

*Significant relationship in the assessment of the Beat Patrol, Compact personnel, and Arresting Officer respondents on the factors of the use of reasonable force and observance of Miranda warning during arrest by the PNP personnel***.**

Correlations

		LE_MEAN	IP_MEAN	SP_MEAN	OP_MEAN	MR_MEAN
Pearson Correlation	LE_MEAN	1.000	-.092	-.031	-.085	.008
	IP_MEAN	-.092	1.000	.731	.591	.188
	SP_MEAN	-.031	.731	1.000	.678	.138
	OP_MEAN	-.085	.591	.678	1.000	.376
	MR_MEAN	.008	.188	.138	.376	1.000
Sig. (1-tailed)	LE_MEAN	.	.060	.301	.076	.445
	IP_MEAN	.060	.	.000	.000	.001
	SP_MEAN	.301	.000	.	.000	.010
	OP_MEAN	.076	.000	.000	.	.000
	MR_MEAN	.445	.001	.010	.000	.
N	LE_MEAN	288	288	288	288	288
	IP_MEAN	288	288	288	288	288
	SP_MEAN	288	288	288	288	288
	OP_MEAN	288	288	288	288	288
	MR_MEAN	288	288	288	288	288

Correlation analysis was conducted to examine the strength and direction of relationships between variables. In this study, a significance level of 0.05 was set, meaning that correlations with p-values below 0.05 were considered statistically significant. Table 8 presents the correlation matrix of these variables.

Table 15 highlights that the strongest correlation was found between Individual Predictors and Enhanced Law Enforcement, with a weak correlation coefficient of 0.092. This was followed by Organizational Predictor, Situational Predictor, and Observance of Miranda Warnings, with coefficients of 0.085, 0.031, and 0.008, respectively. In summary, there is a significant correlation between the predictors, the observance of Miranda warnings, and enhanced law enforcement. The main objective of the study is to determine the relationship between factors influencing the reasonable use of force and the observance of Miranda warnings during arrests by PNP personnel, with the goal of providing input for improved law enforcement strategies. These strategies (dependent variable) are specifically focused on Beat Patrol Personnel, Compact Personnel, and Arresting Officers (independent variables) and are further limited by rank, educational attainment, years of service, and police station. Factors such as the use of force during arrests and Miranda warning observance act as moderating variables.

Multiple regression analysis (MRA) was employed to test the predictive power of the independent variables—work designation, individual predictors, organizational predictors, situational predictors, and Miranda warning observance—on the dependent variable, which is enhanced law enforcement strategies. MRA helps determine which factors are associated with improved law enforcement strategies among non-commissioned police officers in Davao City. Before testing the model's fit, assumptions of homoscedasticity, collinearity, and sufficient observations were checked to ensure the independent variables (individual, organizational, and situational predictors, as well

as Miranda warning observance) significantly impacted the dependent variable (enhanced law enforcement strategies). The collinearity test revealed that the highest variance inflation factor (VIF) was 2.770 for Situational Predictors, while the lowest was 1.204 for Observance of Miranda Warnings. Since these VIF values are below 10, there is no multicollinearity issue.

The MRA results showed that the significant independent variables, Situational Predictors and Individual Predictors, could explain 20.9% of the variance in the dependent variable (Enhanced Law Enforcement). The strongest correlation, though weak, was between Individual Predictors and Enhanced Law Enforcement at 0.092, followed by Organizational Predictor, Situational Predictor, and Observance of Miranda Warnings with correlations of 0.085, 0.031, and 0.008, respectively. This indicates a significant relationship between the predictors, Miranda warning observance, and enhanced law enforcement.

Recommendations for the use of reasonable force in arrests were summarized in Table 16, based on the study findings, and intended to guide law enforcement practices. The study, conducted in Davao City, involved PNP personnel from various police stations, including Beat Patrol, Compact Patrol, and Arresting Officers. Factors such as individual, situational, and organizational predictors are sometimes considered by PNP personnel during arrests.

The following key points were also noted: (1) Male police officers are more likely to use reasonable force during arrests; (2) A college education has an impact on officers' behavior in police operations and arrests; (3) Active aggression from suspects, with the ability to carry out a threat or assault, justifies the use of physical force. Some respondents admitted that they are quick to use force in critical and dangerous situations.

The Miranda warning, which includes informing suspects of their right to remain silent and their right to counsel, is sometimes observed during arrests. However, statements like "The arresting officer informs the suspect of their right to remain silent" and "The arresting officer informs the suspect that counsel will be provided free of charge" were rated the lowest in terms of compliance.

There is a significant difference in how the three groups (Beat Patrol, Compact Patrol, and Arresting Officers) assessed the observance of Miranda warnings, particularly in terms of informing suspects of their right to silence and access to counsel. A significant relationship was found between the factors influencing the use of reasonable force and the observance of Miranda warnings during arrests by PNP personnel.

Based on these findings, the researcher recommends the following actions for PNP leadership: (1) Establish written policies to guide all PNP personnel during arrests; (2) Ensure male officers use reasonable force during operations; (3) Provide continuous education and training for officers; (4) Use physical force when suspects exhibit aggressive behavior; (5) Ensure suspects are informed of their right to remain silent; and (6) Ensure suspects are informed that counsel will be provided free of charge. These recommendations, outlined in Table 16, aim to enhance law enforcement operations.

Table 16.

Recommendations proposed on the use of reasonable force in effecting arrest on suspected criminals to serve as a basis for enhanced law enhancement operations.

Recommendations proposed on the use of reasonable force in effecting arrest on suspected criminals to serve as a basis for enhanced law enhancement operations.		
Factors on the Use of Reasonable Force and Observance of Miranda Warnings during Arrest of suspected criminals	**Findings**	**Recommendations**
Individual Predictors	"5) When conducting police operations and apprehending criminal suspects, male police officers are more likely to use reasonable force", was rated lowest.	a. When conducting police operations and apprehending criminal suspects, male police officers shall use reasonable force.
Individual Predictors	"6) Education, particularly having a college diploma as a minimal prerequisite, has an impact on police disposition when conducting police operations and apprehending criminal suspects", was rated lowest.	b. Continuous education and training for law enforcement personnel.

Situational Predictors	"2) I was more likely to use reasonable force when the crime suspects were in their middle age (36 to 55 years old) during a police operation and arrest a crime suspect", was rated lowest.	c. Active aggression coupled with the present ability to carry out the threat or assault, should be physically restrained with force.
Organizational Predictors	2) I am quick to use physical force in situations where the incident is critical and dangerous", was rated lowest.	d. To be quick to use physical force in situations where the incident is critical and dangerous.
Miranda warning of informing the suspect to remain silent	"1) The arresting police officer informs the suspect that he/she has the right to remain silent", was rated lowest.	e. The arresting police officer informs the suspect that he/she has the right to remain silent.
The Miranda warning of informing the arrestee to be provided with counsel if he cannot afford	"2)The Arresting Police Officer informs the suspect that the counsel to be provided to him/her shall be free of charge", was rated the lowest	f. The Arresting Police Officer should inform the suspect/s that the counsel to be provided to him/her shall be free of charge.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The researcher sincerely expresses his gratitude to all those who have contributed greatly to both my personal and professional endeavors; **DR. ARMANDO E. ABEJUELA, MNSA,** my adviser, through his guidance, direction, corrections, instruction and cooperation, the study became a reality; PMAJ NOEL B VILLAHERMOSA, Talomo Police Station –Station Commander, for allowing the researcher to conduct a study involving the police non-commissioned officers and the detainees of his station; my panel members, for their genuine assistance and pieces of advice which have seen this project work a reality; my classmates and colleagues, most specially NUP Javy Ann G. Arances, for the support and by providing a helping a hand to make this paper possible; and my family, Mercedita Refugio, and Shiela Mae Arcalas, for their sacrifices not only during my undergraduate and graduate program, but throughout my life.

REFERENCES

Aisyah, M. (2018). Islamic bank service quality and its impact on Indonesian customers' satisfaction and loyalty. *Al-Iqtishad Journal of Islamic Economics*, 2018 - smartlib.umri.ac.id

Bartolome, T. (2019). OPINION: Miranda warning. Retrieved from Project Jurisprudence: https://www.projectjurisprudence.com/2019/09/miranda-warning.html

Boivin, R. (2017). Correlates of subject(ive) resistance in police use-of-force situations. *Policing: An International Journal*, ISSN: 1363-951X.

Bradford, B., Yesberg, J. A., Jackson, J., & Dawson, P. (2020). LIVE FACIAL RECOGNITION: TRUST AND LEGITIMACY AS PREDICTORS OF PUBLIC SUPPORT FOR POLICE USE OF NEW TECHNOLOGY. *BRITISH JOURNAL OF CRIMINOLOGY*; *60*(6), 1502-1522, 10.1093/bjc/azaa032.

Chicco, D., Warrens, M.J., & Jurman, G. (2021). The coefficient of determination R-squared is more informative than SMAPE, MAE, MAPE, MSE and RMSE in regression analysis evaluation. *PeerJ Computer Science*, 2021 - peerj.com

Deller, C., & Deller, S. C. (2019). Women in Law Enforcement and Police Use of Deadly Force. *Women & Criminal Justice. 29*(3)

Department of Labor and Employment, Labor Codes of the Philippines, Article 83 of the Labor Code, Book Three Conditions Of Employment Title I Working Conditions And Rest Periods Chapter I Hours Of Work.

Edwards, F., Lee, H., & Esposito, M. (2019). Risk of being killed by police use of force in the United States by age, race-ethnicity, and sex. School of Criminal Justice, Rutgers University, Newark, NJ 07102, vol. 116 no. 34 16793-16798, https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1821204116.

Engel, R. S., Worden, R. E., Corsaro, N., McManus, H. D., Reynolds, D., Cochran, H., . . . Cherkauskas, J. C. (2019). Explaining the Decision to Arrest. *The Power to Arrest*, 29-74.

Garner, J. H., Hickman, M. J., Malega, R. W., & Maxwell, C. D. (2018). Progress toward national estimates of police use of force. PLoS ONE 13(2): e0192932, https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0192932.

Gerber, M. M., & Jackson, J. (2017). Justifying violence: legitimacy, ideology and public support for police use of force. *Psychology, Crime & Law ; 23*(1), https://doi.org/10.1080/1068316X.2016.1220556.

Girgenti-Malone, A. A., Khoder, C., Vega, G., & Castillo, D. (2017). College students' perceptions of police use of force: do suspect race and ethnicity matter. *Police Practice and Research, 18*(5), 492-506.

Hine, K. A., Porter, L. E., Westera, N. J., & Alpert, G. P. (2018). Too much or too little? Individual and situational predictors of police force relative to suspect resistance. *Policing and Society, 28*(5), 587-604.

Hine, K. A., Porter, L. E., Westera, N. J., Alpert, G. P., & Allen, A. (2018). Exploring Police Use of Force Decision-Making Processes and Impairments Using a Naturalistic Decision-Making Approach. *CRIMINAL JUSTICE AND BEHAVIOR, 45*(11), 1782–1801, https://doi.org/10.1177/0093854818789726.

Hine, K. A., Porter, L. E., Westera, N. J., Alpert, G. P., & Allen, A. (2019). What were they thinking? Factors influencing police recruits' decisions about force. *Policing and Society: An International Journal of Research and Policy*, *29*(6), https://doi.org/10.1080/10439463.2018.1432612.

Huey, L. (2018). What do we know about in-service police training? Results of a failed systematic review. *Sociology Publications* 40, https://ir.lib.uwo.ca/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1043&context=sociologypub.

Human Rights Watch. (2018). Human Rights Watch. Retrieved from https://www.hrw.org/world-report/2018/country-chapters /philippines

Johnson, O., Gilbert, K., & Ibrahim, H. (2018). RACE, GENDER, AND THE CONTEXTS OF UNARMED FATAL. *Fatal Interactions with the Police Study (FIPS).*

Kramer, R., & Remster, B. (2018). Stop, Frisk, and Assault? Racial Disparities in Police Use of Force During Investigatory Stops. *Law & Society Review, 52*(4), https://doi.org/10.1111/lasr.12366.

LeCount, R. J. (2017). More black than blue? Comparing the racial attitudes of police to Citizens. Sociological Forum 32:1051–1072.

Mangels, L., Suss, J., & Lande , B. (2020). Police Expertise and Use of Force: Using a Mixed-Methods Approach to Model Expert and Novice Use-of-Force Decision-Making. *Springer Link: Journal of Police and Criminal Psychology, 35*, pages294–303.

Morgan, M., Logan, M., & Olma, T. (2020). Police use of force and suspect behavior: An inmate perspective. *Journal of criminal justice*, 67, 101673.

Morrow, W. J., Nuño, L. E., & Mulvey, P. (2018). Examining the situational and suspect-level predictors of police use of force among a juvenile arrestee population. *Justice Policy Journal, 15*(1), 1-22.

NAPOLCOM. (n.d.). NAPOLCOM.

Nouri, S. (2021). Police use of force at street segments: Do street-level characteristics matter? *Journal of Criminal Justice, 77*, November–December 2021, 101862.

Nowacki, J. S., & Spencer, T. (2019). Police discretion, organizational characteristics, and traffic stop: An analysis of racial disparity in Illinois. *International Journal of Police Science & Management. 21*(1), page(s): 4-16, https://doi.org/10.1177/1461355719832617.

Paoline, E. A., Gau, J. M., & Terrill, W. (2018). Race and the Police Use of Force Encounter in the United States. *The British Journal of Criminology, 58*(1), January 2018, Pages 54–74, https://doi.org/10.1093/bjc/azw089.

Philippine National Police. (2021). Philippine National Police Manual.

Ritchie, A. J. (2019). Invisible no more: police violence against Black women and women of color. *Policing and Society: An International Journal of Research and Policy, 29*(7), https://doi.org/10.1080/10439463.2019.1650746.

Rohma, N., Hariyono, M., & Shofiyuddin, M. (2018). Implementation of Google Forms in ECE to Face Digital Era. *Advances in Social Science, Education and Humanities Research, 249*

Smith, R. J. (2018). The continuing misuse of null hypothesis significance testing in biological anthropology. *American Journal of Physical Anthropology*, 2018 - Wiley Online Library

Soss, J., & Weaver, V. (2017). Learning from Ferguson: Policing, race, and class in American politics. *Annu. Rev. Polit. Sci, 20*, 565–591.

UCLA Police Department. (2022). UCLA Police Department. Retrieved from UCLA Police Department: https://www.police.ucla.edu/other/use-of-force

United States Commission on Civil Rights. (2018). United States Commission on Civil Rights. Retrieved from https://www.state.gov/reports/2018-country-reports-on-human-rights-practices/

Ward, G. (2018). Living histories of white supremacist policing: Towards transformative justice. *Du Bois Review: Social Science Research on Race, 15*(1), 167-184.

Wolfe, S., Rojek, J., McLean, K., & Alpert, G. (2020). Social Interaction Training to Reduce Police Use of Force. *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 687*(1), Pages 124-145, https://doi.org/10.1177/0002716219887366.

Yesberg, J. A., & Bradford, B. (2019). Affect and trust as predictors of public support for armed police: evidence from London. *Policing and Society: An International Journal of Research and Policy*, https://doi.org/10.1080/10439463.2018.1488847.

Yesberg, J. A., Kyprianides, A., Bradford, B., Milani, J., Quinton, P., & Clark-Darby, O. (2021). *Race and support for police use of force: findings from the UK. Policing and Society*, 1-18.