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The Decision to Escalate Incidents to Law Enforcement: Pros and Cons

The decision of whether to escalate incidents to law enforcement is one of the most contested

and complex considerations for organizations, schools, healthcare systems, and even individual

citizens. While law enforcement agencies play an essential role in maintaining public safety,

their involvement often brings a series of consequences that extend beyond immediate incident

management. This paper explores the benefits and drawbacks of involving law enforcement in

escalated incidents, using scholarly resources and institutional guidelines to ground the

analysis. Ultimately, the question revolves around balancing accountability, deterrence, and

justice against concerns such as over-criminalization, disproportionate impacts on vulnerable

communities, and the strain on relationships between stakeholders.

Pros of Law Enforcement Involvement

One of the most important benefits of law enforcement involvement is deterrence. The presence

of law enforcement signals that an incident has crossed a threshold where consequences will be

serious and potentially legal. According to the U.S. Department of Justice (2021), escalation to

law enforcement reinforces accountability and upholds community safety standards. In workplace

or institutional settings, this involvement often sends a clear message that misconduct—whether

violent behavior, fraud, or harassment—will not be tolerated.

Another advantage is access to investigative expertise. Law enforcement has training, tools,

and resources unavailable to most organizations. This includes forensic analysis, interrogation

skills, and interagency connections that strengthen investigations (Carter & Carter, 2009). For

example, in cases involving cybercrime, workplace violence, or theft, internal security or HR

departments may lack the resources to fully investigate the situation. Law enforcement provides

legitimacy and procedural safeguards that ensure evidence is properly documented and cases can

move forward in the judicial system.

Additionally, involving law enforcement can protect organizations from liability. If an

organization attempts to handle a serious incident internally and fails, it may face accusations

of negligence. Legal precedent shows that institutions that fail to escalate certain issues—such

as threats of violence or serious assaults—risk reputational harm and financial damages (Braga,

Papachristos, & Hureau, 2014). Thus, involving law enforcement can serve as a shield against

legal and ethical backlash, particularly in environments such as healthcare, education, and

corporate offices.

Cons of Law Enforcement Involvement

Despite these benefits, law enforcement involvement is not without significant drawbacks. A key

concern is the potential for over-criminalization. Not all incidents warrant criminal charges,

yet once law enforcement is engaged, discretion may narrow. Minor misconduct or conflicts that

could be resolved through mediation might instead result in permanent criminal records (Kupchik,

2010). This outcome can disproportionately harm marginalized groups and young people, creating

long-term barriers to employment, education, and housing.

Another major drawback is the erosion of trust. For communities that already experience strained

relationships with law enforcement, escalation can deepen fear and resentment (Tyler & Fagan,

2008). In educational settings, for instance, research shows that heavy reliance on police has

contributed to the “school-to-prison pipeline,” where disciplinary issues that could be resolved

through restorative practices instead lead to arrests and legal consequences (Skiba et al.,

2011). This dynamic undermines efforts to build supportive and inclusive environments.

Law enforcement involvement may also escalate rather than de-escalate conflicts. The presence

of officers, particularly armed ones, can intensify emotions and increase the risk of physical

confrontation (Braga et al., 2014). In healthcare settings, for example, involving law

enforcement during psychiatric emergencies has sometimes led to excessive use of force instead

of therapeutic intervention (Livingston, 2016). Thus, escalation must be carefully weighed

against the risk of exacerbating the situation.

Balancing Considerations

The decision to escalate requires a nuanced evaluation of context, severity, and alternatives.

Lipovac and Babac’s (2021) discussion of content analysis in job advertisements highlights a

useful framework here: organizational texts and policies often emphasize branding, legitimacy,

and authority. Similarly, involving law enforcement can serve as a performative gesture to

signal seriousness and organizational values. However, like the overuse of branding in job ads,

automatic reliance on police can obscure more nuanced and effective solutions.

Instead, many organizations adopt a tiered response system. Lower-level incidents may be handled

through internal investigation, mediation, or restorative practices, while only severe cases—

such as violent crime or threats to life—are escalated to law enforcement. This layered approach

balances accountability with fairness and reduces unnecessary criminalization (Livingston,

2016).

Conclusion

The decision to escalate incidents to law enforcement involves weighing serious trade-offs. On

one hand, police involvement provides deterrence, legitimacy, investigative expertise, and

protection from liability. On the other, it risks over-criminalization, loss of trust, and

escalation of conflict. Research shows that a balanced, context-driven approach is most effective.

Organizations must ensure their policies are not rigidly punitive but instead allow for

flexibility, cultural sensitivity, and proportionality. In doing so, they protect both safety and

the long-term well-being of their communities.
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