

2015

Body-Worn Cameras: A Step Toward Trust and Legitimacy for Campus Police

Jaycee Elliott
Portland State University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/honorstheses>

Let us know how access to this document benefits you.

Recommended Citation

Elliott, Jaycee, "Body-Worn Cameras: A Step Toward Trust and Legitimacy for Campus Police" (2015).
University Honors Theses. Paper 146.
<https://doi.org/10.15760/honors.141>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access. It has been accepted for inclusion in University Honors Theses by an authorized administrator of PDXScholar. Please contact us if we can make this document more accessible: pdxscholar@pdx.edu.

Body-Worn Cameras: A Step Toward Trust and Legitimacy for Campus Police.

by

Jaycee Elliott

An undergraduate honors thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the

requirements for the degree of

Bachelor of Science

in

University Honors

and

Criminology/Criminal Justice

Thesis Advisor

Dr. Kris Henning

Table of Contents

Abstract	3
Background	4
Research Questions	15
Methods.....	15
Literature Review.....	16
Theoretical Applications and Empirical Support (RQ1)	16
Concerns of Body-Worn Cameras (RQ2).....	29
Characteristics of Campus Policing (RQ3).....	34
Body-Worn Cameras and Campus Policing (RQ4)	43
Conclusion	47
Bibliography	49

Abstract

Throughout history, police-community relations have often been called into question. In an era of instantaneous communication through social media and other outlets, media coverage of events involving perceived police misconduct can have an instant impact on the public trust of the police and their perceptions of the police as legitimate. Just as evolving technology can have a negative impact on perceptions of the police, officer body-worn cameras present departments with a novel outlet to rebuild and maintain trust and legitimacy within their communities. As campus law enforcement agencies continue to be tasked with the equivalent roles of their municipal counterparts, the impacts of trust and legitimacy trickle upon campus police officers. The purpose of this paper is to assess the value of implementing body-worn cameras in modern policing, with a particular focus on campus policing, through relevant research from multiple disciplines of criminal justice, sociology, psychology, and law.

Background

Police Legitimacy

Public cooperation with the police is a vital element of efficient and effective policing. When the public is willing to assist officers in their endeavors to control crime they engage in partnership between citizens and the police, enhancing the principles of community policing by engaging police as public servants rather than crime fighters. A citizen's willingness to cooperate with the police is influenced by two main components, the citizen's trust in the police and his perception that the police are legitimate in their endeavors to control crime. Consequently, police officers must make every effort to ensure that the public trusts them and perceives them as legitimate. For the purposes of this paper *legitimacy* can best be defined as, "a property of an authority or institution that leads people to feel that that authority or institution is entitled to be deferred to and obeyed" (Sunshine & Tyler, 2003). Experts cite procedural justice, "laws and procedures meant to safeguard against error in the application of justice" (Pollock, 2014), as "the primary driver of perceptions of legitimacy" (Sunshine et al., 2003). Additionally, procedural justice has a large impact on the creation and maintenance of legitimacy of police (Tyler and Fagan, 2008).

Researchers have investigated several factors that influence public confidence in police such as race and age; confidence has been used as a measure of trust throughout research because it is easily articulable in surveys (Sherman, 2001; Walker & Katz, 2013; Tyler, 2005; Kappeler & Gaines, 2011). Their findings concluded that perceptions of police confidence can vary by race and age. According to a report released by the NCJRS, 61% of whites surveyed were

confident in the police, whereas only 34% of blacks surveyed expressed that same level of confidence (Sherman, 2001). In 2011, “24% of African Americans had little or no confidence in the police compared with 6% of whites” (Walker & Katz, 2013). Tyler’s work on levels of police trust and ethnic groups drew similar conclusions, “White respondents expressed higher levels of trust and confidence than did minority respondents. Among minority groups, Hispanics expressed intermediate positions between Whites and African Americans.” (Tyler, 2005).

Age is also an influencing factor when measuring public trust and confidence in the police. Criminologists recognize an aging out effect that decreases the likelihood that a person will engage in criminal activity as they grow older, and in turn have a negative encounter with the police. Simultaneously, older people are more likely to possess greater fear of crime than younger people and this bridges the police as their allies thus increasing their trust. Researchers report that 64% of people over the age of 50 possess a great deal of confidence in police, whereas only 52% of people aged 18-29 possess a great deal of confidence in the police (Kappeler & Gaines, 2011).

Influences on Legitimacy

Since legitimacy is necessary for efficient and effective law enforcement and since is impacted across multiple factors of the population, such as race and age, it is necessary to understand what impacts perceptions of police legitimacy within the community. In terms of police legitimacy and trust, public perception can be influenced directly through personal contact with officers and indirectly through the retelling of an encounter with police by peers or a media outlet, in turn impacting their willingness to cooperate with the police. If the public fails to view the police as legitimate and lack trust in the police then they will be less likely to assist them in their efforts.

Direct impacts. Legitimacy of the police is influenced at a micro level by an individual through her own encounters and experiences with the police. As discussed earlier, scholars regard procedural justice as the most significant legitimacy influencer. Procedural justice is held in such regard because officers are held to an ethical standard in society based upon the powers that are allocated to them. Procedural justice does not refer to what laws officers are upholding; rather it focuses on how the officer upholds the law. What level of force is used? Why is a citizen being stopped? Does the officer engage citizens in a civil manner and give a person a reasonable benefit of the doubt? What means does an officer use to obtain answers needed? These are some of the questions addressed when looking at procedural justice. If the very officer that is supposed to uphold the laws in society is engaging in misconduct or illegal activity, the public will diminish an officer's credibility and legitimacy. If a person has a direct contact with an officer and believes the officer is engaging them in a way that is disrespectful, discriminatory, or illegal then the person may feel that the police are illegitimate. Conversely an officer may uphold the laws in a civil and just manner that serves as an example for members of a community and thus enhancing police legitimacy. Also officers conducting an encounter with a citizen that behave professionally and treat the citizen with respect may enhance their legitimacy.

Researchers have indicated that officers can enhance their legitimacy by performing their duties in a fair and neutral manner (Mazerolle, Antrobus, Bennett, & Tyler, 2013). Officers exhibiting certain behaviors such as explaining their actions to a citizen, listening to a citizen, distributing justice fairly, and being neutral throughout an encounter are have the potential to enhance their legitimacy as a citizen is more likely to accept officers' decisions under these circumstances (Mazerolle et al., 2013; Tyler, 2004). Conversely, the absence of these behaviors

in an encounter may lead a citizen to question the intent and fairness of an officer, leading them to believe they are falling victim to misconduct or profiling.

Indirect impacts. Police legitimacy is also influenced indirectly through the retelling of incidents of misconduct by members of the public, local media, or even when local incidents springboard to national media and gain national attention. These displays have the potential to impact the police legitimacy across much of law enforcement regardless of whether an incident occurred in a local setting or some far off place. The retelling of the incident allows the public to experience the incident vicariously whether it occurred in the modern day or it is discussed as a segment of history. The state of police trust and legitimacy has been impacted by key events throughout history. Context regarding these historical events is presented here in three categories (1) police-community relations of the mid-twentieth century, (2) Supreme Court responses to police, and (3) modern police events affecting legitimacy.

Police-community relations of the mid-twentieth century. The establishment of the Kerner Commission in 1967 exemplifies the racial discrimination of the 1960s between white police officers and black citizens that diminished both police legitimacy and trust. White officers patrolling black ghettos throughout the civil rights movement became symbolic of white power (Walker & Katz, 2013) and continued to drive a racial divide in society despite the legislative efforts to bridge this divide. According to studies on deadly force during the civil rights era, “police officers shot and killed African American citizens about eight times as often as white citizens” (Walker et al., 2013). Protests and riots in the summer of 1967 in Detroit and Newark were sparked in part by the police’s racial profiling of black citizens and the police brutality they suffered. These continued incidents regarding police acts of physical aggression and profiling, or conducting a stop upon a citizen based upon their race, ethnicity, gender, or other unique

identifier, without ramification for the police's actions left blacks in a state of disenfranchisement. As a result the protests in Detroit and Newark turned into violent riots that lead to deployment of the National Guard in order to help police the riots. The decision to use deadly force by the police and National Guard involved in these riots left many protesters dead and others with a strengthened animosity for the police. Again in 1970, the National Guard was also called to assist in the policing of protesters at Kent State who did not support the United States' involvement in the Vietnam War. On May 4, 1970, the National Guard fired shots into a crowd of unarmed college protestors that left four dead and nine wounded.

Supreme Court responses to police. In the 1960's the climate of civil unrest fueled a series of landmark Supreme Court cases that addressed police practices and procedural justice in order to attempt to ensure due process. For instance in the 1961 Supreme Court case *Mapp v. Ohio*, the Court reacted to the unreasonable searches of police in accordance of the 4th Amendment and held that evidence obtained as the result of an illegal search may not be admitted into a court of law. Another Supreme Court case in 1966, *Miranda v. Arizona* continued to outline certain actions of police as unconstitutional. In this case the Court held that prior to any questioning of an arrested individual, he must be notified of his Fifth Amendment protections against self-incrimination and his Sixth Amendment right to have an attorney present throughout the criminal justice process. This case rested on the facts that the police failed to inform Miranda of his rights and obtained a confession, after initially denying his guilt, from him after a two hour interrogation. These cases demonstrate the Supreme Court's coinciding opinion that police were engaging in illegitimate practices and failed to carry out procedural justice and due process.

A third pivotal Supreme Court case in 1968, *Terry v. Ohio*, addressed policing practices in the height of the civil unrest in the 1960s. Contrary to the two prior cases, the Court's holding established a lower threshold under which officers may execute searches, thus expanding the police's power. The Court held that a limited search may be conducted by an officer as long as the officer possesses a reasonable suspicion, the new lowered threshold, that the person is armed in order to ensure officer safety. Evidence obtained from a *Terry* stop, as the search is now referred, is not subject to the exclusionary rules applied in *Mapp v. Ohio*. Some believe that this ruling enables officers to operate under racially discriminatory contexts such as racial profiling in their daily encounters thus diminishing police legitimacy (Katz, 2001).

Modern police events affecting legitimacy. The Rodney King incident with the Los Angeles Police Department (LAPD) in 1991 portrays an example of excessive force used by police. After leading over 20 officers on a high speed chase, Rodney King was removed from his vehicle and tasered twice. Simultaneously, two officers proceeded to use physical force against him that resulted King suffering a broken cheekbone, fractured eye socket, internal organ damage, and permanent brain damage. As other responding officers looked on, an amateur videographer caught the incident on camera and it played across national media (Kappeler & Gaines, 2011).

In addition to the paramount attention given to excessive force issues in policing, trust in police and police legitimacy have often been adversely affected by the coverage regarding the disproportionate police contacts with minority populations. Modern cases such as *Floyd v City of New York* continue to shed light on the disproportionate number of minority contacts and the practice of racial profiling. According to the statistics gleaned from the New York Police Department's (NYPD) *Terry* stop forms by Dr. Fagan, the plaintiff's liability expert in the case,

4.4 million people were stopped by the NYPD from 2004 to 2012. Of those 4.4 million people stopped, 52% were black, 31% were Hispanic, and 10% were white. Fagan goes on to explain that the demographic characteristics of the resident population of New York City in 2010 was comprised roughly by 23% black, 29% Hispanic, and 33% white (*Floyd et al. v. City of New York et al.*, 2013). The disproportionate number of *Terry* stops by officers on minority populations displayed in this case continues to solidify the notion that police officers continue to abuse their discretionary powers and must be held accountable for their actions.

Modern police issues such as excessive force and racial discrimination continue to resonate with the historical issues presented earlier and are subject to instantaneous media coverage in an era of enhanced technology and social media. Currently distrust in the police is heightened with all of the coverage of officer use of excessive force against young black men. The incidents involving the police and citizens such as Michael Brown, Eric Garner, Walter Scott, and more has led the public to demand police accountability often sparking protests that turn to riots, expansive news coverage, and litigation (Basu & Karimi, 2014; Botelho, Yan, & Ford, 2015; Yan & Ford, 2015).

Legitimacy Enhancement

Traditionally, measures of police accountability have failed to enhance transparency with regard to officer conduct in questionable encounters (Greene, 2007). Accountability measures meant to ensure proper police conduct have often focused upon the oversight of individual officers. Greene concludes that previous research has uncovered four types of oversight that can be applied to law enforcement:

1. Using a fully external review model
 - a. Citizen review committees
2. Using internal police investigation and external review
 - a. Internal affairs
3. Using professional monitors
 - a. Police auditors
4. Using a combination of any of the three models presented above
(Greene, 2007).

These four methods of oversight have been applied to hold officers accountable for their conduct. However, how they obtain the evidence used to review incidents of officer misconduct may be subject to bias since other police officers within the department are often the ones conducting the investigations and collecting evidence for review. Often times, officers themselves are the ones recording and reporting their own use of force or conduct. However, oftentimes it might be difficult to recollect events as they unfolded to record. This may create recollection error when recording the events that may not be 100% accurate. However, this also creates an opportunity for officers to fabricate or present post-hoc justifications for their conduct. Furthermore, all of these methods fail to introduce a level of transparency that satisfies the needs of the public so that the department may maintain legitimacy and trust.

Body-worn cameras. Body-worn cameras (BWCs) have emerged as a potential solution to the evolving discussion around police trust and legitimacy issues, even reaching the highest levels of government. In fact, President Obama endorses the implementation of BWCs in policing and recently allocated \$263 million to a federal program seeking to help fund BWC implementation in local police departments nationwide (The White House Office of the Press

Secretary, 2014). Essentially a BWC is a video and audio recording device that a police officer wears as a piece of their uniform while performing their duties as an officer. Body-worn cameras come in multiple styles that can be mounted in multiple places on the officers' uniforms including their collars, a breast pockets, or even the frame of a pair of glasses. These devices are designed to record the events leading up to and during a police officer's encounters with the people he serves. Providing an officer's point of view from the cameras enables a review committee to objectively determine if an officer's actions were socially desirable or not. Body-worn cameras have the potential to provide objectively transparent evidence that can diminish any desire for fellow officers to cover up misconduct of another officer. Rather than asking officers about another officer's conduct in an incident in question, an auditor can simply play the recordings from the BWCs of officers present during the incident. This would eliminate the subculture within policing that encourages a unity of officers versus the public. In turn, by disseminating this subculture, police can grow to trust the public and the public them. Many police departments across the country are beginning pilot programs to test the technology, develop policies and procedures regarding the BWCs, and to assess the benefits and concerns of implementing such a novel technological advancement in police work.

Current camera use in policing. The use of cameras is not new in policing though, as the technology has become available and affordable, police have adopted Closed Circuit Television (CCTV) systems for surveillance, dashboard mounted police vehicle cameras, and even interrogation room cameras. According to the report released by the Bureau of Justice Statistics, 61% of all local police departments in the United States used cameras in their patrol cars (Reaves, 2010). Although 20 states and the District of Columbia have adopted mandates for recording certain interrogations (Kent & Carmichael, 2015), law enforcement in other states

often uses some sort of recording devices in interrogation rooms in order to ensure due process and procedural justice for the person being interrogated without a mandate in place. These cameras provide an objective view into the interaction between officers and citizens; however, since they are stationary in nature they possess a limited field of view that can only capture video in the direction that the camera is pointed, disabling it from capturing all the events throughout a police encounter with citizens. In the past few years the interest in these BWC technologies has exploded in the criminal justice field as legislators begin to propose bills that mandate the use of body-worn cameras, government agencies and field experts conduct pioneer studies on their implementation impacts, and the public seeks measures of accountability and transparency for the police as they perform their daily duties.

Campus Policing

As discussed throughout the background thus far, legitimacy of law enforcement is often called into question in the general public because of the direct and indirect influences on legitimacy. These influences have the ability to affect the perceptions of officer legitimacy nationwide despite the original location or agency involved in the incident in question especially when said incident escalates to the national media platform. This is especially true for the police at college and universities since these settings attract constituents that are encouraged to debate and dissent societal issues facing the country. Therefore, college and university police, also known as campus police, are subject to the same criticisms and perceptions regarding trust and legitimacy of their municipal counterparts despite their involvement or lack of involvement in a controversial encounter between a citizen and police. When the public's opinion is influenced by the misconduct of an officer in an individual incident, they likely form an opinion about all law enforcement officers. Thus these perceptions of the police are influenced by one or a few

incidents yet impact all law enforcement, creating a trickle-down effect to even campus police officers. This is evident when discussing the transformation of campus police departments from unarmed and power limited safety officers to departments with fully sworn and armed police officers. Portland State University's (PSU) Campus Public Safety Office is currently going through the planning stages of this transformation into a sworn and armed police department. Given the liberal nature of the school and its encouragement of dissent and debate, the transition has met resistance by some of the students of PSU concerned with the implications of deadly force in light of the historical context of the public and police across the United States. In order to provide some level of accountability and address these concerns, the Board of Trustees recommended the creation of a "University Public Safety Oversight Committee" consisting of a diverse array of campus constituents to handle complaints regarding policies and officer conduct (Board of Trustees, 2014).

Much research exists spanning decades regarding the legitimacy of police and public trust in police; however, there is a lack of published research regarding the implications that body-worn cameras have on police legitimacy and public trust. Additionally, much of the research regarding campus policing is outdated now and does not provide a sufficient understanding of the complexities campus police officers are facing in the modern era of technological advancement as it pertains to their legitimacy and the trust the public has in them. This paper will utilize research fields associated with police camera use and their impact on legitimacy and trust of the police to answer four specific research questions pertaining to body-worn camera benefits and concerns as they relate to the legitimacy of and public trust in general policing and then more specifically, campus policing.

Research Questions

- RQ1:** What theoretical and empirical support exists for using body-worn cameras to enhance police legitimacy?
- RQ2:** What are some of the concerns raised by the implementation of body-worn cameras with police legitimacy?
- RQ3:** What similarities and differences exist between campus policing and general policing?
- RQ4:** Are body-worn cameras a good idea for campus police?

Methods

Within criminal justice there is limited research available regarding modern campus policing and its composition. Even more scarce is research regarding the novel implementation of body-worn cameras in law enforcement. In light of these circumstances the purpose of this research seeks to discuss and synthesize a select field of topics that are relevant to campus policing and body-worn cameras in order to assess the worth of their implementation in campus policing as it relates to the public trust of police and perceptions of police legitimacy. The fields of study will come from multiple disciplines of study including criminology/criminal justice, sociology, psychology, and law. Sources presented to support claims will be published in peer-reviewed journals or government documents. Some news articles are utilized to demonstrate a few points regarding their coverage of police/citizen encounters; not for their factual content.

Literature Review

Theoretical Applications and Empirical Support (RQ1)

Theoretical and empirical research suggests that body-worn cameras have the potential to impact the issues revolving around police legitimacy and distrust by providing a measure of accountability and introducing an objective viewpoint that makes policing more transparent. The applicable theories discussed are Deterrence Theory, Routine Activities Theory, Objective Self-Awareness Theory and Situational Crime Prevention Theory. Analysis of these theories will be framed by defining the theory and then discussing how body-worn cameras impact the behavior of officers and citizens. Following the discussion of theoretical application of BWCs, empirical support is presented regarding camera use in law enforcement and pioneer studies focused on BWC implementation.

Deterrence Theory. Jeremy Bentham, a proponent of utilitarianism, believed that punishment in itself was evil and should only be used to prevent a greater evil (Williams & McShane, 2010). This means that the only purpose for punishment is the deterrence of future crime. There are two types of deterrence that differentiate on who is being deterred as a result of potential sanctions. Specific deterrence gears its efforts of crime prevention toward the individual offender by introducing a punishment that will dissuade them from engaging in crime in the future. General deterrence is focused upon potential offenders, often attempting to prevent others from engaging in crime by diminishing the perceived rewards that a caught offender received. For Bentham, the three components of deterrence that impact its effectiveness, celerity, certainty, and severity. Celerity refers to the speed at which punishment is distributed to the

offender. Certainty addresses the likelihood that an offender is caught for engaging in criminal activity. Finally, severity refers to the proportionate sanctions against the offender for the crime committed. When any of these three criteria are enhanced, a person will be deterred from engaging in criminal or undesirable conduct.

Body-worn cameras have the ability to provide for both types of deterrence suggested by Bentham. Specific deterrent measures are in place when an officer or citizen encounter each other and the officer is wearing a BWC. General deterrence is addressed as long as the department is transparent in its use of BWCs. Much of the time police-community relations are publicized, it is due to an incident questioning the conduct of an officer. However, a department could combat some of the negative publicity presented in the media by publicizing the objective BWC footage relaying a message to would-be offenders, whether officers or citizens, of the presence of BWCs in policing. The new knowledge of BWC presence would impact the would-be offenders' understanding that their actions will be captured regardless of what events occur during a police-citizen encounter and thus deter their susceptibility to engage in criminal activities. Finally the three cornerstones of deterrence celerity, certainty, and severity have the potential to be impacted with BWC implementation.

With regard to the impact on officers, their conduct is susceptible of being captured by the BWC, nearly ensuring the certainty that any officer misconduct will be caught while the BWC is recording. This curtails an officer's ability to make post-hoc justifications for any misconduct since the recording is objective and enhances the fact-finder's ability to dole out sanctions with an appropriate level of severity. Providing an instantaneous objective viewpoint of an incident in question, BWCs have the potential to immediately exonerate or indict an officer whose conduct is called into question. Much of the research focused upon BWCs analyzes the

resolution of citizen complaints against officers wearing BWCs because it provides a measure of celerity when looking at the duration of time it takes to resolve a citizen complaint.

The deterrent impacts that BWCs create for citizens are similar to those of officers. Rather than looking at an officer's conduct during an encounter, the behavior of a citizen is scrutinized. Body-worn cameras increase the certainty that citizen's undesirable behavior will be captured and used as evidence against them. Also, the ability to view the objective recording of an incident will enhance celerity by expediting the legal dispute process because less time will be spent debating the facts of a case. Furthermore, just as they affect officers' punishment severity, BWCs enable a fact finder to apply punishment with proportionate severity to the crime committed by a citizen.

Routine Activities Theory (RAT). Felson and Cohen's Routine Activities Theory (RAT) was first applied to criminology in 1979. According to the theory crime can occur based upon a combination of three factors, the presence of a motivated offender, the presence of a potential victim, and the lack of a capable guardian (Williams & McShane, 2010). Essentially the theory states that if a motivated offender and potential victim are present, without the presence of a capable guardian, then a crime is likely to occur. This theory is impacted by ecological and environmental characteristics of an incident. If all three of these factors collide in an isolated area farther from society, the susceptibility of the crime occurring increases.

Officers are provided with benefits when BWCs are implemented under RAT. Essentially when a citizen is the aggressor in an encounter, and officer may have to use force to protect herself and the officer's credibility may be called into question. However, the presence of a BWC will provide the officers with a mobile guardian that will provide transparency and recall the events leading to the use of force.

Body-worn cameras have tangible benefits for the citizen involved in the collision of the three factors of crime outlined by RAT. In the scenarios often displayed in the media throughout history, people of minority races are often subject to racial profiling or excessive force used by the police. Historically they have been vulnerable and possessed feelings of disenfranchisement as the protests in the 1960s displayed. When these feelings are manifested in the community, detrimental outcomes occur for police and community relationships diminishing the trust of the police. According to MacDonald and Stokes, one way to address trust issues, especially with minority populations, is to “create greater transparency with regard to efforts at changing police practices relating to racially charged issues (e.g., racial profiling)” (Macdonald & Stokes, 2006). In these scenarios, the officer presents himself as the motivated offender targeting a potential victim in the absence of a capable guardian. To counteract this imbalance in the RAT triangle, BWCs present themselves as a capable guardian over the officer. This in turn takes away one factor in the RAT triangle by giving the citizen the benefit of the doubt that they are innocent. Even if the citizen encountered believes that the officer distrusts her, the implementation of the BWC in the scenario is a signal to the citizen that the department trusts her by implementing an accountability measure that enables the department to investigate any complaints by the citizen involving the officer’s conduct and legitimacy.



Figure 1: This is a depiction of the crime triangle presented by RAT where the officer is engaging in some sort of misconduct.

Objective Self-Awareness Theory (OAS). Objective Self-Awareness Theory (OSA) was initially developed by Wicklund and Duvall in 1972. According to OSA, an individual's susceptibility to alter her behavior is impacted by the level of self-awareness that she possesses. "Self-awareness may be increased by any stimulus that draws a person's attention to himself, e.g. a tape-recording of one's voice, or the presence of a mirror or camera" (Carver, 1975). When a person is aware of their behavior he will contemplate whether that behavior fits within socially

desirable bounds or socially unacceptable bounds. Accordingly, the person will be susceptible to conform to social norms, or engage in behavior that is socially desirable, when his self-awareness is heightened.

The implementation of body-worn cameras presents itself as a measure of heightened self-awareness for both police officers and citizens alike. When the camera is rolling, they will both contemplate their actions and heighten their self-awareness. This will dissuade undesirable behaviors from manifesting during an encounter. Carver's work with mirrors and aggressive behavior supports this theoretical claim. Based upon pretest surveys, Carver divided test subjects into two groups, high punitive and low punitive, depending on their views of punishment. Then he divided each of those groups into control and test groups. The test group subjects were placed in a room, possessing a mirror, and were instructed to ask another subject, actually a research confederate, a series of questions. For every wrong answer, individuals in the test group was instructed to deliver a finger shock to the questioned subject. The shock power ranged from 0-10 and each individual subject was provided the discretion to determine the shock level. The same process was repeated for individual subjects in the control group; however, the mirror was not present during their trials. Carver sought to address a person's susceptibility to engage in aggression when their self-awareness was heightened (e.g. the presence of the mirror). His results showed that the presence of the mirror did decrease the aggression levels of the individual administering the shock, especially in the high punitive category (Carver, 1975). Body-worn cameras have the potential to have the same effect in policing for both citizens and officers as the mirror in Carver's experiment had on the test subjects administering the shocks.

Situational Crime Prevention Theory. Situational Crime Prevention, is driven by the task of preventing the occurrence of crime and is "characterized as comprising three measures

(1) directed at highly specific forms of crime (2) that involve the management, design, or manipulation of the immediate environment in as systematic a way as possible (3) so as to reduce the opportunities for crime and increase its risks as perceived by a wide range of offenders” (Clarke, 1983). Essentially crime preventative strategies are implemented in a setting susceptible to crime that attempt to harden potential targets or victims. Rather than focusing on the reasons that a person engages in crime, it raises the stakes for committing the crime. These target hardening strategies cause an offender to believe that the likelihood of getting caught is high. An example of this is a burglar avoiding breaking into a house that clearly has an alarm system in place. The alarm system acts as a target hardening measure that makes carrying out the crime more difficult.

Body-worn cameras are also conveyed as a situational crime prevention strategy because of their characteristics of target hardening when discussing police-citizen encounters. When attempting to ensure officer legitimacy the presence of a BWC makes it more difficult to get away with any misconduct toward a citizen. This is because the recording captured by the BWC decreases the vulnerability of the citizen by hardening them as the potential target and provides her with the evidence necessary to dispute an officer’s conduct. If an officer attempts to racially profile a citizen and conduct a stop and frisk, it will all be caught on camera. This leads to a hardened target and dissuades an officer from rationally engaging in unethical conduct with a citizen or a citizen engaging in an antisocial way with an officer.

Situational crime prevention has been critiqued in the past for limited “ability to deal with highly mobile crimes” (Wortley, 2002). This is certainly true for most stationary surveillance efforts used as crime prevention techniques. However, BWCs are unique because their

attachment to an officer makes them mobile making Wortley's critique mute with regard to the prevention of crime and misconduct associated with police and citizen encounters.

Camera use in criminal justice. Three main camera applications in criminal justice, closed circuit television (CCTV), interrogation room cameras, and dashboard mounted cameras in police vehicles (dash cams) provide demonstrative empirical evidence of the benefits cameras can have for policing. These camera implementations act as measures of accountability that makes the recorded actions of police or citizens transparent to an auditor. In accordance to the theoretical support discussed previously, camera presence has the ability to impact an individual's behavior.

CCTV Closed circuit television cameras have been implemented in criminal justice for the longest period of time and are most commonly used camera in criminal justice. Their placement as a target hardening technique enables them to provide guardianship over potential victims. These devices are commonly placed in areas that experience high levels of transient people such as city centers and low levels of security personnel such as parking structures where their presence is overtly displayed and can monitor the area. With regard to empirical research, this is the type of camera that is most developed. The most current meta-analysis of CCTV impact on crime conducted a systematic review of 44 CCTV evaluations. Although the optimal circumstances for crime reduction were not identified, the analysis concluded that the pooled effects of CCTV implementation across the 44 studies was a reduction in crime of 16% (Welsh & Farrington, 2009). Another study in Newark, NJ focused on comparing two types of law enforcement responses, CCTV crime detections leading to police response and traditional calls for service. Specifically, the researchers addressed what effect CCTV detections had on arrest rates when compared to traditional responses to calls for service. In all crime categories

analyzed, CCTV incidents resulted in higher arrest rates that were statistically significant (except for the violence category) than those of traditional calls for service. In fact, when comparing the observed and expected rates of arrest, CCTV had immense impacts on high priority incident arrest rates. High priority incidents had “observed arrest rates (21.5%) nearly three times the expected rate (7.7%)” (Piza, Caplan, & Kennedy, 2014). These findings in crime reduction are telling of the ability CCTV has to curve the behavior of potential offenders. With specific regard to law enforcement, these findings are indirectly applicable because an officer, just like any other potential offender, that considers engaging in misconduct would have the certainty of being caught increased and thus deterred from engaging in misconduct. This may lead to lower levels of misconduct and thus enhanced legitimacy.

Interrogation room cameras Interrogation room cameras, although not mandated, are used in much of the police departments across the country to ensure officer conduct is procedurally just and thus reinforces their legitimacy. During an interrogation the ultimate carrot for an officer is a suspect’s confession. Unfortunately sometimes officers may use sticks to obtain the carrot by infringing upon a person’s rights and the law. *Miranda v. Arizona* serves as a prime example of officers stepping outside of the guidance of procedural justice in an effort to obtain a confession. When investigating the exoneration of death row inmates researchers reported that “false confessions were a contributing factor in approximately 30% of the more than 300 DNA exonerations” covered by the Innocence Project (Kassin, Kukucka, Lawson, & DeCarlo, 2014). Mandated cameras in interrogation rooms provide prosecutors, judges, and other actors of the court with significant transparency of an interrogation. According to a study on the effects of Electronic Recording of Interviews with Suspected Persons (ERISP) the presence of ERISP has had a number of beneficial outcomes for the criminal justice system. Some police

(44%), prosecutors (90%), defense (71%), and judges (75%) agree or strongly agree that the presence of ERISP has reduced the frequency of voir dire challenges of evidence related to police interviews. The study also reports that police (53%), prosecutors (85%), defense (63%), and judges (80%) surveyed agreed or strongly agreed that “ERISP has had a beneficial impact upon public confidence in the criminal justice system” (Dixon, 2006). Another study reports survey results obtained from 631 police investigators and concluded that 81% of those surveyed “felt that interrogations should be recorded” (Kassin et al., 2014).

Dash cams Dash camera implementation increased dramatically from 2001-2005. In 2001 11% of state police and highway patrol cars had dash cams and by 2005 72% of state police and highway patrol cars had dash cams (International Association of Chiefs of Police, 2005). This is in part because of the allegations against officers engaging in racial profiling in the 1990s-2000s. A survey of officers’ personal experiences with dash cams found that 93% of officers being investigated for misconduct, where video evidence from a dash cam was available, were exonerated. In addition the study found that dash cams impacted the number of citizen complaints made and withdrawn. In the same study, surveyed police supervisors reported that, “in at least half of the instances, once the complainant is made aware that the stop or contact was recorded, the complaint was withdrawn” (International Association of Chiefs of Police, 2005). These studies are telling of the true legitimacy of police when the full objective story is presented by cameras.

Although cameras have been present in criminal justice for some time, their mounted stationary positions can often miss evolving events of an encounter between a citizen and the police. Since body-worn cameras are mounted to an officer, the events of an encounter are often captured, this is the added novelty to their implementation. According to White, body-worn

cameras “can have a greater impact than street CCTV or vehicle-borne cameras as they can be deployed at any position within the incident; those present quickly learn that the recordings include sound, and are more obvious than other CCTV systems that can blend into the background” (White, 2014). If for some reason the BWC’s point of view is obstructed by anything and a reviewer of the footage can’t see the events, they can rely upon the audio recording of the events.

Pioneer studies on body-worn cameras. Available published research specifically pertaining to the effectiveness of body-worn cameras is limited at this point as many of the pioneer studies are still being conducted. White’s assessment of BWC evidence identified five pioneer studies that addressed the implementation of BWCs in policing:

Pioneer Studies Conducted on Body-Worn Cameras			
Study	Location	Researchers	Year
Plymouth Head Camera Project	England	Goodall	2007
Renfrewshire/Aberdeen Studies	Scotland	ODS Consulting	2011
Rialto Police Department	California	Ariel, Farrar, Sutherland	2013
Mesa Police Department	Arizona	Mesa PD	2013
Phoenix Police Department	Arizona	White	2013

(White, 2014).

Of those studies identified by White, the Rialto Police Department study was the only one identified with research published in an academic journal. However, another pioneer study occurring with the Orlando Police Department has a preliminary article published. The methods and findings of these surveys are presented below.

Rialto study. Ariel, Farrar, and Sutherland are the pioneers behind this Cambridge University study analyzing *The Effect of Police Body-Worn Cameras on Use of Force and Citizens’ Complaints Against the Police* (Ariel, Farrar, & Sutherland, 2014). Over a period of

twelve months the researchers measured the effect of BWC recording on police use of force and citizen complaints against officers. Using a randomly controlled setting, officers were randomly assigned to shifts where they would wear BWCs and record all contacts with the public, identified as “experimental shifts.” Officers were also assigned to “control shifts” where they did not wear BWCs. Thus, this study uses shifts as the unit of analysis; the number of shifts analyzed was 988 (489 experimental shifts and 499 control shifts). Use of force was defined as “a non-desirable response in police–public encounters” for both excessive and reasonable uses of force (Ariel et al., 2014).

The findings of this study suggest statistically significant reductions in officer use of force, “64.3% reduction from 2009, 61.5 % from 2010, and 58.3 % from 2011” (Ariel et al., 2014). Of the 25 recorded incidents of police use of force during the experimental period, 17 occurred during control shifts and 8 occurred during experimental shifts. The mean rate of use of force incidents per 1,000 police contacts was 0.78 for control shifts and 0.33 for experimental shifts where BWCs were deployed. Similarly, citizen complaints reduced during the experimental period in 2012 from 2009 (70 citizen complaints), 2010 (51 citizen complaints), 2011 (24 citizen complaints), and 2012 (3 citizen complaints). However, given the low frequency of 2012 citizen complaints in both the control and experimental shifts, the results are not statistically significant.

Orlando study. The Orlando study is currently ongoing and only preliminary survey data regarding *Officer Perceptions of the Use of Body-Worn Cameras in Law Enforcement* is available. However, this preliminary survey is unique in its findings since the data was collected “prior to high profile incidents such as what occurred in Ferguson, Missouri” (Jennings, Fridell, & Lynch, 2014). The larger Orlando study seeks to address the impacts that BWC’s have on law

enforcement. This preliminary survey includes data collected from 91 participating officers and serves as an examination of officer perceptions of BWC use in their department. Using a 5 point Likert-scale to assess participants' level of agreement with a statement related to the implementation of BWCs. Although this study does not supply data relative to the impact of BWCs, the data it does supply can be assessed for its potential impact on the public trust of police and police legitimacy.

The findings of this study produced mixed results for variety of topics. When officers were asked if "body-worn cameras would improve your own behavior" 19.8% believed they would. However, 42.9% believed that BWCs would impact the behavior of other officers when asked if "body-worn cameras would increase the by-the-book behavior of other officers." Similar results were supplied when questioning officers about BWCs reducing officer use of force, concluding that 3.3% of officers believed that their own use of force would be reduced due to BWC implementation and 20% believed that BWCs would reduce the use of force of the agency overall. (Jennings et al., 2014)

Implications on trust and legitimacy of pioneer studies. These studies support some of the benefits presented by the Police Executive Research Forum (PERF) and White in their assessments of BWCs relative to increasing officer trust and legitimacy. White says that the presence of BWCs has a "civilizing effect" on officers that may reduce an officer's susceptibility to use force, reduce and expedite the resolution of citizen complaints, promote officer professionalism, and enhance officer training to correct internal errors in policing (White, 2014; Miller, Toliver, & Police Executive Research Forum, 2014). Social media often serves as a platform for on looking citizens to publicize clips of footage of perceived officer misconduct allowing it to instantaneously spread nationwide and draw attention to the department.

According to Jackson, “Learning how to harness the power of social media to deliver more information, beyond just about individual events or incidents, could provide opportunities for both a better informed public and a more-robust debate about police-community relations” (Jackson, 2015). The transparent effect that BWCs present could enable police departments to share footage of disputed encounters with the public so that they may have an objective view of the incident in question and the sequences of events leading up to the incident. This enhanced transparency through social media is principle in building and maintaining trust and legitimacy in the modern era of technology.

Concerns of Body-Worn Cameras (RQ2)

The benefits of body-worn cameras are clearly presented; however, concerns exist with their implementation and oppositional viewpoints should be considered before implementing BWCs. Considerations of these merited concerns should influence policy with the implementation in order to ensure trust and legitimacy of the police. Three concerns addressed in this section are (1) privacy issues, (2) device tampering, data storage, and access, and (3) CSI effect. All three of these concerns have the potential to impact the public’s trust in the police and the citizen’s perceived legitimacy of the police.

Privacy issues. Privacy concerns are at the forefront of discussion for the opponents of body-worn camera implementation. The opponents often site federal law which, “blocks the warrantless capturing of photo or video images of people where they have an expectation of privacy” (ManTech Advanced Systems International, Inc., 2012). Some states have single party consent laws for recording audio between parties where an officer does not have to have a citizen’s permission to record as long as there isn’t a reasonable expectation of privacy. Other states have two party consent laws that do require the citizen’s permission to record.

Opponents are also concerned with the background footage obtained by a BWC when coupled with other advanced police technologies such as facial recognition software (White, 2014). The combination of these technologies enable police to glean advanced information about a person that they may feel invades their privacy. Often an Orwellian attitude that “Big Brother” is watching has been adapted toward cameras. This concern presented from an Orwellian mindset is one of surveillance. The argument to this surveillance concern is that people being recorded should not worry if they have nothing to hide. Solove refutes this nothing to hide argument discussing its implications (Solove, 2011). His argument merely outlines the idea that conceding to these cameras gives up too much ground to the government to glean information and aggregate conclusions. He writes:

“One such harm, for example, which I call aggregation, emerges from the fusion of small bits of seemingly innocuous data. When combined, the information becomes much more telling. By joining pieces of information we might not take pains to guard, the government can glean information about us that we might indeed wish to conceal. For example, suppose you bought a book about cancer. This purchase isn't very revealing on its own, for it indicates just an interest in the disease. Suppose you bought a wig. The purchase of a wig, by itself, could be for a number of reasons. But combine those two pieces of information, and now the inference can be made that you have cancer and are undergoing chemotherapy. That might be a fact you wouldn't mind sharing, but you'd certainly want to have the choice” (Solove, 2011).

Another privacy concern presented by opponents relates to the pure sensitivity of some of the incidents of which the police respond. Consider an incident of intimate partner violence. If the incident is ongoing, it could be beneficial for an officer to activate his BWC so that he may capture any criminalizing actions taken by an offender in the situation. However, the victim may not want the incident to be recorded because they do not want anyone to be aware of or see their victimization. Additionally, the recording may deter potential victims or witnesses of crimes from cooperating with police as they do not want that recording to be pulled later as evidence against an offender. With these scenarios in mind, departments are faced with policy making

decisions regarding the activation of BWCs, whether the officers are mandated to record all or certain encounters or whether they have discretionary power to activate their BWCs.

Device tampering, data storage, and access. Whether a department implements mandatory or discretionary policies regarding the activation of BWCs, the officer will have control over the activation of the BWC. Especially during the initial period of BWC implementation, human error is expected play some role in failure to activate BWCs. At the same time some opponents of BWCs are concerned with officer controlled activation because an officer wishing to act in a socially undesirable way during an encounter with a citizen may purposefully decide not to activate a BWC, defaulting to the traditional lack of transparency presented without BWCs. In addition to the failure to activate a BWC, concerns are raised with the tampering of a device when an officer's actions are called into question. An officer may attempt to cover up his involvement in misconduct by destroying the BWC itself and blaming it on a citizen, attempt to erase BWC recordings, or even attempt to edit the footage. The possibility of any of these instances of tampering occurring. These incidents of device tampering should be considered when creating policies regarding BWC implementation (Miller et al., 2014).

Another concern relates to the logistics of the storage and access to data. Who has access to recordings and where it should be stored are all questions that the PERF address in their report, *Implementing a Body-Worn Camera Program: Recommendations and Lessons Learned*. The Deputy Chief of Police William Roseman of Albuquerque, New Mexico emphasized the concern presented when questioning who would have access to the recordings, "Here in Albuquerque, everything is open to public record unless it is being used in an investigation, your neighbor can request the footage under the Open Records Act, and we must give it to them"

(Miller et al., 2014). However PERF goes on in the report to explain that just because an officer is granted the ability to record certain incidents and scenes, not everything recorded should be public record, especially if the recording reveals certain aspects to a person's life that are protected by privacy rights. The report also goes on to explain that storage of recordings is variable based upon the local and state laws.

CSI effect. The CSI effect in criminal justice refers to the inflated expectations of evidentiary presentations that jurors hold regarding the evidence presented in a criminal trial. Adapted from the popular TV show Crime Scene Investigation, the CSI effect claims that people on a jury expect actual crime scene investigators to present evidence as damning and comparable to the evidence that Gil Grissom, Nick Stokes, and Warrick Brown turn up in the popular show. However, in reality, the technology and ability to uncover such evidence is often not possible due to technology limitations and other impractical and unreasonable expectations of crime scene investigators. The CSI effect claims that without this dramatized level of evidence present in a court of law, jurors will be more susceptible to acquit defendants. Although there is limited evidence of support that the CSI effect exists (Cole & Dioso-Villa, 2009), it is necessary to discuss its potential impact on officers as BWCs are implemented.

The CSI effect, as it relates to body-worn cameras, refers to the dilution of the individual officer's credibility to a point where an officer's word holds no merit without the presence of objective BWC footage to support the officer's claim. Given the limited trust of police and the perception of limited police legitimacy exhibited by young people and minorities, the CSI effect may be amplified specifically within these groups. However, officer credibility proves to play a substantial role in many cases; testimony may come from multiple officers in individual cases, "for example, an observing officer, an arresting officer, an undercover officer, a supervising

officer... and so forth” (Dorfman, 1999). Policy considerations regarding BWCs often discuss the discretionary and mandatory activation of BWCs in the field. Under a discretionary policy, where an officer can determine when they want to activate a BWC, officers may fail to activate the BWC during an encounter where the objective footage may be useful in their exoneration of a citizen complaint. At which point, an officer must rely on his own testimony, the testimony of any witnesses, and the fact finder in the case to exonerate him. However, under a mandatory activation policy, an officer should always record certain types of encounters and therefore increase the likelihood that an encounter called to question is recorded. This footage will provide the fact finder with a transparent view to take into consideration during their decision.

Characteristics of Campus Policing (RQ3)

Wilson and Wilson identify the distinguishing components of campus policing that differ it from general policing; “The precepts of campus law enforcement that dictate its differences from traditional policing are its ability to relate, specifically, to the atmosphere of trust, respect, and perceptually safe havens that our colleges and universities so carefully embrace and expose their communities to” (Wilson & Wilson, 2011). Campus law enforcement agencies are often tasked with the same duties of their municipal counterparts. This is resulting in a campus police department structures, police powers, and responsibilities that assimilate general police departments while serving an institution of higher education and its constituents in a limited geographic area rather than city, county, or state at large. Since officer jurisdiction is often limited to a small geographic region, assuming the campuses are smaller than most general police jurisdictions, a prime opportunity to build legitimacy and trust through practices of community policing presents itself.

However, they also have the added institutional responsibilities that expand their involvement in public servant work. This means that campus law enforcement officers are subject to the same measures of perceived legitimacy and trust. However, campus police officers face a few more caveats of legitimacy measurement among students. Jacobsen's work considers these caveats; "although students expect the campus police to protect them from harm, they believe that officers should fulfill this function while not interfering with their lives as college students. Further, students delegitimize the power of the campus police by raising questions about their status as 'real' officers and highlighting how they overreact to the wrong types of behaviors" (Jacobsen, 2015). In an interview with a campus police officer, Jacobsen unveils more insight into how campus officers can damage their perception of legitimacy among students. The officer discusses the training officers receive at the academy often being geared as "worst case scenario" incidents. When new officers enter duty as a campus police officer, they must tone down their initial reactions to an incident and assess its severity, doling out the necessary action to resolve the situation. According to the officer, oftentimes new graduates of the academy overreact to the incidents they face in an environment that is considered relatively safe. (Jacobsen, 2015). Students can perceive this overreaction to an incident as excessive force further separating ties between these officers and the constituents of the university.

Understanding the history of campus policing is critical to address a new officer's overzealous crime fighting mindset. The development of modern campus police throughout history is quite different than that of municipal departments. Where the municipal police began wielding unhampered power and authority that had to be limited over time, campus police officers traditionally began with very limited power that has been expanded over time. This expansion of power could have only developed due to a certain level of trust in the campus

police by university constituents, a growing need to control campus crime and problems, and the continued legitimacy of campus officers in their functions as they continued to gain more authority.

People served. Campus police officers are tasked with providing a safe learning environment for campus constituents that possess many dynamic characteristics. College is often the first period of time that students move away from their parents and learn to develop on their own. The university environment entices students of diverse backgrounds coming from various parts of the country and world to mingle together for the first time. Also this population of students is highly transitional as new freshmen and sophomores come to the school every year, students often move away from school during the summer and come back in the fall, and graduating seniors move away from the university every year. In addition to the transitional diverse student populations, campus police are also charged with providing a safe working environment for staff and faculty members.

Campuses also harbor better educated individuals that tend to have liberal mindsets. These people are attracted to the ability to express themselves freely. Since dissent and debate are often encouraged in this academic setting discussion of various topics occurs on campuses. Throughout the history of policing, constituents of universities have questioned police conduct and authority. This environment can prove to be very difficult to police for officers, especially if their actions are perceived as illegitimate and they lack the trust of campus constituents.

Campus problems. There is no doubt that the consumption of alcohol by college students is widespread, as students come of drinking age, engage in social activities, and are often without parental guardianship for the first time. When rates of psychoactive substance use are compared between college students and comparable non-college counterparts, patterns are

similar (Nobles, Fox, Khey, & Lizotte, 2010). However, when looking specifically at alcohol consumption, binge drinking is much more prominent with college students (Nobles et. al, 2010). According to a 2014 survey of student health, 34.6% of college students surveyed reported that they had consumed five or more drinks in a sitting within the last two weeks (American College Health Association, 2014). Although alcohol consumption is not a direct path to criminality and violence, it is often a correlated ingredient present in crimes (Boles & Miotto, 2003). This correlation is especially true when looking at college student' alcohol consumption rates in relation to rates of property destruction, vandalism, and violent crimes on campus (Madensen & Eck, 2006). The prominence of binge drinking on campuses presents campus police officers with higher proportions citizen contacts with people whose actions and mental state are inhibited enabling them to feel invincible in their actions and disregard consequences. Consumption of alcohol can be considered a staple of college life and campus police's interference with alcohol consumption and events related to alcohol consumption can diminish students' perceptions of campus law enforcement legitimacy under the criteria outlined by Jacobsen's work (see Jacobsen, 2015).

The high levels of alcohol consumption among college students may negatively impact a student's, especially a female student, ability to resist any unwanted advances (Lane, Gover, & Dahod, 2009). A student's susceptibility to sexual assault and date rape may be amplified depending on her proclivity to party and binge drink. In addition, much of research concludes that a victim of rape is likely to know the offender; however, her fear of rape occurring often centers on a stranger as the offender (Fisher & Sloan III, 2003). The frequency of sexual and assault on campus is hard to quantify due to the underreporting of these crimes. However, females are much more likely to fall victim to a sexual assault than males. Campus police are

tasked with informing students about sexual assaults and concerning themselves with preventative measures to decrease their occurrences.

Student health is also of concern for officers as they serve a population that may be susceptible to vulnerability. According to self-reported survey reports, in the last 12 months 8.1% of students surveyed seriously considered suicide, 1.3% of the surveyed students actually attempted suicide (American College Health Association, 2014). However, these findings may underestimate the true scope of the issue as other surveys have found occurrences of suicidal thoughts in the past two weeks at rates as high as almost 23% of students surveyed (Soet & Sevig, 2006). These statistics are telling of the responses campus police officers must make in order to de-escalate a crisis scenario of one of the students at the university.

The students at universities are not the sole cause of problems presented to campus police officers. In fact, at some universities people who are not affiliated with the college at all often draw the attention and concern of campus police officers. This is especially true of urban universities where clear university boundaries do not exist. For instance, Portland State University (PSU) has recently begun the process of transitioning its Campus Public Safety Officer into a university police department staffing fully sworn armed officers. This is primarily due to the number of contacts officers have with people who are not affiliated with PSU and the lengthy criminal histories that many of these people possess. According to the PSU Presidential Task Force on Campus Safety, “90% of the arrests made on campus are persons with no affiliation with the university” (Balzer, Lopez, Thomas, Runkles-Pearson, Moller, Randol, Kirkland, Henning, Morris, Holdahl, Zerzan, & Haley, 2013).

Mission and functions. Modern campus police departments, although similar in structure to municipal police departments, are under the umbrella of university missions and

goals rather than that of a city or state. This leads the campus police departments to have missions that are focused on being public servants of the university rather than crime fighters. A campus police department oftentimes must align with the mission of the school to ensure legitimacy among the students and institution. This university oriented mission approach is proactive in nature rather than reactive, getting to the core of community policing. Additionally, the campus departments ideally view themselves as a part of the university and the community that they serve and often their mission statements unify the department, community, and campus. This is evident when comparing campus police department mission statements with those of their respective municipal police departments. Arizona State University's Campus Police Department presents a mission statement, "To enhance the quality of life by providing a safe and secure environment through professional and **proactive law enforcement services in partnership with the University community**" (Arizona State University Police Department, 2015). Mesa, the city that Arizona State is located, Police Department lists their mission statement as, "Your Police Department, dedicated to working with you, **fighting crime**, defending human rights, and protecting life and property, to make our community safe for all" (Mesa Police Department, 2015). Whereas ASU's mission is focuses on preventing crime, Mesa's focuses on fighting crime. Similarly Virginia Tech Police Department holds a mission that states, "The Virginia Tech Police Department strives to enhance the safety and quality of life for students, faculty, staff and visitors through effective law enforcement and **proactive crime prevention in partnership with the university community**" (Virginia Tech Police Department, 2015). Whereas the Blacksburg, the city that Virginia Tech is located, Police Department's mission statement is, "The Blacksburg Police Department believes in the principals of community policing and works in partnership with citizens and local businesses to promote, encourage, and

enact ways to **maintain a low crime rate**, increase public safety, and enhance our quality of life” (Blacksburg Police Department, 2015). Here Blacksburg’s mission partners with the community, but fails to discuss taking proactive measures of crime prevention. These distinctions can impact how individual officers carry out their duties and functions on a day to day basis.

The Bureau of Justice Statistics most recent report on campus law enforcement discussed the unique functions of campus police departments. More importantly, the report uncovered some of the ways that university police carry out their responsibilities. Campus police enhanced their trust and perceived legitimacy by meeting with groups affiliated with the university that they served and discussing crime-related problems. Some of the groups a campus police department meets with regularly are campus administrators, student housing groups, student government, Greek letter groups, and other student organizations (Reaves, 2015). By building a rapport with these groups they are enhancing the susceptibility of public cooperation and in turn legitimacy.

Some of the functions presented in the report are listed below:

Security Functions

- Building Access Control
- Event Policing
- Monitoring Surveillance Cameras

Specialty Public Safety Functions

- Animal Control
- Dispatching Calls for Service
- Emergency Fire/Medical Services

Vehicle-Related Functions

- Traffic and Parking Enforcement
- Transportation Systems Management

Specialized Functions

- Bomb/Explosive Disposal/Detection
- Search and Rescue
- Tactical Operations
- Task Force Participation

(Reaves, 2015)

Although much of these functions are present in municipal policing, a few are unique to campus policing. Additionally the variety of functions performed by campus police departments forces campus officers to be more versatile than officers of a municipal department that may be able to specialize in certain areas. Event policing is one such function that can present numerous challenges for campus departments.

Event policing can include anything from monitoring crowds at a sporting event, presentation, concert, and protests. These situations can often turn volatile very quickly, especially when alcohol is present. Large crowds in sports stadiums, competitive spirits running high, and the presence of alcohol are all among contributing factors to violence occurring at

sporting events (Madensen & Eck, 2008). At universities, there is no sporting event more crowded than football games. In 2006 alone, attendance at college football games rose to 47.9 million people (Rees & Schnepel, 2009). With these massive crowds and the presence of alcohol, a staple of the college environment, the potential for violence is more heightened. Campus police officers have to be able to make their presence known to the crowd in order to deter violence from breaking out, while ensuring their legitimacy. If the wrong response is made by the police, a student party riot may erupt (Madensen & Eck, 2006). Oftentimes these riots tend to possess characteristics such as:

- “a lot of intoxicated people are present
- both males and females are present, and nearly all the attendees are young adults
- the gathering includes students from other universities
- the gathering includes young adults who are not college students
- the disturbance starts late at night and continues into the early morning
- males are most often responsible for any destructive acts
- injuries and property damage (e.g., from fires and overturned cars) are common
- participants resist authority/police intervention” (Madensen et al., 2006).

FERPA regulations. The Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) of 1974 outlines statutory limitations regarding the ways in which a university may share student records with parties other than the student. Data collected from BWCs presents new considerations in this area of law. Under FERPA, college administration and faculty are not prohibited from having access to campus police records. The exemption of police records from FERPA restrictions only applies if the records satisfy three criteria. The records are exempt as long as they:

1. are created by a law enforcement unit
2. are created for law enforcement purposes
3. are actually maintained by the law enforcement unit

(“Your Rights Under FERPA,” 2011).

The footage captured by BWCs used by police officers of the campus police department is therefore exempt from the limitations presented under FERPA. However, some consideration has been given to storage of footage and who has access to recorded footage in police departments. The recommendations provided by many police executives to the Police Executive Research Forum (PERF) reported that, “their legal advisors and prosecutors were comfortable using a third-party vendor to manage the storage system” (Miller, Lindsay, Jessica Toliver, and Police Executive Research Forum, 2014). PERF’s recommendation of using a third-party data storage vendor is not applicable to campus police departments using BWCs because it infringes upon the third criteria of FERPA exemptions, *are actually maintained by the law enforcement unit*.

Body-Worn Cameras and Campus Policing (RQ4)

The application of body-worn cameras within campus policing is a practice that should ease any existing tension between campus constituents and the campus police department.

Policing structure and problems. As law enforcement continues to adapt to the contemporary practices policing, technology, and public perceptions of trust and legitimacy, campus policing continues to make the similar adjustments. The Bureau of Justice Statistics report including survey data for more than 900 4-year colleges in the United States with enrollment levels of at

least 2,500 students reported that 92% of public institutions were using sworn police officers, 91% of public universities had sworn officers present on campus at all times, and 91% of public institutions used armed officers (Reaves, 2015).

Just as campus policing is beginning to reflect the structure and policies of their municipal counterparts, campus police departments have also been increasing their use of technology in their policing practices. Of the surveyed universities, 71% provided patrol officers with some sort of electronic device to enhance their policing practices (Reaves, 2015). This is promising for the adoption of body-worn cameras in campus police departments since technology being welcomed into most departments.

These structural and tactical similarities between municipal and modern campus policing are adaptations to modern problems facing campus police departments. According to policing scholars, large universities have “crime problems commensurate with small cities” (James C. Wada, Ryan Patten, & Kimberlee Candela, 2010). This establishes the role that campus police officers must play within a university. Not only do campus police officers have to respond to traditional calls for service like municipal officers do within their own jurisdiction, but they also have to handle a wide variety of tasks that even municipal officers would not traditionally handle. This requires campus police officer to be more versatile than a municipal officer while at the same time having to work harder to obtain legitimacy from the people she serves. Body-worn cameras are the next tactical change to occur within campus police departments in order to be more transparent with the university constituents and maintain their trust and perceived legitimacy.

Academic and training potential. Implementing such novel technology in an academic setting will enable universities to conduct studies related to their effectiveness, benefits, and

consequences that will align with the proactive crime prevention and university unification missions of many campus police departments. Campus police departments often orient their missions around providing campus constituents with a safe learning environment. Body-worn camera implementation offers students the opportunity to engage in academia by studying how they affect the safety of the campus, continuing to build bonds between the officers and campus constituents that builds trust and legitimacy.

Body-worn camera implementation in campus policing will also provide campus police departments with a novel training enhancement that can be used to teach new officers about legitimate and effective policing practices when dealing with incidents on campus. Recall the discussion of suicide ideation among students in college; 1.3% of the surveyed students reported that they actually attempted suicide in 2014 (American College Health Association, 2014). Applying this statistic to a modestly sized university of 20,000 students means that in 2014 approximately 260 students would have attempted suicide. That is an average of 5 suicide attempts every week at a university with an enrollment of 20,000. Assuming that campus police officers respond to a certain number of these suicide attempts is reasonable. However, an inexperienced officer may not have the crisis intervention training techniques to successfully de-escalate a situation. Recordings from BWCs of prior crisis interventions can be used to train officers the proper techniques in realistic situations. Proper intervention in these types of scenarios will enhance the perception of legitimacy among students directly and indirectly involved in the incidents.

Concerns. The concerns presented by implementing BWCs are also worth considering in a campus environment. The privacy guidelines of FERPA are mute with regard to BWCs in a campus setting as long as the three exemption criteria are met. However, the privacy concerns

presented by most opponents to BWCs are applicable to a campus setting, especially when other advanced technologies have the potential to glean information that people would prefer to keep private. Device tampering presents itself as an obstacle that has the potential to be controlled with strict sanctions and punitive measures that deter officers from attempting any form of tampering in fear of being caught. The more BWCs present at a given scenario, the more accountability an officer will have and the harder it will be to tamper with evidence obtained by the BWC. The largest applicable concern to campus policing is the mandatory and discretionary policies regarding the activation of the devices. In order to ensure legitimacy of officers, a mandatory activation policy should be adopted for encounters that do not present themselves as sensitive such as interviewing a vulnerable victim, an encounter where the citizen has a reasonable expectation of privacy, or a citizen requests that the recording be turned off on camera. These policy considerations can help a campus police department maintain cooperation of campus constituents and continue to build and maintain trust and legitimacy.

Benefits to legitimacy and trust. Since the academic setting that campus police officers operate within often encourages dissent, debate, diversity, and a more liberal mindset, officers be subject to diminished trust and perceived illegitimacy among campus constituents. This may be due to campus police and university relations, campus police incidents of misconduct, or the trickle-down effect of mistrust and illegitimacy as a result of officer misconduct projected in the media streams. Whatever the cause of diminished trust and legitimacy, BWCs offer campus police departments with an opportunity to be as transparent with its constituents as possible.

Much of the crime related encounters with campus constituents that are detrimental to campus police trust and legitimacy are related to alcohol consumption, where people may be in an inhibited mental state. Since alcohol is a staple of college life among students, officers

intervening in alcohol related events can diminish their legitimacy (Jacobsen, 2015). However officers responding to these alcohol related crimes with BWCs will be able to increase transparency with students questioning the events leading up to and throughout the encounter when they are sober by showing them footage from the encounter and thus be able to counterbalance the negative effect to their legitimacy. The research conducted on BWCs thus far supports this position and has the potential to even lead to decreased numbers of filed complaints.

Conclusion

Although there are merited concerns with the implementation of BWCs, the benefits presented outweigh the concerns especially with regard to the current climate of policing

mistrust and perceptions of police illegitimacy that trickle down to campus police departments. Much of the concerns can be addressed with policy that limits the access and control of the recordings. One such policy recommendation is limiting the footage released by police departments to the public by blurring faces in the footage to protect privacy and identity of people captured and using a fact finder to determine whether a department can release certain footage. This is just one way that policy can mitigate some of the concerns with BWC implementation without losing the benefits provided by their presence. Just as the public questions the conduct of police officers throughout history, one might question what effect the presence of a BWC would have on events that live in infamy throughout history. Jackson writes, “Demonstrating to the public that its decision-making process is neutral and fair relies on the department’s ability to communicate this point through both word and deed. That communication must take on both what may be a complex history between the department and the communities it serves and other factors that shape public views” (Jackson, 2015). Just as the problems faced by campus police at modern university are comparable with a small cities problems, the solution to this problem must be equally as comparable. Increasing transparency by implementing another level of oversight is the recommended solution. Moving forward with modern campus policing, it is advisable for campus police departments to adopt BWC technologies so that they may continue to build and maintain the trust of their unique campus constituents and the perception of their practices is legitimate.

Future research should include conducting longitudinal studies that attempt to quantify the impact that BWCs have on police legitimacy in campus settings. A potential study should include surveying campus constituents about their perceptions of the campus police’s legitimacy before and after BWCs are implemented. Additionally records regarding complaints regarding

officer conduct should be analyzed to determine if an impact exists when implementing BWCs. Finally, surveying officers about their perceptions, similar to that of the Orlando study discussed earlier, should be conducted. Since BWCs are such a novel field and limited, if any, research is being conducted on their implementation in a university setting the suggested studies should seek to be as robust as possible to make the largest leap in knowledge possible.

Bibliography

- American College Health Association. "National College Health Assessment II Reference Group Executive Summary: Spring 2014." (2014). http://www.acha-ncha.org/docs/ACHA-NCHA-II_ReferenceGroup_ExecutiveSummary_Spring2014.pdf
- Ariel, Barak, William A. Farrar, and Alex Sutherland. "The Effect of Police Body-Worn Cameras on Use of Force and Citizens' Complaints Against the Police: A Randomized Controlled Trial." *Journal of Quantitative Criminology*, November 19, 2014, 1–27. doi:10.1007/s10940-014-9236-3.
- Arizona State University Police Department. Mission Statement. (2015). <https://cfo.asu.edu/police-jurisdiction>
- Basu, Moni, and Faith Karimi. "Protesters Torch Police Car in Ferguson - CNN.com." *CNN*, November 26, 2014. <http://www.cnn.com/2014/11/25/justice/ferguson-grand-jury-decision/index.html>.
- Balzer, Jacqueline, Chas Lopez, Domanic Thomas, P.K. Runkles-Pearson, Mary Moller, Heather Randol, Debbie Kirkland, Kris Henning, Nicole Morris, Valerie Holdahl, Phil Zerzan, and Bryant Haley. "Improving Campus Safety at Portland State University: Presidential Task Force on Campus Safety Final Report." (2013).
- Blacksburg Police Department. Mission Statement. (2015). <http://www.blacksburg.gov/index.aspx?page=23>
- Boles, Sharon M., and Karen Miotto. "Substance Abuse and Violence: A Review of the Literature." *Aggression and Violent Behavior* 8, no. 2 (March 2003): 155–74. doi:10.1016/S1359-1789(01)00057-X.

- Botelho, Greg, Holly Yan, and Dana Ford. "Baltimore Protests: Crowds Stand Firm after Curfew - CNN.com." *CNN*, April 29, 2015. <http://www.cnn.com/2015/04/28/us/baltimore-riots/index.html>.
- Carver, Charles S. "Physical Aggression as a Function of Objective Self-Awareness and Attitudes toward Punishment." *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology* 11, no. 6 (November 1975): 510–19. doi:10.1016/0022-1031(75)90002-5.
- Clarke, Ronald V. "Situational Crime Prevention: Its Theoretical Basis and Practical Scope." *Crime and Justice* 4 (January 1, 1983): 225–56. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1147510>.
- Dixon, David. "'A Window into the Interviewing Process?' The Audio-Visual Recording of Police Interrogation in New South Wales, Australia." *Policing and Society* 16, no. 4 (December 1, 2006): 323–48. doi:10.1080/10439460600968123.
- Dorfman, David. "Proving the Lie: Litigating Police Credibility." *American Journal of Criminal Law*. (1999). <http://digitalcommons.pace.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1527&context=lawfaculty>
- Fisher, Bonnie S., and John J. Sloan III. "Unraveling the Fear of Victimization Among College Women: Is the 'Shadow of Sexual Assault Hypothesis' Supported?" *Justice Quarterly* 20, no. 3 (2003): 633–59. <http://stats.lib.pdx.edu/proxy.php?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=i3h&AN=10945760&site=ehost-live>.
- Floyd et al. v. City of New York, et al.* Case 1:08-cv-01034-SAS-HBP 25-28 (New York, 2013).
- Greene, Jack R. "Make Police Oversight Independent and Transparent." *Criminology & Public Policy* 6, no. 4 (November 1, 2007): 747–54. doi:10.1111/j.1745-9133.2007.00477.x.

- International Association of Chiefs of Police. *The Impact of Video Evidence on Modern Policing: Research and Best Practices from the IACP Study on in-Car Cameras*. Alexandria, Va.: International Association of Chiefs of Police, 2005.
- Jackson, Brian. "Respect and Legitimacy A Two-Way Street" (2015) *RAND Corporation*
- Jacobsen, Shannon K. "Policing the Ivory Tower: Students' Perceptions of the Legitimacy of Campus Police Officers." *Deviant Behavior* 36, no. 4 (2015): 310–29.
doi:10.1080/01639625.2014.935653.
- James C. Wada, Ryan Patten, and Kimberlee Candela. "Betwixt and between: The Perceived Legitimacy of Campus Police." *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies & Management* 33, no. 1 (March 9, 2010): 114–31. doi:10.1108/13639511011020629.
- Jennings, Wesley G., Lorie A. Fridell, and Mathew D. Lynch. "Cops and Cameras: Officer Perceptions of the Use of Body-Worn Cameras in Law Enforcement." *Journal of Criminal Justice* 42, no. 6 (November 2014): 549–56. doi:10.1016/j.jcrimjus.2014.09.008.
- Kappeler, V., & Gaines, L. (2011). Chapter 11 Community Policing and Special Populations. In *Community Policing: A Contemporary Perspective* (6th ed.). Amsterdam: Elsevier.
- Kassin, Saul M., Jeff Kukucka, Victoria Z. Lawson, and John DeCarlo. "Does Video Recording Alter the Behavior of Police during Interrogation? A Mock Crime-and-Investigation Study." *Law and Human Behavior* 38, no. 1 (February 2014): 73–83. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/lhb0000047.
- Katz, Lewis R. "Mapp after Forty Years: Its Impact on Race in America." *Case Western Reserve Law Review* 52 (2001): 471.
<http://heinonline.org/HOL/Page?handle=hein.journals/cwrlrv52&id=483&div=&collection=>
- Kent, Stephanie L., and Jason T. Carmichael. "Legislative Responses to Wrongful Conviction: Do Partisan Principals and Advocacy Efforts Influence State-Level Criminal Justice Policy?" *Social Science Research* 52 (July 2015): 147–60. doi:10.1016/j.ssresearch.2015.01.004.

- Macdonald, John, and Robert J. Stokes. "Race, Social Capital, and Trust in the Police." *Urban Affairs Review* 41, no. 3 (January 1, 2006): 358–75. doi:10.1177/1078087405281707.
- Madensen, T., & Eck, J. (2008). Spectator Violence in Stadiums. *Community Oriented Policing Services*, 54. Retrieved from http://www.popcenter.org/problems/pdfs/spectator_violence.pdf
- Madensen, T., & Eck, J. (2006). Student Party Riots. *Community Oriented Policing Services*, 39. Retrieved from <http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED494602.pdf>
- ManTech Advanced Systems International, Inc. "A Primer on Body-Worn Cameras for Law Enforcement." (2012). <https://www.justnet.org/pdf/00-Body-Worn-Cameras-508.pdf>
- Mazerolle, Lorraine, Emma Antrobus, Sarah Bennett, and Tom R. Tyler. "Shaping Citizen Perceptions of Police Legitimacy: A Randomized Field Trial of Procedural Justice." *Criminology* 51, no. 1 (February 1, 2013): 33–63. doi:10.1111/j.1745-9125.2012.00289.x.
- Mesa Police Department. Mission Statement. (2015). <http://www.popcenter.org/library/awards/goldstein/2008/08-37.pdf>
- Miller, Lindsay, Jessica Toliver, and Police Executive Research Forum. 2014. "Implementing a Body-Worn Camera Program: Recommendations and Lessons Learned." Washington, DC: Office of Community Oriented Policing Services.
- Nobles M. R., Fox K. A., Khey D. N., Lizotte A. J. (2010). Community and Campus Crime: A Geospatial Examination of the Clery Act. *Crime & Delinquency*.
- Piza, Eric L., Joel M. Caplan, and Leslie W. Kennedy. "Is the Punishment More Certain? An Analysis of CCTV Detections and Enforcement." *Justice Quarterly* 31, no. 6 (November 2, 2014): 1015–43. doi:10.1080/07418825.2012.723034.
- Pollock, J. (2014). *Ethical Dilemmas and Decisions in Criminal Justice* (8th ed.). Belmont, Calif.: Wadsworth

- Rees, Daniel I., and Kevin T. Schnepel. "College Football Games and Crime." *Journal of Sports Economics* 10, no. 1 (February 1, 2009): 68–87. doi:10.1177/1527002508327389.
- Reaves, B. (2015). Campus Law Enforcement, 2011-2012. Retrieved from <http://www.bjs.gov/content/pub/pdf/cle1112.pdf>
- Board of Trustees. Resolution Regarding the Commissioning of Sworn Officers by the University Public Safety Department. (2014). <http://www.pdx.edu/board/sites/www.pdx.edu.board/files/Resolution%20Sworn%20Officer.pdf>
- Sherman, W. Lawrence. "Trust and Confidence in Criminal Justice." (2001) National Institute of Justice.
- Soet, J., & Sevig, T. (2006). Mental Health Issues Facing a Diverse Sample of College Students: Results from the College Student Mental Health Survey. *NASPA Journal*.
- Sunshine, Jason, and Tom R. Tyler. "The Role of Procedural Justice and Legitimacy in Shaping Public Support for Policing." *Law & Society Review* 37, no. 3 (September 2003): 513–48. doi:10.1111/1540-5893.3703002.
- The White House Office of the Press Secretary. "FACT SHEET: Strengthening Community Policing." (2014). <https://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/2014/12/01/fact-sheet-strengthening-community-policing>
- Tyler, Tom R. "Enhancing Police Legitimacy." *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 593, no. 1 (May 1, 2004): 84–99. doi:10.1177/0002716203262627.
- Tyler, Tom R., and Jeffrey Fagan. "Legitimacy and cooperation: Why do people help the police fight crime in their communities?" (2008) *Ohio State Journal of Criminal Law*.
- Virginia Tech Police Department,. Mission Statement. (2015). http://www.police.vt.edu/VTPD_v2.1/home.html

- Walker, S., & Katz, C. (2013). *The Police in America: An Introduction* (8th ed.). New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Welsh, Brandon C., and David P. Farrington. "Public Area CCTV and Crime Prevention: An Updated Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis." *Justice Quarterly* 26, no. 4 (December 1, 2009): 716–45. doi:10.1080/07418820802506206.
- White, Michael D. 2014. *Police Officer Body-Worn Cameras: Assessing the Evidence*. Washington, DC: Office of Community Oriented Policing Services.
- Williams, F., & McShane, M. (2010). *Criminological Theory* (5th ed.). Upper Saddle River, N.J.: Pearson/Prentice Hall.
- Wilson, P. Charles, and Shirley A. Wilson. "Perceived Roles of Campus Law Enforcement: A Cognitive Review of Attitudes and Beliefs of Campus Constituents." (2011). *Professional Issues in Criminal Justice*.
- Wortley, Richard. *Situational Prison Control: Crime Prevention in Correctional Institutions*. Cambridge University Press, 2002.
- Yan, Holly, and Dana Ford. "Black UVA Student Martese Johnson Arrested, Bloodied - CNN.com." *CNN*, March 19, 2015. <http://www.cnn.com/2015/03/19/us/uva-police-brutality-allegations/index.html>.
- "Your Rights Under FERPA," 2011. <http://www.campussafetymagazine.com/article/ferpa-and-campus-public-safety/>.