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Chapter 1: Introduction

For six consecutive days in July 2016, millions of Americans watched news reports of snipers in Dallas, TX, shooting 12 police officers and killing five. In a report called “Murder and Extremism in the United States in 2016” (Anti-Defamation League, 2016), the Dallas police chief referred to this event as “payback” (p. 2) for an incident days earlier where a prisoner died while in police custody. Uncharacteristically, one of the snipers was U.S. Army veteran Micah Johnson who used this highly public approach to provide a template for others seeking to target police officers (Cannick, 2016). Merely 10 days after that horrifying event, three police officers were fatally shot, as a man indiscriminately opened fire on them, while they were responding to a radio call in Baton Rouge, LA. These incidents have left some challenges for law enforcement agencies, as they face controversial and uncertain times. They also showcase that the very nature of police work requires officers to respond to some of the most unpredictable, dire, and violent encounters humankind has to offer (Fachner & Carter, 2015).

The National Law Enforcement Officers Memorial Fund (2016) calculated a 78% increase in officer deaths for the calendar year 2015-2016, which amounted to 32 officers shot and killed in the line of duty. These incidents are amongst the most bizarre and violent acts of vengeance against law enforcement the country has ever experienced (Jansen, 2016). The twin attacks in Dallas and Baton Rouge set off a period of fear, anguish, and confusion that even the most hardened police veterans called one of the
most challenging moments of policing they had ever experienced (Williams & Binder, 2016).

Amid the two previously mentioned attacks, police officers from Georgia and Michigan were shot in incidents that drew far less attention, but added to the growing sense that it was a dangerous time to be a police officer (Evans & Nakhlawi, 2016). As stated by F. Lee Bailey (2010), when considering the use of lethal force, no police officer is required to die. However, the men and women of law enforcement choose to run toward violence, dramatically increasing their risk of victimization and exposure to trauma. The incidents described thus far, represent some outcomes in American policing that may serve as a warning for needed change in parts of the U.S. public safety system (Dorner, 2015).

According to the Federal Bureau of Investigation’s (FBI) most recent reported accounts of justifiable homicide, nearly two times per week in the United States a police officer shoots and kills an individual (FBI National Press Office, 2015). This may have contributed to widespread community unrest, causing some Americans to question the legality of police interactions. As recently as October 2015, thousands of demonstrators, carrying signs displaying, Hands Up, Don’t Shoot and Black Lives Matter, flooded the open spaces of Manhattan’s Union Square. In similar assemblies, protestors marched on the New York City Police Department headquarters and converged on the Brooklyn Bridge thoroughfare, bringing traffic to a complete halt in displays of solidarity, inspired to address the demand for reform to policing (Harvard Law Review, 2015).

Although police departments have been recording their interactions for decades via in-car video cameras, in recent years, the explosion of community member-recorded
interactions has changed the discussion about law enforcement (Figueroa, 2016). We live in a time where technology and its many uses are advancing far more quickly than are policies and laws (Office of Community Oriented Policing Services [COPS Office], 2015). It can be argued that the use of cameras during police interactions makes police officers and members of the public who are being recorded more accountable for their behavior (Figueroa, 2016). Pagan (2014) noted that in 2014, various private citizens’ cell phone videos captured the death of Eric Garner in Staten Island, NY, an alleged kick to the head of Jamil El-Cuffee in Brooklyn, NY, as well as the shooting death of Michael Brown in Ferguson, MO. These incidents placed the police in questionable circumstances, and it ultimately sparked outrage, civil unrest, and a heated national debate about policing in the United States (Lynch, 2015). The manner in which a police agency responds to such incidents defines the agency’s willingness to open itself up to outside scrutiny (White, 2014).

Technological developments in the portability of devices with video recording capabilities have renewed the discussion about cameras in policing (Katz, Choate, Ready, & Nuño, 2014). Thus far, researchers have examined individual officer’s enforcement activities (Miller, 2014) and measured public trust in communities (Ariel, Farrar, & Sutherland, 2015), but few have researched the perceptions of a body-worn camera (BWC) by the men and women who wear them on patrol. A BWC is a small camera that is clipped onto a police officer’s uniform, on his or her chest, or possibly to headgear, such as glasses or a head mount (White, 2014). The officer wearing it can activate the BWC, or it can be automatically triggered by sound, movement, or another stimulus (Blitz, 2015). There has been little attention directed toward the merits and drawbacks of
BWCs, and there are even fewer empirical studies gauging the impressions of the technology in the field. Even less attention has focused on how BWCs may give police departments the opportunity to fully engage communities in a dialogue about their expectations for transparency and accountability.

The Fourth Amendment of the U.S. Constitution requires police to have reasonable suspicion that a crime has been, is being, or is about to be committed before stopping a suspect (U.S. Const. amend. IV). If the police reasonably suspect a person is armed and dangerous, they may conduct a frisk, which is a quick pat-down of the person’s outer clothing (Terry v. Ohio, 1968). According to the 2015 New York Civil Liberties Union (NYCLU) Annual Report, nearly nine out of 10 New Yorkers who were stopped and questioned by police were not charged with any crime (New York Civil Liberties Union [NYCLU], 2015). This prompted an analysis by the NYCLU, revealing that innocent New Yorkers have been subjected to police stops and street interrogations more than 5 million times since 2002, and that Black and Hispanic communities continue to be the overwhelming target of these tactics (Lieberman, 2014).

United States Federal Court Judge Shira Scheindlin found that the NYPD stop, question, and frisk tactics violated the constitutional rights of New Yorkers. One of the remedies she ordered was for the department to begin testing BWCs (Floyd v. City of New York, 2013). Moreover, in a letter dated July 29, 2014, several lawmakers and community leaders called on New York City Mayor Bill de Blasio, NYPD Police Commissioner William Bratton, and New York City Council Speaker Melissa Mark-Viverito to equip officers with BWCs in the wake of allegations of police misconduct (Tempy, 2016). In response, Commissioner Bratton announced at a press conference on
University of Pittsburg Law Professor, David A. Harris (2010), looked at the impact of BWCs on both police and members of the public, particularly how these recordings might play a role in ensuring that officers comply with use of force guidelines. The study concluded that the camera, by its mere presence, imparted a sense of responsibility because an officer’s actions could be monitored during street encounters (Katz et al., 2014). Several studies (Farrar, 2013; Palmer, Warren, & Miller, 2014; White, 2014) compared civilian complaints and the use of force before and after deployment of BWCs. The researchers strongly suggested that activation of the BWC, and the awareness thereof by the officer and the subject, modified the behavior of both, resulting in decreased hostility and civilian complaints.

Research suggests that humans essentially become more self-aware when they are being watched (Gervais & Norenzayan, 2012). Moreover, people who know they are under observation are more likely to alter their conduct (Farrar, 2013). This is appealing to law enforcement leadership in terms of the potential to improve police services, and reduce misconduct complaints, all while increasing transparency and accountability (Westphal, 2016). An audio and video record of what occurred during a police encounter makes it more difficult for officers to deny allegations of force when they happen, and it makes it difficult for accusers of police to fabricate misconduct when it is absent (Palmer et al., 2014).
Problem Statement

Politicians, victims’ families, civil rights groups, and some police leaders have called for equipping officers with BWCs to increase transparency and accountability (Bradner, 2015; Fieldstadt, 2014; King & Disis, 2015; Morgan, 2015). With the advancement of cell phone technology, making recordings of police-citizen encounters has become more prevalent. The emergence of the BWCs may help police departments ensure that events are also captured from an officer’s perspective (COPS Office, 2015). This research study examines the perceptions of New York City police officers who adorned themselves with a BWC and their non-camera-wearing patrol partners during a 1-year pilot program. As such, the call for widespread adoption of BWC programs has come from places in the United States where police-involved shootings of unarmed individuals have occurred (Blitz, 2015). In December 2014, President Barack Obama created the Task Force on 21st Century Policing, which proposed an investment of $75 million to purchase 50,000 BWCs for police departments throughout the United States (Office of the White House Press Secretary, 2014).

Police officers spend significant time every day patrolling neighborhoods and responding to calls for service. They encounter crime victims, perpetrators of violence, and others committing criminal or disorderly acts (Long, 2012). The literature suggests that the benefits of BWCs extend beyond improved citizen and police behavior and lead to quicker resolution of complaints and lawsuits (Farrar, 2013). As a result, the examination of the BWC, as it relates to the incorporation of the device into the police sub-culture, is appropriate.
Theoretical Rationale

This study looked at the development of the BWC pilot program in the NYPD from the perspective of officers assigned to various police precincts throughout New York City. The theoretical framework of this study is related to information technology-adoption theories. Thus, a research model was developed by integrating two different theoretical perspectives. The social learning theory and the technology acceptance model (TAM) were used, while adding one other factor, the act of self-selection, to better determine the factors affecting the implementation and adoption of the BWC into the NYPD. These kinds of unified and integrated technology-acceptance models have been used in different studies (Hu, 1999; Legris, 2001; Mathieson, 1991) and in different settings (Adams, Nelson, & Todd, 1992; Dishaw & Strong, 1999; Park, 2009). Realizing the emerging importance of technology for police departments, this model attempts to explain the concepts where policing and technology meet. The researcher also examined the pilot program in the context of Akers’s (1973) social learning theory to determine the perceived impact of the BWC on the behavior of officers wearing it and on their non-BWC-wearing patrol partners, during the 1-year pilot.

Statement of Purpose

Since the summer of 2014, high-profile citizen deaths, such as Freddie Gray, Baltimore, MD; Eric Garner, Staten Island, NY; and Michael Brown, Ferguson, MO, have thrust the issue of police brutality and excessive force to the forefront of public discourse. Police departments are under public scrutiny, and citizens are calling for increased police accountability and transparency. This scrutiny has led to the proliferation of BWCS. Few studies (Jennings, Fridell, & Lynch, 2014; Katz et al., 2014; Roy, 2014)
have focused on police departments’ internal acceptance of BWCs. The internal buy-in of technology is imperative, because the benefits, like transparency and better officer and citizen behavior, can only be achieved if officers turn on, and use, the BWC (Gaub, Choate, Todak, Katz, & White, 2016).

The purpose of this study was to examine the variety of factors that affect New York City Police officers’ and their patrol partners’ perceptions of BWCs, which included their own experiences in the field. The primary objective of this study was to understand police officers’ perceptions of the BWCs. The study included four elements: (a) how the use of the BWC affected patrol officer autonomy and the use of discretion, if at all; (b) the impact of the BWC on job satisfaction; (c) the nature of the camera wearers’ and non-camera wearers’ perceptions by precinct of assignment, age, gender, shift worked, and educational level; and (d) the impact of the BWC on the relationship between patrol partners in a two-officer patrol team, when one partner did not wear a BWC.

Police officers are not immune to the social missteps attendant when working in a multicultural, multiracial, and multiethnic environment (Long, 2012). According to the Federal Bureau of Justice Statistics (Langton & Durose, 2013), an estimated 17.7 million persons, aged 16 or older, indicated that their most recent contact with the police was as a driver being pulled over at a traffic stop. These drivers represented 8.4% of the nation’s 209 million drivers (Federal Bureau of Justice [FBJS], 2013). Overall, approximately 5% of the traffic stops led to the driver, the vehicle, or both being the subject of a police search (FBJS, 2013). Police were more likely to search male drivers (7.4%) than female (1.6%) drivers. Black drivers (12.3%) were about three times as likely as White (3.9%) to
be searched and about two times as likely as to be searched as Hispanic drivers (5.8%) who were stopped and searched in the same year (FBJS, 2013). Yet, for a significant number of minority community members, that interaction escalated into something more serious: an arrest, a search, or perhaps even mistreatment by the police (American Civil Liberties Union [ACLU] (2015). What determines whether a stop will result in an admonished driver, a criminal defendant, or a civil rights litigant? This can be attributed, in part, to discretion, which is integral to all aspects of any police-citizen encounter.

Police discretion is defined by the distinction between legally permissible police action and the real acts of police officers (Skolnick, 1994). Paradoxically, police officer discretion can be beneficial and dangerous to people and society. Discretion can be both indispensable and essential to effective police work (Davis, 1975). At its most basic, discretion is the freedom to decide between at least two possible choices (Luna & Walker, 2000). Nevertheless, it is also a major source of power abuse. It can create over-enforcement as well as under-enforcement (Lundman, 1980), may promote arbitrariness or favoritism (Klockars, 1985), or it can even fuel police-citizen conflict (Grant, Grant, & Toch, 1982). Examining the discretion of police officers following the implementation of a BWC program may shed light on decisions made without scrutiny, given that the BWC is seen as a tool that can make officer behavior more visible to the public (Jennings et al., 2014).

A police department that deploys BWCs is making a statement that the actions of its police officers are a matter of public record (White, 2014). Both the public and police officers feeling the need to videotape every interaction can be seen as a reflection of the times and an unfortunate commentary of the state of police-community relations (Katz et
al., 2014). The literature suggests that the emergence of BWCs has already had an impact on policing, and this impact will only increase as more agencies adopt the technology (Mateescu, Rosenblat, & Boyd, 2015).

Research Questions

The following research questions guided this study:

1. What are the perceptions of BWCs by volunteer pilot program police officers and their non-camera-wearing patrol partners?

2. To what degree did wearing the camera impact the behavior of the BWC volunteer participant and his/her non-camera-wearing partner?

3. To what degree did the BWC change the nature of the relationship between the BWC volunteer participant and his/her non-camera-wearing partner?

4. Is there a relationship between years of police experience, years partnering, and the perceived impact of the BWC?

Significance of the Study

This study attempts to explain the behaviors and beliefs of the volunteer pilot program officers and their non-camera-wearing patrol partners from both a theoretical and practical perspective. Furthermore, since a growing number of police departments across the United States have debated the pros and cons of BWCs, it is important to examine the technology as it may become part of the standard uniform for a 21st century police officer (Miller, Toliver, & Police Executive Research Forum, 2014).

Essentially, this study may help to develop a better understanding of the factors affecting a police department’s successful adoption and implementation of BWCs. It may also provide empirical support for the technology-acceptance model from the perspective...
of the user. This study adds to the technology-acceptance literature by testing this integrated technology-acceptance model in a different culture and in a rarely-studied organizational setting (White, 2014). From a practical standpoint, if the usability of technology-adoption factors is taken into account by the NYPD, this study may be helpful to provide recommendations for each step of the integration process.

This study will also supersede some of the common limitations of many of the technology-acceptance studies. In their meta-analysis of technology-acceptance models, Legris, Ingham, and Collerette (2003) addressed three distinct and apparent limitations. First, they claimed that most of the 11 studies were conducted in universities or academic settings because of economic availability, instead of in business or government settings. In comparison, in this study, a law enforcement setting was used to measure the adoption of BWC technology. Second, Legris et al. (2003) found that most of the research application tools described in the literature were office-automation software or systems-development applications, which do not reflect real-life environments. In this study, the BWC is used as a research-application tool. Thirdly, most of the studies measuring technology acceptance did not test system usage. Instead, they relied on an individual’s self-reporting. This study examined the BWC as it was worn by patrol officers in selected precincts throughout the five boroughs in New York City.

Legris et al. (2003) further claimed that this kind of measurement might not reflect an actual measure of the police officer’s acceptance. Although, in this study, specific BWC usage was not tested, the objective examined insight of the patrol officers as the BWCs were introduced into the NYPD. The measurement of the impact of BWCs on the behavior of the participants and their non-camera-wearing patrol partners was
selected as the dependent variable. The officers’ gender, age, years of experience, and years partnering were selected as the independent variable. The BWC, itself, was identified as an intervening variable.

In 2014, NYPD police officers began wearing BWCs, creating a virtual log of street encounters and interactions (Pagan, 2014). However, data storage is the biggest driver of the cost related to the BWC program (Pagan, 2014). The volume of the recorded videos is based on the NYPD policy mandating BWC use in different cases or encounters (New York City Police Department [NYPD], 2015).

Research shows that agencies are paying, on average, about $1.50 per gigabyte for uploading and data storage for BWCs (Mesa Police Department [MPD], 2013). An NYPD officer works 20 shifts per month, which makes the average cost of a BWC $90 per month per user (Pagan, 2014). There are approximately 20,000 police officers on patrol in New York City, which translates to $1.8 million per month and $21.6 million annually for data storage for the BWC (Pagan, 2014). For this reason, Ariel et al. (2015) conducted a study of the Rialto California Police Department BWC program, and they found that with $1.00 spent on both the BWC and the storage technology, approximately $4.00 was saved in complaint litigation.

According to Long (2012), “Service lies at the foundation of policing” (p. 13). Yet, the necessity to record every interaction with residents is bound to minimize criticism of police officer behavior and the unnecessary use of force (Miller, 2014). The use of a BWC provides hard video evidence of decisions made by police officers in high-intensity situations (White, 2014). Video recording by BWCs protects against false accusations, misconduct, or abuse against officers (Katz et al., 2014).
Early versions of policies governing the use of BWCs show that officers had to physically activate the BWC when they exited their patrol car, oftentimes creating a tactical disadvantage (Lynch, 2015). Moreover, recording equipment had to be manually activated when interacting with civilians or recording statements during investigations. Under the authority of NYPD Operations Order 21 (NYPD, 2014b), New York police officers were to activate the BWC during all interactions with the public. Based on this order, the individual officer has moderate discretion to record, based on tactics, practicality, and safety. For instance, the BWC can be deactivated when interviewing a victim of sexual assault to maintain the victim’s privacy.

Consequently, BWCs are not a panacea and cannot, by themselves, ensure good decision making, appropriate use of police power, or even reduce false claims against the police (Rawlings-Blake, 2014). However, police agencies could consider the fact that using BWCs may prevent people from coming forward as credible witnesses to aid investigations, due to fear of retaliation or fear of public exposure (Miller et al., 2014).

**Definition of Terms**

*Arrest* – the act of depriving a person of their liberty, usually in relation to the purported investigation or prevention of a crime, to a procedure as part of the criminal justice system.

*Body-Worn Camera (BWC)* – a video recording system utilized by law enforcement to record police officers’ interactions with the public or to gather video evidence at crime scenes. BWCs have been known to increase both officer and citizen accountability.
Civilian Complaint Review Board (CCRB) – an independent department in New York City that investigates the use of force, discourtesy, offensive language (racial, ethnic, sexual orientation, or gender-based slurs), or abuse-of-authority complaints against the NYPD (CCRB, 2016).

Community – a social unit that shares common values and is situated in a given geographical area.

Criminal Court Summons – instrument directing an individual to appear at a future time to answer common minor offenses, such as drinking or urinating in public. The sole function of this summons is to achieve the defendant’s court appearance in a criminal action or arraignment.

Education Level – the maximum number of years of formal schooling an officer has obtained. For example, a police officer’s education level could be (a) a high school degree, (b) an associate degree, (c) some years of college not resulting in a degree, (d) a baccalaureate degree, or (e) courses or degrees beyond a baccalaureate degree (Taylor, Santos, & Egge, 2011).

In-Car Video (ICV) – an on-board camera that continuously records through a police vehicle’s windscreen. It may be attached to the interior windshield or on top of the dashboard by a suction cup or an adhesive-tape mount. ICVs can provide video evidence during police encounters.

Police Officer – a sworn individual who is empowered with statutory arrest authority (O’Shea & Nichols, 2003).

Police Misconduct – inappropriate or illegal actions, or inactions, taken by law enforcement officers in connection with their official duties.
Probable Cause – standard by which police authorities have reason to obtain a warrant or to arrest a suspected criminal.

Terry Stop – police practice of using force, if necessary, to stop, question, and frisk, under certain court-established circumstances, conduct a protective pat-down or frisk of an individual on less than probable cause (Terry v. Ohio, 1968).

Use of Force – physical restraint by a member of law enforcement to gain control of an unruly person or situation, or the amount of effort required by the police to compel compliance by an unwilling subject (NYPD, 2015).

Years of Service – length of time a police officer has been a sworn officer employed by a law enforcement agency (Taylor et al., 2011).

Chapter Summary

Technology is changing the nature of police work on a daily basis. The use of BWCs is significantly affecting policing in various ways: (a) to improve evidence collection, (b) to strengthen officer performance and accountability, (c) to enhance agency transparency, (d) to document encounters between police and the public, and (e) to investigate and resolve complaints and officer-involved incidents (Dillon, 2013).

Although BWC deployment can offer many benefits, the use of BWCs also raises serious questions concerning this technology’s impact on police-community relationships (Farrar, 2013). The manner in which police officers and community members engage one another shapes the type of relationship the police and community share (Long, 2012). BWCs not only create concerns about the public’s privacy rights, but they also can affect how officers relate to people in the community. Moreover, BWCs may improve the community’s perception of the police and expectations of how police agencies should
share information with the public (Miller et al., 2014). This study employed Askers’s (1973) social learning theory to help the researcher better understand the reciprocal interactions amongst cognitive, behavioral, and environmental determinants. In addition, Davis’s (1989) technology-acceptance model was used to provide empirical evidence on the relationships that exist between usefulness and ease of use of the BWC.

Chapter 2 contains a review of the literature relevant to the research problem and Chapter 3 contains a detailed description of the methodology used to conduct the study. Chapter 4 presents a detailed analysis of the results and findings, and Chapter 5 discusses the findings, implications, and recommendations for future research and practice.
Chapter 2: Review of the Literature

Introduction and Purpose

Police agencies are no exception to innovation, and they must continually adopt new technology in order to perform their duties. (Scott, 2015). One influential element driving innovation is the requirement placed on police agencies to provide new models of accountability (Gaub et al., 2016). A law enforcement agency’s decision to improve performance by technology adoption is its response to external pressures for increased accountability and transparency (Chan, 2001). In August of 2013, the NYPD was mandated to conduct a pilot program requiring some officers to use body-worn cameras while on patrol (Floyd v. City of New York, 2013). This court ordered the NYPD to address some illegalities uncovered regarding its stop, question, and frisk policies.

Long before the invention of the BWC, law enforcement agencies relied on the assistance of ancillary recording devices to enhance crime prevention and intervention. In September 1939, Popular Science Magazine described a 35-mm camera mounted on a hole cut into the roof of a police car (Armagnac, Oxberry, Wakeling, & Waltz, 1939). Shortly thereafter, the formal development of in-car video (ICV) systems created records of selected events and encounters experienced by police officers. Notably, they were used to monitor a police officer’s behavior in various contexts (Maghan, O’Reilly, & Ho Shon, 2002). Some examples included use of force, illegal searches, racial profiling, and any form of illegal, unprofessional, or abusive behavior by police officers. Some agencies adopted ICV systems in the wake of controversial cases or in response to accusations of
other problematic conduct by officers such as racial profiling (Maghan et al., 2002). However, ICV systems have also protected officers from false allegations of unlawful or unprofessional conduct.

In May 1988, Ohio Police Officer, Robert Surgenor, was involved in a high-speed chase where three robbery suspects fled in a stolen car. Officer Surgenor installed a video camera on the dashboard of his police car, using the remnants of a child seat, and captured the first-ever police chase, from beginning to end (Surgenor, 1999). Thus, as ICV technology was embraced by law enforcement, it became increasingly important to have recordings of specific police encounters. Law enforcement has incorporated video evidence analysis, collection, tracking, review, and storage into ICV systems.

Since 1988, when Police Officer Surgenor (1999) used a makeshift camera to record the first police chase, there has been an evolutionary course of ICV technology and use in law enforcement. As of 2007, roughly two-thirds of local police agencies reported having ICV cameras in their patrol cars (Burch, 2012; Reaves, 2010). Between 1999 and 2007, ICV use was common amongst agencies of all sizes (Reaves, 2010). Specifically, Koper, Taylor, and Kuber (2009) discovered that nearly all agencies using ICVs found them to be effective, and almost half reported no significant challenges to their use.

Eventually, the nationwide ICV initiative increased the demand for transparency. Of the almost 5,000 misconduct reports filed each year against police, excessive force complaints made up nearly one-quarter (The Cato Institute, 2010). Yet, growing anxiety over police abuse negatively impacts law enforcement’s public relations, and such
tensions have hampered the effectiveness of law enforcement in the communities they police (U.S. Department of Justice, 2000).

As a result of recent advancements in video technology, it is natural that the limitations of the dashboard camera were absolved with the emergence of the BWC (Roy, 2014). At first glance, BWCs appear to be a solution for law enforcement agencies that are struggling to provide transparency to their communities and resolve civilian complaints efficiently. In framing our understanding of BWC technology in policing, it is helpful to consider the following issues: (a) the evolving history of cameras and policing, (b) the research on cameras and policing, (c) the emergence and practice of BWCs, (d) specific police agency studies where the BWC was introduced, (e) BWCs and operational work, (f) BWCs’ impact on criminal proceedings, (g) BWCs’ impact on social sciences, (h) how BWCs may improve citizen behavior, and (i) police and civilian critics of BWCs.

**Evolving history of cameras and policing.** In 1968, the U.S. Congress established federal rules governing the use of real-time electronic interception. Title III of the Omnibus Crime Control Safe Streets Act, also known as the Wiretap Act (1968) was passed in response to congressional investigations and published studies that found extensive wiretapping had been conducted by government agencies and private individuals without the consent of the parties or using legal sanctions (Center for Democracy and Technology, 2005). Congress found that the contents of the taped conversations, and the evidence derived therein, were being used by law enforcement and private parties as evidence in court and administrative proceedings (Rahavy, 2003).
The Wiretap Act (1968) prohibits the unauthorized, nonconsensual interceptions of wire, oral, or electronic communications by governmental agencies. The Wiretap Act and its subsequent revision in 1986, known as the Electronic Communications Privacy Act of 1986 (Kennedy & Swire, 2003) were the first pieces of legislation to lay the framework for constitutional authority over conducting electronic surveillance, specifically wiretapping. The Wiretap Act developed a foundation for many of the basic procedures for legally conducting a wiretap. It was through this act that Congress “sought to enact a statutory wiretapping scheme that satisfied the Fourth Amendment requirements” (Monnat & Ethen, 2004, p. 24), which had been previously established in the court case of Berger v. New York (1967). In 1967, the Berger case established a set of fundamental criteria governing the use of wiretaps (Berger v. New York, 1967). In this case, the court “identified the requirements for a wiretap order to be constitutional under the Fourth Amendment” (Monnat & Ethen, 2004, p. 24).

The U.S. Supreme Court has held that the Fourth Amendment protection against unreasonable search and seizure extends to the interception of communications and applies to conversations where an individual has a reasonable expectation of privacy. Berger v. New York (1967) and Katz v. United States (1967). Congress sought to balance the privacy interests of the individual with the legitimate law enforcement and intelligence needs of the state (Wintersheimer, 1988). The Wiretap Act (1968) further stipulates that, before a wiretap may commence, a warrant must be issued by a judge who must conclude the existence of probable cause that a crime has been, is being, or is about to be committed (Center for Democracy and Technology, 2005). If a wiretap is needed before the commission of a crime, only the identification of the planning and
conspiratorial activities is authorized to be extracted from the recording (Wintersheimer, 1988). Since the passage of this act, judges have almost never denied governmental requests for wiretaps (Rahavy, 2003).

In 1986, Congress passed the Electronic Communications Privacy Act (EPCA, 1986), which allowed law enforcement to use rapidly expanding technologies such as video surveillance. Although electronic surveillance technology has advanced tremendously since 1986, the ECPA was found to be ill-equipped to keep pace with technological changes (Ciocchetti, 2006).

The ECPA (1986) defines an intercept as “the aural or other acquisition of the contents of any wire, electronic, or oral communication through the use of any electronic, mechanical, or other device” (EPCA, 1986). Courts applying the ECPA have held that a qualifying intercept occurs only where the acquisition of the communication occurs contemporaneously with its transmission by the sender (Global Policy Partners, LLC v. Yessin, 2009). According to the Administration Office of the United States Courts (2014), a total of 3,554 wiretaps were reported as authorized in 2014, with 1,279 authorized by federal judges, and 2,275 authorized by state judges. Compared to the wiretap warrant applications approved during 2013, federal judges’ approval rate decreased 13% in 2014, and the approval rate by state judges increased 8%. One state wiretap application was denied in 2014 (United States Courts, 2014).

The success of the laws governing electronic surveillance hinges on the faith that citizens have in law enforcement agencies. The primary issues surrounding the ECPA debate lie in the belief that Americans have a right to privacy (Ciocchetti, 2006). The U.S. Constitution does not guarantee a right to privacy; however, the Fourth Amendment
provides protection against unreasonable searches and seizures (U.S. Const. amend. IV),
but it does not limit actions that private citizens can engage in that directly affect another
person’s privacy. When distrust in the constitutional framework increases, pressure then
surfaces to introduce controls to limit the capabilities of law enforcement (Ciocchetti,
2006). Ideas, such as camera surveillance, could become potentially volatile without faith
in the law enforcement entities.

Studies analyzing the impact of camera systems on crime rates have typically
involved cameras installed in publicly-accessible urban areas where the public’s
expectation to privacy is low, such as city streets or shopping centers (McLean, 2012;
Piza, Caplan, & Kennedy, 2014; Welsh & Farrington, 2009). Researchers have examined
the impact of cameras in a variety of locations, including the United Kingdom (Gill &
Spriggs, 2005; Welsh & Farrington, 2009) the United States (Cameron, Kolodinski, May,
& Williams, 2008; King, Mulligan, & Raphael, 2008; La Vigne & Lowry, 2011;
Schlosberg & Ozer, 2007), and Europe (Lomell, Saetnan, & Wiecek, 2002). Despite the
fact that crime prevention has typically been the preferred policy basis for governmental
and private installation of cameras, studies have generally found that video cameras have
little or no statistical effect on incidents of crime (Biale, 2008; Welsh & Farrington,
2009). Webster (2009) disputed that video surveillance systems do not prevent crime and
that the evidence base does not support the continued expansion and use of video
surveillance on the basis of crime prevention alone. Further, Webster (2009) questioned
the purposes and uses of video surveillance systems and contended that they have
become a normal and widely accepted aspect of modern society.
Historically, there has been little video evidence of encounters between police officers and the public, and given the volatile nature of those encounters, this often results in radically divergent accounts of incidents (Stanley, 2015). In a period of less than a year, the BWC has transformed from a technology that received little attention by many police leaders and scholars, to one that has become rapidly prioritized, funded, and diffused into local policing (Lum, 2015). BWCs have the potential to be a “win-win,” helping protect the public against police misconduct and, at the same time, helping to protect police against false accusations of abuse (Jennings et al., 2014, p. 6).

**Studies on Cameras and Policing**

There is evidence that closed-circuit television (CCTV) systems are more effective in preventing certain types of crimes than others (Piza et al., 2014). Generally speaking, property crimes seem more susceptible to the impact of CCTVs (Brown, 1995), especially thefts from and of vehicles (Skinns, 1998; Tilley, 1993), while personal crimes, such as assault, are less likely to be influenced (Deismann & the Royal Canadian Mounted Police, 2003). Welsh and Farrington’s (2009) review found that CCTVs had no effect on crimes of violence, but they had a significant impact on vehicle crime.

Crime can be a purposed behavior designed to meet an offender’s need for things, such as money, status, and thrill, and meeting those needs involves making some decisions and choices (Askers, 1973). Derived from economic models of expected utility, rational-choice theory suggests that individuals choose to engage in criminal activity if the expected utility of the crime exceeds that of all other behavioral options (Cornish & Clark, 1986). With this recognition, the offender may come to associate criminality in that setting with a heightened risk of apprehension and prosecution. An offender’s
perception of the benefits and cost of criminal activity may be affected by social, psychological, and situational factors (Cornish & Clarke, 1986).

Clarke (1983) tied rational-choice theory to crimes committed by individuals who, having weighed the cost of benefits of the crime, choose to perpetrate crime. Central to this, is an evaluation by the potential offender of two questions: Will I succeed in carrying out the crime? If I do succeed, will I get caught? Although rationality is limited by the availability of information and the mental state of the offender, the elevated risk of detection tends to outweigh the anticipated benefits of the crime (Cornish & Clarke, 1986). The presence of CCTV cameras also give an offender the impression that the community values guardianship (Welsh & Farrington, 2009), and that potential targets are harder to breach than they appear (Wilson & Kelling, 1982).

A number of studies have found the installation of CCTVs has displacement effects; meaning that offenders divert their illicit activities to alternative settings and crime is not technically reduced it is simply moved to another setting (Ratcliffe, Taniguchi, & Taylor, 2009). Noted in the criticism of this research, there is a negligible impact of CCTVs on crime, or perhaps in containing crime, so it increases, relative to the areas not covered by CCTVs (Armitage, 2002). One of the earliest studies of CCTVs was undertaken by Musheno, Levine, and Palumbo (1978), and it failed to find a crime-reduction effect on a housing development after cameras were installed. Cameras were placed in the lobby and elevator areas of three housing development blocks in New York City in August of 1976. Images and sound were continuously transmitted to residents’ TV screens. A victimization survey indicated that in four out of eight crime types, there
was an increase after CCTV installation, while in the remaining four crime types, there was only a small decline.

One emerging question is whether the resources being spent on CCTV technology are related to crime decline. A meta-analysis conducted by Welsh and Farrington (2009) found that CCTV causes a “modest but significant decrease in crime,” (p. 716), but their impact may depend on the research site. The use of CCTVs in parking decks and lots showed a more significant reduction in crime than in public housing and downtown areas (Welsh & Farrington, 2009).

Welsh and Farrington (2009) also suggested that early evaluations of mounted cameras brought about an emphasis on officer safety as an outcome measure. This led to the development of an onboard camera that could record the view from a police vehicle’s windshield (Gervais & Norenzayan, 2012). The modern-day dashboard cameras first appeared in the 1960s when a camera was set up on a tripod that took up the entire passenger seat of a patrol car (International Association of Chiefs of Police [IACP], 2004). They became more common in the 1980s when self-contained visual recording systems were introduced (Ulkemen, 2009). In order to assist law enforcement agencies in purchasing the technology, the Office of Community Oriented Policing Services (COPS Office, 2015) provided millions of dollars in grants to departments that were interested in developing video surveillance systems (Westphal, 2016). A camera mounted in a patrol vehicle was expected to deter assaults on officers, increase citizen compliance, and make for a safer working environment (Poyner, 1992). Additionally, the video evidence could be used to discourage and investigate reports of racial profiling of motorists (Westphal, 2016).
Most departments view dashboard cameras favorably and use the technology in their own jurisdictions, at least in some capacity (Harris, 2010). The IACP (2004) conducted an evaluation of department use of dashboard cameras. A written survey asked officers to rate the impact that the cameras had on their personal safety. The results indicated that officers perceived only a slight feeling of increased safety when the camera was present (White, 2014). Individually, officers said they reviewed how they approached each situation and took mental notes of any officer-safety issues they discovered, such as turning their backs on a potentially dangerous individual, or allowing themselves to be distracted by other persons or events (IACP, 2004a). Officers also reported that when communicating to citizens that a camera was present and recording, the incident would deescalate, thereby improving officer safety (IACP, 2004b). A small number of officers reported that the camera distracted their attention away from the violator (IACP, 2004b). Some officers believed that, when positioning themselves and the violators, they sometimes put getting the best possible camera angle ahead of officer safety (IACP, 2004a).

In addition to increasing officer safety, agencies also reported that dashboard cameras improved accountability, simplified the incident review process, and enhanced their training curriculum (IACP, 2004a, 2004b). Patrol officers reported that the technology prompted them to pay more attention to following protocol and how they were treating suspects and citizens (Harris, 2010).

The widespread criticism of racial profiling at the local, state, and national levels reflects public concern that the race-based, decision-making process reflects racial prejudice, either overt or covert, by individual police officers and administrators (Engle,
Tuholski, Laughlin, & Conway, 1999). In 1999, allegations of racial bias or racial profiling were being lodged against police agencies across the United States (Ikner, 2005).

In several incidents in New Jersey jurisdictions, empirical evidence support the claims of significant racial profiling (Cleary, 2000). For example, Cleary’s (2000) Racial Profiling Studies in Law Enforcement reported that while Black and Hispanic motorists made up only 13.5% of the drivers on that state’s highways, they represented 73.2% of those stopped and searched by the highway patrol personnel. A group of citizens used video files from New Jersey State Police dashboard cameras to refute over a dozen complaints about police misconduct that were filed by motorists who had been stopped for traffic violations (Brown, 2014). With the ever-present concerns for accountability and civil liability, Firman (2002) suggested that police departments be flexible in their willingness to integrate new technology into their law enforcement practices. As a result of the advancements in portability, grade resolution, data storage, and overall audio capabilities, it is natural that the limitations of the dashboard camera were absolved with the emergence of the BWC.

The BWC. In 2005, the United Kingdom began initial small-scale testing of BWCs in The Devon and Cornwall Police Force, a territorial police force responsible for patrolling the counties of Devon and Cornwall in England (Farrar, 2013). In 2006, the first significant deployment of BWCs were by the Police Standards Unit (PSU) as part of the United Kingdom Domestic Violence Enforcement Campaign (Miller et al., 2014). The basic command units, equipped with the head cameras, recorded everything that
occurred during an incident, from the time of arrival, which led to the preservation of good-quality, first-disclosure evidence from the victim (Miller et al., 2014).

Evidence gathered during the initial testing stages was deemed especially useful in the way of supporting prosecutions if the victim was reluctant to give evidence or press charges (White, 2014). In July 2007, the PSU published the *Guidance for the Police Use of Body Worn Cameras* (Goodall, 2007). The report was based on the first national pilot of BWCs conducted in the UK. In the report’s foreword, Anthony McNulty, Minister of State Security, stated:

The use of body-worn video has the potential to improve significantly the quality of evidence provided by police officers. Video recording from the scene of an incident will capture compelling evidence that could never be captured in written statements. (Goodall, 2007, p. 5)

Despite being hailed as a tool to enhance the quality of evidence, the focus of the utilization of video was beginning to shift from exclusively benefitting prosecutions (White, 2014). The PSU (Goodall, 2007) highlighted that BWCs also had the significant potential to prevent and deter crime. In addition, the final report on the pilot project for the BWCs stated that complaints against officers wearing the cameras had been reduced to zero, and time spent on paperwork had been reduced by 22.4%. This ultimately led to a 9.2% increase in officer time spent on patrol, 50 minutes of a 9-hour shift (Goodall, 2007).

Following the pilot project, other jurisdictions within the UK expanded BWC testing. In 2008, the Hampshire Police began to use the technology in parts of the Isle of Wight, the largest and second-most populous island in England, located in the English
In 2009, The Security Industry Authority, which is the organization responsible for regulating the private sector industry in the UK, found that a CCTV license could be extended to cover the use of a BWC (Palmer et al., 2013). The summary stated that a CCTV license was required to review footage from a BWC and that a door supervision or security guard license was required to operate a BWC if security activities were also being performed (Electronic Privacy Center, 2015).

In 2010, over 40 UK police areas were using BWCs to varying degrees (Farrar, 2013). Grampian Police Department (GPD), which patrols the northeast region of Scotland, covering the City of Aberdeen and Moray, was one such agency that initiated a BWC trial in July 2010 (Grampian Police Department [GPD], 2010). The GPD project highlighted the following benefits in a post report: (a) increased public reassurance, (b) reduction of fear of crime in local communities, (c) increased early guilty pleas, (d) resolution of complaints about police or wardens more quickly, and (e) reduction in assaults on officers.

**United States.** In the aftermath of the shooting of Michael Brown, which occurred in August 2014 in Ferguson, MO, and the in-custody death of Eric Garner on July 2014 on Staten Island, NY, police use of body camera technology has become a topic of national inquiry (COPS Office, 2015). In light of these events that have exposed rifts in the relationships between police and the communities they serve, President Barack Obama signed an Executive Order establishing the Task Force on 21st Century Policing (Edwards, 2015). On December 1, 2014, President Barack Obama proposed reimbursing communities for half the cost of buying cameras and storing video, a plan which would
require Congress to authorize $75 million, over 3 years, to help purchase 50,000 recording devices (Edwards, 2015).

Implementing new technologies can give police departments the opportunity to fully engage and educate communities in a dialogue about their expectations for transparency, accountability, and privacy (President’s Task Force, 2015). Law enforcement agencies face major challenges, including determining the effects of implementing various technologies, identifying costs and benefits, examining unintended consequences, and exploring the best practices by which technology can be evaluated, acquired, maintained, and managed (Groff & McEwin, 2008). Addressing these technology challenges by using research, accumulated knowledge, and practical experiences can help agencies reach their goals (Lum, 2015).

In November 2014, Vocativ, a media and technology company, conducted a survey of police departments serving the 100 most-populous U.S. cities (Tracy, Fox, & Walsh, 2014). Vocativ found that 41 cities used BWCs on some of their officers, 25 had plans to implement BWCs, and 30 cities did not use or plan to use BWCs at that time (Tracy et al., 2014). The following cities had BWC technology in place: Oakland and San Diego, CA; Denver and Colorado Springs, CO; Mesa, AZ; Albuquerque, NM; Omaha, NB; Dallas, Ft. Worth, San Antonio, and Houston, TX; Indianapolis, IA; Detroit, MI; Columbus, OH; Washington, D.C.; Atlanta, GA; and Miami, FL (Tracy et al., 2014).

However, in Las Vegas, NV; Jersey City, NJ; and St. Louis, MO, officers expressed concerns about the deployment of BWCs. The trepidation surrounded possible distraction and safety issues, and if all the footage filmed by the BWCs would be accessible via public record requests, and whether the victims of domestic violence
would be hesitant to call police if they knew they would be filmed (Ramirez, 2015). Officers were also concerned that they would be subjected to disciplinary action based on a review of unrelated matters with regards to BWC footage (Collins, 2013). Some agencies have argued that it was mandatory for police departments to include provisions about BWCs in union contracts because it would be a clear change in working conditions as well as something that could impact an officer’s safety (Lynch, 2015). For instance, the Denver Police Union filed a lawsuit against the police department saying the pilot program ignored the collective bargaining rules (Stanley, 2015). The department’s proposal was for officers to upload footage from their respective homes while off duty. The union argued that the plan could impact the chain-of-custody requirements for evidence in crimes and impact officer discretion (Phillips, 2015).

For nearly 100 years, the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU) has been the nation’s guardian of liberty, working in courts, legislatures, and communities to defend and preserve the individual rights and liberties that the Constitution and the laws of the United States guarantee everyone in this country (ACLU, 2016). The ACLU has advocated for BWC use for both police departments and U.S. Customs and Border protection, and that safeguards are in place to protect the privacy of both officers and civilians (ACLU, 2016). Some police departments in the US have experimented with, or deployed, BWC systems. The National Institute of Justice (NIJ) (Moore, Trojanowicz, & Kelling, 1988) within the United States Department of Justice issued a primer regarding laws, policies, practices, and technology for local police departments to consider. To develop an understanding of these emerging laws and practices, researchers have
attempted to dissect the multitude of applications for the BWC in 21st century policing in the US.

**Phoenix, AZ study.** The Bureau of Justice Assistance (BJA), through the SMART Policing Initiative (SPI), awarded the Phoenix Police Department $500,000 to purchase, deploy, and evaluate BWCs (Miller et al., 2014). The design and implementation of the project included the purchase of 56 BWC systems. In 2014, a study was conducted to attempt to measure the impact the BWCs had on individual police officers as well as the communities they served (Katz et al., 2014). This quantitative study of the Phoenix Police Department assessed police accountability and effectiveness in response to domestic violence incidents with the incorporation of the BWCs. In particular, Katz et al. (2014) focused on six principal areas: (a) officer camera activation, (b) utility and use of the BWC, (c) impact of the BWC officers on job performance, (d) impact on public compliance and cooperation, (e) impact on officer accountability, and (f) impact on domestic violence case processing and outcomes. These findings suggest that police behavior is unique, and the research does not necessarily translate across departments or communities. A police agency and community’s response to the implementation of BWCs may be a reflection of the scope and nature of issues in that department and community (Katz et al., 2014).

Specifically, the Phoenix study relied on a pre/post comparison between target and comparison groups (Katz et al., 2014). The pre/post BWC deployment relied on data from January 1, 2012 through July 31, 2014. The BWCs were deployed in the field on April 15, 2013. The study period covered about 134 total weeks, or 67 weeks of pre-BWC deployment and 67 weeks of post-BWC deployment. The study also compared
officers in one area who were assigned to wear BWCs to officers in another area who were not assigned to wear BWCs. The study found differences between the two areas with respect to population, socioeconomic characteristics, domestic violence, and crime. Throughout the study, Katz et al. (2014) discussed several limitations. First, the findings of the study should not necessarily be generalized to other communities (Katz et al., 2014). Second, that a non-equivalent control-group design was employed that inherently possessed a number of limitations. The most important of which included the interaction of selection with other sources of invalidity.

Noted in the study was the fact that officers were transferred out of the Phoenix Police Department throughout the period as a consequence of natural attrition and the replacement process. Finally, Katz et al. (2014) disclosed a contamination of the treatment to the comparison group. As a consequence, the comparison group officers communicated often with one another before, during, and after each shift, and they were sometimes deployed to the same location as one another. The presence of an officer with a camera might have impacted the behavior of those around them, as well as it may have influenced their perceptions of the technology.

**Mesa, AZ study.** A study conducted in Mesa, AZ, also found that BWCs were associated with a reduction in civilian complaints filed against officers (Katz et al., 2014). In October 2012, the Mesa Police Department implemented a 1-year pilot program in which 50 officers were assigned to wear BWCs, and 50 officers were assigned to a control group without BWCs. The two groups were demographically similar in terms of age, race, and other characteristics. The study found that during the first 8 months of deployment, the officers without cameras had almost three times as many complaints as
the officers who wore cameras. The study also found that the police officers assigned to wear BWCs had 40% fewer total complaints and 75% fewer use of force complaints during the pilot program than they did during the prior year when they were not wearing BWCs (Katz et al., 2014).

**Partners in police work.** The police culture is a conglomeration of different behaviors, experiences, and reactions of officers faced with the hardships of dealing with the general public (Kling, 2005). These experiences are dangerous, unappreciated, and hostile to policing efforts (Dees, 2013). Although danger and an unappreciative public are common variables in describing police culture, researchers often place too much emphasis on trying to define police culture through the lens of danger, use of force, corruption, and coercion (Crank 1998). It is the law enforcement rules and routine of police work that cause an officer to bond with his or her fellow officers in an interdependent fashion (Kling, 2005). This bonding can go to an extreme when a police department divides into subcultures, which is normally characterized by secrecy or insulation from others in society (Kling, 2005).

Satisfaction with a patrol partner is a function of the fulfillment of needs and expectations specific to that relationship (Dees, 2013). It also involves the matching of ideal qualities, or behaviors, in a partner with those qualities that are actually fostered in a partnership (Genshaft, 1980; Parelman, 1983). In dyadic relationships, satisfaction has been found to be related to increased contact with a partner, believing a partner is emotionally and physically available to meet one another’s needs (Burke & Weir, 1977; Janis & Hoffman, 1970), and being able to choose a partner instead of being randomly assigned to one (Hill & Stull, 1981).
The level of satisfaction within a partnership may vary based on the duration of the time partners have been together (Griffith, 2015). A developmental sequence occurs in all close relationships that then facilitates and reinforces a partnership (Dees, 2013). Stability, certainty, and satisfaction are generally found in long-term partnerships (Medling & McCarrey, 1981). In a police partnership, officers can be reassigned before this period is reached, contributing to less partner satisfaction and less interpersonal interaction.

Booth and Hess (1974) suggested that there are certain conditions in social interactions that set the stage for the development of close relationships. These conditions involve schedules with flexibility, long hours, and occasional free periods for interaction time (Griffith, 2015). The potential for forming primary bonds between co-workers is the result of these conditions. An example of a long interaction period is found in a police partnership. Partners are together for patrol shifts, for extended periods, which provide ample time to obtain information and form close bonds (Dees, 2013). Close bonds are also formed when members of a dyad are working toward mutual goals (Booth & Hess, 1974). The main concern in personal and work dyads is to achieve goals in an efficient and productive manner. These goals can be professional or interpersonal. Individual members of a dyad therefore must interact in a supportive, interpersonal manner, and be satisfied with his/her relationship and with a patrol partner to be effective in attaining goals (Safilios-Rothschild, 1981).

**BWC and operational work.** For a BWC program to be effective, it needs the support, not only of the community but also of the frontline officers who will be wearing the cameras. Securing this support can help ensure the legitimacy of a camera program
and make its implementation more successful (Miller et al., 2014). Some police agencies have found it beneficial to take an incremental approach to the implementation of BWCs. For example, the San Diego Police Department planned to deploy 100 cameras as part of a pilot program with the eventual goal of outfitting 900 uniformed officers with cameras (Abrams Institute, 2015). Additionally, 54 uniformed officers in the NYPD were outfitted with BWCs in 2014 for a year-long pilot study, and another 1,000 were slated for spring 2016 (Pagan, 2014).

As Lum (2015) emphasized, rapid adoption of technologies in the absence of high-quality information about the impact of those technologies can lead to unintended consequences that may work against both police and citizen interests. The need for more research in this area is paramount, as the adoption of BWCs will likely have important implications for police-citizen interactions, police management and budgets, safety and security, citizen privacy, citizen reporting and cooperation with police, and practices in the courts (Koper, Lun, Willis, Woods, & Hibdon 2015).

A research team at the Center for Evidence-Based Crime Policy at George Mason University (GMU) formulated a four-phase project to help understand BWC deployment across the US (George Mason University, 2015). Phase I included a systematic review of existing and ongoing research knowledge relevant to BWCs for both law enforcement and the courts. This review allowed law enforcement agencies to understand the scope of research and knowledge on BWCs through December 2015. Phase II concentrated on studies of existing BWC use and concerns in law enforcement and the courts. This phase reviewed survey evidence from the Federal Bureau of Justice Statistics (Langton & Durose, 2013) and the Police Executive Research Forum (PERF) (2015) regarding the
The GMU researchers reviewed two areas of research to examine the state of existing and ongoing empirical studies related to BWCs (Lum, 2015). Most of the research was conducted in law-enforcement agencies. However, given the likely impact of BWCs on court processes, researchers Blitz (2015), Fiumara (2012), and White (2014) also examined literature and existing projects related to BWCs in smaller police agencies in Arizona and California. Despite the rapid diffusion of BWCs, GMU discovered significant gaps in knowledge about BWC use, as well as their intended and unintended consequences in both policing and court processes (Lum, 2015).

The first review of the research field was initially a study by White (2014) for the Federal Office of Justice Programs Diagnostic Center (FOJPDC). White (2014) found five evaluation studies of BWCs in policing as of September 2013. Also discussed in the White (2014) study were a number of possible benefits and challenges related to BWC use. Relying upon this document as a starting point, GMU expanded the search for BWCs to include both existing and ongoing research not yet completed at that time (Lum, 2015). Although they specifically limited their search to only empirical data in policing, whether qualitative or quantitative, it excluded opinions and theoretical discussions, descriptions of the technology or agencies using BWCs, and guidelines explaining how to use the technology.
In total, the GMU meta-analysis discovered 12 existing empirical studies of BWCs and 30 ongoing research projects, which they divided further by whether they were United States or international studies. Those studies mostly employed randomized controlled trials. Notable in the research is the growth in the amount of studies that have been or are being conducted since the initial review of the literature in 2013 (GMU, 2014). Also notable is that over half of the ongoing studies are in randomized controlled trials (Lum, 2015).

In particular, Barak Ariel et al. (2015) at Cambridge University, and The Police Executive Program appear to be carrying out a large portion of ongoing experimental trials. Some of these are replications of the first studies on BWCs, which were carried out in Rialto, CA (Ariel et al., 2015; Farrar & Ariel, 2014; Katz et al., 2014). Not only is the increase in experimental research on BWCs noticeable, but the rapid response to research needs due to the deployment of this technology appears to be historically unmatched (Lum, 2015). For example, despite the rapid adoption of license plate readers in policing since around 2009, this technology has still not produced a similar research response (Lum, Hibdon, Cave, Koper, & Merola, 2011). Additionally, at least one national survey of police agencies (Goodison, Davis, & Wilson, 2015) used a stratified random sample approach to survey police agencies about the prevalence and nature of BWC use. The Bureau of Justice Statistics also developed a survey and sampling instrument to gather information about BWC prevalence and use (Tankebe, 2015).

BWCs may reduce use of force complaints against the police (Ariel et al., 2015; Farrar & Ariel, 2013; Goodall, 2007; Katz et al., 2014), or BWCs result in quicker resolution of misconduct complaints (Katz et al., 2014; ODS Consulting, 2011).
However, if that signals increased accountability, improved citizen satisfaction, or improved police or citizen behavior, is still uncertain (ODS Consulting, 2011). It is also unclear, perhaps because of low incident rates, whether BWCs significantly reduce incidents of use of force either excessive or non-excessive (Ramirez, 2015). For instance, Ariel et al. (2015) found that BWCs reduce use of force incidents, but Katz et al. (2014) found that arrest activity increased for officers wearing BWCs. Conversely, Ready and Young (2015) found that officers wearing cameras, while less likely to perform stop, question, and frisks or make arrests, were more likely to give citations.

Despite a great deal of progress that has been made in expanding research on BWCs, many questions have received little attention. For example, while much of the existing research focuses on police officer behavior (Harris, 2010) and police professionalism (Lynch, 2015), few have expanded upon use of force and misconduct as measured by civilian-generated complaints and other allegations (Ramirez, 2015). Lum (2015) provided a list of research questions that no researchers have used. Some examples are: (a) technical aspects of BWCs, including how BWC footage is stored and used; (b) changes in agency policies related to use of force and police-citizen interactions; (c) the investigation of critical incidents, officer-involved incidents, or officer-involved shootings or deaths; and (d) crime and fear of crime, insofar as BWCs might change police and citizen actions in ways that might lead to increases or decreases in crime.

Nonetheless, BWC adoption has been rallied by more-critical and hard-to-measure concerns, including whether BWCs can reduce implicit or explicit bias and differential treatment based on race, sex, age, ethnicity, or other extralegal characteristics.
(Henstock, 2015). Additional questions of misconduct or professionalism concern the potential impact of BWCs on officer compliance with Fourth Amendment standards. Similarly, while ongoing research is examining officer attitudes about BWCs (Jennings et al., 2014), other measures of these attitudes, such as job satisfaction and retention, have not been investigated.

**Impact on criminal proceedings.** The availability of video may prove valuable in helping to address racial bias and excessive force by providing evidence that is, in some ways, better than eyewitness testimony (Blitz, 2015). For example, video evidence was an important factor in immediately prompting South Carolina prosecutors to file murder charges against a police officer on April 4, 2015, for shooting unarmed Walter Scott during a traffic stop (Macari, 2015). This type of evidence is superior in many ways to the unreliable memories of eyewitnesses (Lynch, 2015). Even events visible in the camera footage will almost always require interpretation, and jurors will only engage in such interpretation after lawyers provide the information necessary to place the video in a larger narrative (Rawlings-Blake, 2014). Viewers of video may fail to notice important details, events, or objects when their attention is focused elsewhere, perhaps by lawyers or witnesses explaining the scene. Moreover, to a far greater extent than eyewitness testimony, video likely provides jurors with an illusion of objectivity (Blinder & Santora, 2015). Jurors recognize that witnesses can lie, especially if cross-examination of a witness reveals awkwardness, inconsistencies, or lapses in memory. Jurors may well be less aware of how video evidence can be selective and subject to interpretation, including interpretations that distort, rather than clarify, what happened in a police encounter (Rawlings-Blake, 2014).
Few researchers have sought to identify relevant applications of the BWC to the court system. Some articles have addressed the impact of BWCs on the courts (IACP, 2004). These publications consist of reports and law review articles containing legal or other analyses, none of which are empirical in nature. However, according to Lum (2015), three unpublished in-progress research projects may address some aspects of the impact of BWCs on court processes (Ariel et al., 2015; White, 2014; Young 2014). Additionally, Lum (2015) posited that, White (2014) examined the impact of BWCs on plea bargains in Spokane (WA), and Tempe (AZ), while Young (2014) investigated the effect of BWCs on case-processing efficiency in Ventura (CA). All three also examined the impact of BWCs on criminal convictions.

Given the limited research directly related to BWCs and courts, further research is necessary. In additional literature, Lum (2015) pinpointed foundational questions related to technology use and technology-based evidence in the court system. While a wide range of articles have been published on a variety of court technologies, many of these articles are also not empirical (Capps, 2015; Goodall, 2007; Peters & Eure, 2015). One commonality in this literature relates to the challenges that courts, judges, attorneys, and jurors encounter when they interact with emerging technologies and sophisticated forms of evidence. For example, there is empirical research related to juror decision making when confronted with technologically sophisticated evidence (Hans, 2007). Although the specific issues are not often duplicated across technologies, these articles raise potentially important questions, such as the impact of BWC evidence on juror decision making.

Accordingly, some articles may be theoretically relevant to this current study because they delineate amongst the broad categories of inquiry, such as alterations to
decision making, to court processes, or to the addition of resource burdens that may be encountered by the courts (Lum, 2015). One area of existing research activity relates to the costs and benefits of using recordings as evidence. In 2004, the IACP published a report examining the views of prosecutors on the topic of video evidence in court (IACP, 2004). The survey predates body cameras and, as a result, examines prosecutors’ beliefs about the utility of other types of video evidence in the form of dashboard camera footage (Lum, 2015). Despite this, according to Lum (2015), surveys included criminal prosecutors. Specifically, 91% of responding prosecutors indicated that they had used video evidence captured from an in-car camera in court. Moreover, 58% of the responding prosecutors reported a reduction in the time spent in court as a consequence of video evidence. Further, 41% of responding prosecutors reported an increase in their case preparation time related to such evidence. These and other findings from the report highlight important areas of inquiry.

**Impact on social sciences.** An important consideration in the study results is the application of the research in law and psychology. Multiple authors reported findings suggesting that recordings may not be viewed by members of the public as objective accounts of incidents with police. The Kahan, Hoffman, and Braman (2009) study of dashboard camera evidence demonstrated that objective video evidence may be perceived differently by members of the public based on individual characteristics. Along similar lines, Lassiter, Diamond, Schmidt, and Elek (2007) demonstrated that recordings filmed from different perspectives tend to communicate significantly different impressions to mock jurors viewing the footage. Specifically, the Lassiter et al. (2007) results show that videotaped confessions filmed from the officer’s perspective were more likely to be
perceived as voluntary by experimental participants when compared with those filmed from a neutral perspective (Lassiter & Irvine, 1986; Lassiter et al., 2007; Lassiter, Munhall, Geers, Weiland, & Handley, 2001; Lassiter, Slaw, Briggs, & Scanlan, 1992). In further experiments, the researchers also linked these perceptual differences to jurors’ assessments of the defendant’s guilt and recommended sentences (Lassiter et al., 2001; Lassiter et al., 2007). Moreover, results indicate that judges may also be susceptible to these effects (Lassiter et al., 2007).

In addition to these empirical studies, the literature search yielded significant legal applications directly related to BWCs and the admissibility of video evidence during court proceedings. Some of these articles are published in law review journals (Harris, 2010; Wasserman, 2015). To date, no data has been found regarding the admissibility of BWC video evidence taken from a New York City police officer. Nonetheless, video evidence has been admissible in other jurisdictions (Meza, AZ; Chicago, IL), in spite of these concerns related to judicial proceedings (White, 2014). Smith (2010) highlighted the dangers of a video’s false objectivity and the impact of denying jurors and judges the chance to examine video evidence. Smith (2010) also explored how opposing parties’ might clarify, in cross-examination, how videos might be subject to alternative interpretations, or how such courtroom discussions might make jurors more aware of what the video failed to capture.

The literature suggests that legal organizations tend to be advocates of the use of BWCs within strict limitations related to privacy, access, redaction, limited data storage, chain of custody, and limits on officer discretion to erase or view the videos (Macari, 2015; Scott, 2015). Macari (2015) also noted that the potential consequences of BWC
usage for police legitimacy are often raised in the legal scholarship. Macari called for: (a) empirical investigations into public opinions surrounding BWCs, and (b) additional agency interactions with the public, as well as agency adoption strategies based in community engagement and approval.

**Police officer behavior in the US and abroad.** A growing body of evidence may largely support many of the key ideas surrounding the use of the BWC. Braga (2015) found that 60% of Americans believed the use of BWCs would help soothe community-police relations. Law enforcement agencies across the country are either considering BWCs or have begun to equip their officers with them, following a series of shootings of civilians by police in over the past few years that have sparked protests and civil unrest (Smykla, 2015). Advocates of body-worn cameras have argued that the technology will change police officer behavior during encounters with citizens. In the NYPD ruling, the judge noted: “If, in fact, the police do, on occasion, use offensive language—including racial slurs—or act with more force than necessary, the use of body-worn cameras will inevitably reduce such behavior” (Floyd v. City of New York, 2013, pp. 26-27).

Harris (2010) suggested that technology could increase officer compliance with the Fourth Amendment provisions governing search and seizure. Several of the empirical studies tested the potential for improving police officer behavior. The Rialto Police Department study reported that following implementation of the BWC program, citizen complaints against police declined by 88% from 24 in 2011, a year before the study, to just three complaints during the camera project study period (Farrar, 2013). Moreover, use of force by police officers dropped by 60%, from 61 to 25 instances, following the start of the BWC study (Farrar, 2013).
The Mesa Police Department (AZ) also assessed the impact of BWCs on officer attitudes and officer behavior (MPD, 2013). With regard to attitudes, researchers at Arizona State University (MPD, 2013) surveyed officers at multiple points in time regarding the BWC project. The officers generally had positive views about the potential impact of the body-worn cameras: 77% believed the cameras would cause officers to behave more professionally (MPD, 2013). The Phoenix Police Department evaluation addressed similar questions about attitudes and behavior and also included officer surveys at multiple points in time. The results indicated that, prior to the start of the study, officers’ attitudes were either ambivalent or negative. However, after wearing the camera for 3 months, some officers’ attitudes improved significantly (White, 2013).

The Mesa Police Department study also examined officer behavior measured through citizen complaints (Capps, 2015). The first part of the analysis compared the 50 officers who wore BWCs to 50 non-camera-wearing officers. During the first 8 months of the evaluation, the BWC users were the subjects of eight complaints. During that same time, the control officers were the subjects of 23 complaints. The second part of the analysis examined the complaint trends of BWC users before and after they started wearing the cameras. In the year before the camera project started, officers were the subjects of 30 complaints; at the officers’ pace, they were estimated to generate 12 complaints during the camera project study. According to White (2013), if this trend held, implementing the body-worn camera system would be associated with significant declines in complaints against officers, including: 60% decline amongst BWC users (a year, before compared to study period); 65% fewer complaints about BWC users compared to non-camera-wearing officers. As with the Rialto Police Department study,
the behavior dynamics that caused the decline in complaints remains unknown. BWCs have the potential to improve police legitimacy and enhance democracy, not the least by calming situations on the front lines of policing to prevent the pain and damage caused by unnecessary escalations of volatile situations (Ariel, 2014).

The UK studies also sought to test the impact of the technology on officer behavior (Goodall, 2007). For example, the Plymouth Head Camera Project reported a 14.3% reduction in citizen complaints during the first 6 months of the project, compared to the same 6-month period from the prior year (James, 2007). During the project, there were no complaints filed against officers wearing head cameras (Goodall 2007). In the Renfrewshire/Aberdeen Police Department studies, officers wearing body cameras recorded more than 5,000 citizen encounters, and only five citizens filed complaints as a result of those incidents (James, 2007). Notably absent from this study was the fact that there was no comparison to officers who did not wear cameras.

Proponents of BWCs have also argued that the technology will improve citizen behavior during encounters with police, suggesting that they will be more respectful and compliant (Farrar, 2013). There is little evidence to support this assertion outside of anecdotal reports in the media (Lovett, 2013) and preliminary results from a few evaluations (Goodall, 2007). The results of the UK study further state that citizen behavior improves as a result of BWCs, although the evidence used to support this statement is not clear (Goodall, 2007).

Officers using BWCs in high-crime neighborhoods noted that the people present significantly reduce the level of their behavior when officers with head cameras attend, more so than just with the presence of a police officer (Lovett, 2013). The equipment can
have a greater impact than street CCTVs or vehicle-borne cameras because they can be deployed at any position within the incident. Individuals interacting with the police quickly learn that the recordings include sound, and BWCs are more obvious than other CCTV systems that can blend into the background after a short time (Goodall, 2007).

The Renfrewshire and Aberdeen studies also examined assaults on officers to ascertain whether officer BWCs change citizen behavior (ODS Consulting, 2011). During the 5,000 recorded encounters in both sites, officers were assaulted on four occasions (ODS Consulting, 2011). In the Aberdeen study, there were 62 assaults on officers: 61 against officers not wearing cameras and one against a camera-wearing officer. The researchers concluded that if police officers wearing BWCs had been assaulted in proportion to the overall number of assaults in Aberdeen, it might have been expected that 18 assaults would have taken place rather than one (ODS Consulting, 2011).

**U.S. studies on improved citizen behavior.** United States research that addresses evaluations of the BWC provides some insight into the potential for improved citizen behavior. First, the Mesa Police Department’s (2013) evaluation asked officers their perceptions of the impact of the cameras on citizen behavior. The officers’ responses were: 45% stated that cameras caused citizens to act more respectfully. Second, anecdotal evidence from the Phoenix Police Department evaluation suggests that the technology appeared to have a civilizing effect on citizens once they realized that a camera was recording their behavior (White, 2013). Last, the Rialto Police Department experiment documented a substantial drop in officer use of force. This finding may be explained in part by changes in citizen behavior (White, 2013). The citizens may have altered their behavior during encounters with officers who were wearing cameras, such as being more
respectful and compliant, which led to fewer incidents in which officers needed to use force (ODS Consulting, 2011). Farrar (2013) acknowledged this possibility but noted that his study was unable to offer definitive evidence on citizen behavior. Members of the public with whom the officers communicated were also aware of being videotaped and therefore were likely to be cognizant that they ought to act cooperatively (Farrar, 2013).

**Critics of BWC.** It is noted clearly in the literature that some resistance to BWCs has come from police officers themselves (Jennings et al., 2014). These concerns echoed the response to dashboard cameras in the mid-1990s (Pilant, 1995). Officers expressed concerns over the potential for supervisors to go on unsolicited fishing expeditions in an effort to find behavior that would get an officer into trouble (White, 2013). The response from the NYPD following the judicial order to deploy BWCs was almost universally negative (Pagan, 2014). Former NYC Police Commissioner Raymond Kelly stated that “the body camera issue opens up certainly more questions than it answers” (Lovett, 2013 p. 12).

In May 2012, the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department announced a plan to pilot test BWCs (Ramirez, 2015). The Las Vegas Police Protective Association, a police union, responded by threatening to file suit against the department because the cameras represented a clear change in working conditions that would have to be negotiated through the union contract (Schoenmann, 2012). The NYPD union made similar claims (Celona, 2013). The experiences of several other police departments shed light on how leaders can respond to officers’ concerns. In Phoenix, AZ, police leadership engaged officers from the beginning of the project (Farrar, 2013). Police executives attended every briefing to explain the goals and objectives of the project and to answer officer questions.
Line officers were invited to participate in the scope of the work group that developed the request for proposals from vendors, and they participated in pilot and durability testing (White, 2013). The leadership also engaged the officers’ union in developing policies and procedures governing camera use. Commander Michael Kurtenbach of the Phoenix Police Department stated that it was “just as important to be transparent with officers as it is with the community” (White, 2013, p. 22).

Similarly, the Rialto police union participated in developing their department’s administrative policy (Dillon, 2013), and the Mesa Police Department (2013) created a stakeholder workgroup to manage the implementation of the body-worn camera project. The workgroup included officials from the department’s records unit, evidence section, information technology unit, policy management unit, training unit, and internal affairs as well as employees from the Mesa City Prosecutor’s Office. “The objectives of the workgroup were to minimize the impact on officers and to integrate the on-officer body camera system into existing processes” (MPD, 2013, p. 1). Open communication, both prior to and after BWC deployment, can strengthen the perceived legitimacy of a BWC program, demonstrate agency transparency, and help educate stakeholders about the realities of using BWCs (Miller et al., 2014).

**Law enforcement agency concerns.** Despite the tangible benefits of increased transparency (Bradner, 2015), heightened accountability (Fieldstadt, 2014) and a quicker resolution of officer-involved incidents (Farrar, 2014), some agencies note BWCs as potential deterrents. The cost of data storage and procurement (Pagan, 2014), the privacy of police-victim interactions (White, 2014), and lack-of-sound policy or guidelines (Miller et al., 2014) all pose resistance to the adoption of the BWC in certain law
enforcement agencies (Henstock, 2015). Functionally, BWCs may pose harm to the departments and communities that adopt them (Kampfe, 2016). To that end, the Minnesota Legislature drafted a bill prohibiting the use of BWCs for 1 year in 2016, to allow police departments time to consider strategies to mitigate their negative financial and privacy impacts (Simons, 2016). Questions about the legality of using BWCs in certain situations have also been raised (White, 2014). Some agencies have attempted to mitigate these concerns through their BWC policies, giving officers the discretion to determine what is inappropriate to film, such as when nudity is present (Volpenhein, 2015), or while interviewing a confidential informant (Mahbubani, 2015).

In their seminal study, the Rialto Police Department (2013) found a decline in both incidents where officers used force during arrest situations as well as a reduction of complaints against the police when BWCs were in use. However, the FBJS (2013) found a significant increase in both violent crime and property crime in Rialto in 2012. Bear and Rieken (2014) described the fact that correlation is not causation, and other factors may be at play.

The effectiveness of a BWC program is dependent upon support from both the community and the officers (Miller et al., 2014). One of the primary concerns for police executives is the fear that BWCs will erode the trust between officers and agency leaders (White, 2015). Some officers may view the cameras as a signal that their supervisors do not trust them, and they worry that supervisors would use the cameras to track and scrutinize their every move (Miller et al., 2014). Bear and Rieken (2014) suggested that there may be a problem when interpreting BWC footage during the incidents in question. For example, a Metropolitan Police Department (Ramirez, 2015) BWC video
documented a street encounter between a police officer and an individual suspected of possessing marijuana (Ramirez, 2015). The individual was released without arrest; however, the BWC video created a larger problem with the stop and search, and it resulted in subsequent discipline for the officer.

There is some debate over whether supervisors should also periodically and randomly review videos to monitor officer performance (Miller et al., 2014). Some agencies (Rialto, CA; Mesa AZ; Oakland, CA) allow periodic monitoring to help supervisors to proactively identify problems and hold officers accountable for their performance (Miller et al., 2014). Other agencies (Baltimore, MD; Fort Collins, CO; New South Wales, AUS) permit periodic monitoring only in certain circumstances, such as when an officer is still in a probationary period or after an officer has received a certain number of complaints (Miller et al., 2014). Some agencies (Phoenix, AZ; Topeka, KS; Daytona, FL) prohibit random monitoring altogether, because they believe doing so is unnecessary if supervisors conduct reviews when an incident occurs (Miller et al., 2014).

**Operational work-related hazards.** Critics of BWCs have also raised questions about the impact of the technology on officer health and safety. For example, Pat Lynch, President of the NYPD’s Patrolmen’s Benevolent Association (PBA), questioned numerous aspects of body-worn cameras, including their effect on officer health and safety:

> There is simply no need to equip patrol officers with body cams . . . . Our members are already weighed down with equipment like escape hoods, Mace, flashlights, memo books, ASPs, radio, handcuffs, and the like. Additional
equipment becomes an encumbrance and a safety issue for those carrying it.

(Celona, 2013 p. 32)

The UK BWC study (Goodall, 2007) provided a comprehensive list of potential hazards to officers who wear cameras and rates the risk level for each hazard. The guide deems many of the hazards low risk, such as being targeted for assault because of the camera, neck injury from the weight of the camera, and electrical shock. However, the guide does rate several hazards as medium risk, such as assailants strangulating officers with the camera strap or wire; assailants hitting officers with the camera and causing head injury; cameras transferring infectious agents or bodily fluids when officers share units; and headbands causing soreness, discomfort, and headache (Goodall, 2007). The guide also offers measures to reduce the risks. For example, wearing the camera on other parts of the uniform (e.g., a lapel or torso) can mitigate many of the cited health concerns.

Critics of BWCs (Mateescu et al., 2015; Phillips, 2015) have cited numerous concerns over citizen privacy. First, the National Institute of Justice (NIJ) guide states that federal law blocks the warrantless capturing of photo or video images of people where they have an expectation of privacy, and most states have similar laws (Braga, 2015). Moreover, a number of states require two-party consent before lawful recording of private conversations (Coelho, 2013). The NIJ guide further states that when using BWCs, considerations on whether or not audio recording is allowed during video recording will require specific research prior to purchases or even piloting devices (Draisin, 2011). For example, in September 2011, the Seattle (WA) Police Department determined that use of BWCs would violate Washington state law (Abrams Institute, 2015). State law bars audio recording of private conversations without the consent of all
directly involved (People v. Lucero, 1987). Unauthorized recording exposes police to potential civil suits. State law does allow an exception for dashboard-mounted cameras in police cars but not BWCs on police officers. The city of Seattle law department informed the police department that it would be unwise to implement a body camera program without first obtaining a legislative exception to the Washington Privacy Act (Rosenberg, 2011). In addition, Sam Walker once said that “the camera will capture everything in its view and that will include people who are not suspects in the stop” (Rosenberg, 2011, p. 22). Skeptics have also suggested that citizens, including witnesses and confidential informants, may be less willing to provide information to police, knowing that the encounter is recorded and can be viewed by others later (Harris, 2010).

BWCs capture, in real-time, the potentially traumatic experiences of citizens who are victims of a crime, those who are involved in medical emergencies and accidents, or those who are being detained or arrested (Hinds, 2013). As such, citizens’ emotional trauma could be exacerbated when they realize that the experience was caught on video (Harris, 2010). Moreover, the potential for BWCs to be coupled with other technologies, such as facial recognition software, may present additional concerns for citizen privacy (White, 2013).

These concerns highlight the importance of developing detailed policies governing when the BWCs should be turned on and off. For example, the model policy template developed by the Body Worn Video Steering Group (2013) provides specific guidance on how to minimize the collateral intrusion of the technology, specifically with regard to private dwellings, religious sensitivities, intimate searches, vulnerable witnesses
and victims, and communications governed by legal privilege. Detailed policies and careful officer training can assuage some citizens’ objections to BWCs.

There was a consensus from numerous sources on the importance of developing policies, procedures, and training for BWC use. Many of the camera systems are simple and intuitive, but training and policy requirements vary depending on the individual system. The NIJ guide (2015) states that officer training should emphasize that the technology’s primary purpose is for evidence collection, officer safety, and improved public relations, but monitoring officer performance is also a benefit of the system. Police officer reluctance to accept the technology can be minimized by their active involvement in policy development (Ulkemen, 2009). The NIJ Guide further highlights the importance of department policy: If cameras are to be used, policies and procedures will have to be put into place, or expanded on, to address several legal issues. These issues extend beyond the more obvious privacy and civil liberties protections toward which agencies must be sensitive. For example, a policy would have to address when a camera should be used and when it should be turned on or not turned on to ensure fair treatment of all citizens. Parameters would need to be set for voluntary, compulsory, and prohibited use of the camera. Camera video may also be considered a public-record item and a procedure would need to be created for public assessment and information requests (Tankebe, 2015). A policy should be in place before any testing or deployment (ManTech, 2012).

Results strongly suggest that adopting BWC technology requires a substantial commitment by the law enforcement agency, a commitment that far exceeds the initial outlay of funds to purchase the cameras (Peters & Eure, 2015). Several agencies have
described the considerable groundwork that they must complete before camera
deployment, such as selecting a vendor, overcoming officer and police union objections,
developing training and a policy that covers a wide range of critically important issues
from when to turn the cameras on and off to supervisor review and video redaction
(Morgan, 2015). One of the most pressing resource decisions involves storing and
managing the video data. Departments that choose to maintain the data locally, as
opposed to using a storage service, must overcome numerous challenges to effectively
manage the vast amount of video that an officers’ BWC records and to respond to
requests from the public and prosecutors for the data (Lum, 2015). Commander
Kurtenbach of the Phoenix Police Department noted that agencies must fully articulate
the goals they seek to accomplish with BWCs and that they should be deliberate in their
decision-making process, because the technology affects all aspects of the law
enforcement agency as well as other stakeholder agencies (White 2013).

Chapter Summary

From the studies reviewed, it is clear that BWCs are perceived in different ways
by different members of the law enforcement profession. Factors, such as public access to
video footage, frequency of footage review to assess compliance, and behavior
modification, all have an impact on the attitude of police officers when it comes to
incorporation of a BWC program (Harris, 2010). A lack of reliable data also appears to
be a significant issue that only further adds to the concerns in studying this issue. A
review of the literature studying various BWC programs and concerns of both law
enforcement management, as well as the rank-and-file employees, helps to further refine
and direct this study.
There are vast differences in policing small towns versus areas with major drug
gangs and crime problems (Goldstein, 2000). Nonetheless, the research noted a number
of perceived benefits, overall, for using BWCs, including better evidence documentation
and increased accountability and transparency (Miller et al., 2014). Also, there are many
other factors that law enforcement executives must consider, such as privacy issues,
officer and community concerns, data retention and public disclosure policies, and
financial considerations (Figueroa, 2016). The cost of implementing body-worn cameras
include not only the cost of the cameras but also of any ancillary equipment and training.

To date, little research is available to assist law enforcement executives who need
to decide whether and how to implement the use of BWCs in their departments. The
majority of the studies found that it was roughly twice as likely for force to be used in the
control condition, without cameras, as it was with cameras, and the studies determined
that the effect was statistically significant (Dillon, 2013). Also, most researchers
hypothesized, based on the previous research, that the change comes at least in part from
the awareness of being filmed (Farrar, 2013). With institutionalized BWC use, an officer
is obligated to issue a warning, from the start, that an encounter is being filmed,
impacting the psyche of all involved by conveying a straightforward, pragmatic message:
“we are all being watched, videotaped, and expected to follow the rules” (Ariel, 2014, p.
8).

As police-public encounters become more transparent, the curtain of silence that
protects misconduct may be easier to unveil, which would make misconduct a less likely
occurrence (Barak, 2014). It is the expectation that the BWC will increase transparency
(Figueroa, 2016) and improve accountability (White, 2014); however, Katz et al. (2014)
were not able to pinpoint what factors determined whether the BWC influenced the behavior of police officers, members of the public, or both. However, it was clear that there was an overall reduction in use of force (Katz et al., 2014). The research also suggests that the effect of using the cameras could have spilled over into the control shifts, making the exact size of the effect difficult to ascertain (Katz et al., 2014).

From a research perspective, it should be noted that all but one of the studies identified in the literature review involved quantitative research methods. One study, Jennings et al. (2014), involved a quantitative analysis that relied on baseline data of officer perceptions toward BWCs collected from surveys administered to Orlando (FL) police officers who participated in an experiment evaluating a particular brand of BWC. However, all of the studies make note of the need for additional research on this topic in a number of areas. Very little qualitative material has been noted in the reviewed studies as to the real-world experiences of actual participants in policing with BWCs. This research differs from the previously examined studies because it involved a more-focused setting and attempted to measure the impact of BWCs on three distinct areas: the issuance of criminal court summonses, making arrests, and the examination of use of force complaints.
Chapter 3: Research Design Methodology

Introduction

With the continuous increase in law enforcement accountability, Albert Reiss, Jr. (1971) discussed the absence of official documentation in most police-citizen contacts. He suggested that citizens receive a receipt from a police officer that documents the particulars of all contacts (Reiss, Jr., 1971). Although the public’s perception of police encounters continues to be a concern, technology has grown since Reiss’s observation and recommendation. BWCs are being seen more frequently as a possible resolution and an avenue to provide an accurate picture of encounters, friendly or not, between police and the public (Lovett, 2013). With their emergence, recordings of police-citizen encounters may now provide individuals with virtual receipts of their interaction with police.

The review of the literature revealed that there is a growing number of police agencies that continue to debate the pros and cons of BWC deployment. Few studies however, have gauged the perceptions held by the non-camera-wearing patrol partner in a two-officer patrol team. In order to obtain data on New York City police officer perceptions toward BWCs, an online survey was developed that was specifically related to the use of the BWC while performing patrol duty. This survey collected data from a population of volunteer officers in the NYPD pilot BWC program, and their non-camera-wearing patrol partners, to determine their perceptions and recommendations about the value of BWCs.
The problem that this researcher focused upon was the lack of evidence from individual police officers using BWCs, to support the public’s widespread call for more police accountability. According to the Law Enforcement Code of Ethics (IACP, 2004), police officers are expected to endure significant burdens caused by citizens’ exercise of their First Amendment rights. Further, the code states: “the same restraint demanded of police officers in the face of provocative and challenging speech, must be expected when they are merely the subject of videotaping that memorialized, without impairing, their work in public spaces” (p. 8).

If policing is a means to an end, a means to create social order through the application of power (Bittner, 1990), then the addition of the BWC should be examined for its potential to quell violence (Newell, 2014). BWCs function as a governmental counterweight to increasingly ubiquitous citizen recordings of police-citizen encounters (Johnson, 2014). An increase in attention from the media and the public on questionable use of force occurrences has added pressure on the police to adopt BWCs to increase transparency and accountability (Lovett, 2013). To provide a broad perspective on the effect that BWCs have on police officers, a quantitative approach was used to address the research questions presented.

Studies of police have noted that officers perceive their working environment to be laden with danger (Westley, 1970) or the risk of danger (Tauber, 1970). Officers have often been described as being preoccupied with the danger and violence that surrounds them, always anticipating both (Brown, 1988; Cullen, Link, Travis, & Lemming, 1983; Sparrow, Moore, & Kennedy 1990). Skolnick (1966) explained that the element of
danger is integral to a police officer’s work and that explicit recognition might induce some emotional barriers to police work.

The foundation of the police culture is built upon the anxiety associated with the dangers that officers may perceive in their working environment (Paoline, 2000). This study collected and examined data from officers participating in the NYPD pilot BWC program and their non-camera-wearing patrol partners. The researcher used a quantitative survey-based research methodology. Additionally, the researcher developed and distributed an online survey instrument requesting that 54 participants and their 54 non-camera-wearing patrol partners evaluate their experiences using the BWCs during the 1-year pilot program. The literature review for this research identified agencies that deployed BWCs and their perceptions of the device as it relates to their day-to-day functions.

A survey was developed based on Jennings et al. (2014), to measure the officers’ general perceptions of the BWC. In addition, the survey quantified the perceived impact of the BWC on partnership, citizen behavior, personal behavior, and the behavior of the camera-wearers’ fellow officers. Permission to use the survey instrument (Appendix A) that was tested in the Orlando Police study was provided by Jennings et al. (2014).

The research questions that this study endeavored to answer were:

1. What are the perceptions of BWCs by volunteer pilot program police officers and their non-camera-wearing patrol partners?

2. To what degree did wearing the camera impact the behavior of the BWC volunteer participant and his/her non-camera-wearing patrol partner?
3. To what degree did the BWC change the nature of the relationship between the BWC volunteer participant and his/her non-camera-wearing patrol partner?

4. Is there a relationship between years of police experience and years partnering and the perceived impact of the BWC?

Previous scholars have used quantitative research methodologies and correlational studies (Leibowitz, Guzy, Peterson, & Blake, 1993; Taylor, Kowalyk, & Boba, 2007) with self-report surveys (Bruce, 2004; O’Shea & Nichols, 2003; Taylor et al., 2007). This present study also used quantitative techniques in order to collect, analyze, and provide statistical analysis. The use of the quantitative method allowed the researcher to draw less objective conclusions from the study.

The intent of the researcher in using an online survey was to allow the participants to disclose personal information and honestly report their perceptions toward BWCs. The online administration of the survey permitted the researcher to gather data from the total population of pilot program participants (\(N = 108\)). This included the BWC participants (\(n = 54\)) and their patrol partners (\(n = 54\)) in order to provide an assessment of the general perception that police officers held toward BWC.

**Research Context**

The profession of policing has recently been witness to, and consumer of, a number of technological advancements and innovations such as the use of global positioning system (GPS) monitoring devices (Hughes & Burton, 2014), in-car cameras (IACP, 2003, 2004), and closed-circuit television camera systems (Menichelli, 2014; Surette, 2005). Consequently, nine out of the 10 largest municipal police departments in.
the country are in some phase of a BWC program, and numerous smaller departments
have also deployed BWCs (Peters & Eure, 2015). The New York City Police Department
(NYPD) is the largest municipal police force in the United States (Reaves, 2010), having
jurisdiction over law enforcement and investigations within the five boroughs of New
York City. The NYPD has 34,450 sworn police officers (Finest FAQ, 2016).

The NYPD has argued that there is a correlation between its stop, question, and
frisk policy and the drop in murder, rape, robbery, and aggravated assault (NYPD, 2015).
Challengers of this policy argued that the stop, question, and frisk policies have had an
unjustified positive or negative impact on minority neighborhoods, and the practice has
weakened the public’s perceptions of the criminal justice system (Spitzer, 1999).
Additionally, challengers have argued that these data do not support the NYPD’s claims,
and that there is an unwarranted increase of stops that violate the Fourth Amendment of
the United States Constitution (Jones-Brown, Stoudt, Johnston, & Moran, 2013). In her
2013 decision, finding that the NYPD stop-question-and-frisk practice unfairly violated
the Fourth Amendment rights of minorities, U.S. District Judge Shira Scheindlin ordered
the NYPD to test the use of BWCs. She added that recording interactions might address
some of the problems associated with street encounters (Floyd v. City of New York,
2013).

As a result of this court decision, the NYPD Body-Worn Camera Pilot Program
was introduced to determine whether BWCs contribute to officer safety, provide evidence
for criminal prosecutions, help to resolve complaints, and foster positive relations with
the community (NYPD, 2014a). The purpose of the court decision was to visually and
audibly record specific interactions between police officers and the public, and to retain
the associated video for a period of time (NYPD, 2014a). To meet this goal, the NYPD researched the practices of other departments, assessed the available technology, identified the precincts that would be part of the program, and issued an operations order to govern the program (NYPD, 2014a).

Considering the above, the format for this research consisted of a quantitative survey that was administered to BWC pilot participants and their non-camera-wearing patrol partners. The survey was designed using Likert-type response choices consisting of fixed responses. Additionally, the survey participants were requested to provide demographic data on their gender, race, age, years of experience, and years as a patrol partner. The study participants received an online survey that was sent to their NYPD-provided email address via SurveyMonkey. The questions were relevant to the development, deployment, and integration of the BWC program in the NYPD. The researcher ensured that identifying information on the survey would remain confidential including the identities of the research participants and their affiliated tax-registry numbers and other NYPD identifiers.

**Research Participants**

The population for this study was officers assigned to the identified six precincts throughout New York City’s five boroughs. A total of 54 officers volunteered to wear a BWC as part of the NYPD pilot study. During shifts, these 54 officers performed duties with their patrol partners in the same police car. Prior to the implementation of the BWC program, the participating officers attended a day-long BWC training session (Office of the Inspector General for the New York City Police Department [OIG-NYPD], 2015). The officers integrated the BWCs into their patrol duties on May 1, 2015 and since that
time, they have engaged in various police-department-sanctioned focus groups to share their experiences.

The entire population of NYPD body-worn camera patrol officers and their patrol partners were expected to participate in the study ($N = 108$). Officers from the six BWC participating precincts wore two different BWC models that were selected by the NYPD: (a) The Axon Flex, manufactured by TASER and (b) the LE3, manufactured by VIEVU (NYPD, 2014b). The BWCs recording mechanism is activated by pushing or sliding the power button located on the camera. A shift is considered to be 8 hours and 35 minutes, and there are three shifts for patrol officers: 7:05 a.m. to 3:40 p.m.; 3:00 p.m. to 11:35 p.m., and 11:15 p.m. to 7:50 a.m. A total of three BWC devices were distributed to the volunteer patrol officers on each shift. The patrol officers worked 5 days per week, for a total 42 hours and 55 minutes per week, for a total of nine BWCs in each pilot precinct. During each shift, officers patrolled the streets of their respective precinct boundaries and interacted with offenders, victims, witnesses, and members of the public. The participants were instructed to wear the BWC and record all of these interactions as per the operations order.

**Instruments Used in Data Collection**

This study used a quantitative online survey, administered to the 54 volunteer participants and their patrol partners. The survey used excerpts from Jennings et al. (2014) where the Orlando Police Department participated in a study examining the perceptions of BWCs. For the purposes of this study and the design of the research survey, a 4-point Likert-like scale was used to measure the study participants’ level of agreement on items associated with BWC implementation. A score of 4 indicated
strongly agree and a score of 1 indicated strongly disagree. Three items were reverse coded so that, consistent with the other items, a 4 would reflect a positive perception of the BWC. The survey consisted of specifically-developed questions related to the participants and their patrol partners’ experiences with the BWC.

According to Creswell, Plano, Clark, Gutmann, & Hanson (2003), survey design is beneficial to describe the “trends, attitudes, or opinions of a population by studying a sample” (p. 153) and to “generalize from a sample to a population so that inference can be made about some characteristics, attitudes, or behaviors for this population” (p. 154). Using a survey was the most appropriate design for this study as it provided a mechanism to learn about BWC volunteers and their patrol partners’ perceptions of the BWC and its effects.

The purpose of the survey method for this study was to generate quantitative or numerical data about behaviors and perceptions that could later be statistically analyzed (Fowler, 2002). Tightly focused, closed-ended questions have the advantage of giving respondents a fixed issue to respond to and a standardized format for answering the question, facilitating the ability to compare responses across populations (Martin & Polivka, 1995; Schuman & Presser, 1981). The survey requested that participants answer each question by electronically marking a box, placed under each question that most correctly aligned with their perception of the BWC.

Validity requires that the questions measure what they are purported to measure and that the participants interpret the questions as the researcher intended (Czaja & Blair, 2005). Validity also refers to the accuracy or correctness of measurement (DeVaus, 1993). To aid in establishing the validity and reliability of the instrument, a pilot survey
was distributed to five BWC officer volunteers and five of their patrol partners. One of the advantages of conducting a pilot survey is that it can give advance warning regarding weakness in a proposed study (Simon & Goes, 2011). These include: (a) where research protocols might not be followed, (b) whether the proposed methods or instruments are inappropriate, and (c) whether the proposed methods or instruments are too complicated (Simon & Goes, 2011). DeVaus (1993) advised researchers to “check to see if there are any ambiguities or if the respondents have any difficulty responding” (p. 54). Pilot testing ensures that a research instrument can be used properly and that the information obtained is consistent (Fowler, 2002).

A well-designed, well-conducted pilot survey can inform a researcher on the research process and about the outcomes (Simon & Goes, 2011). The selected individuals pretested the online survey to ensure that the questions were appropriate and assessed the time necessary for a research participant to complete the survey. Additionally, the pretest subjects were asked to suggest alternative verbiage, if necessary, and ensure that the content of the questions was clear. The result was an instrument consisting of questions designed to evaluate the respondents’ perceptions of the BWC after the completion of the pilot program. Also included in the survey are demographic questions, which provide information about each respondent.

**Procedures for Data Analysis**

In this research study, descriptive statistics were conducted to examine the demographic characteristics of the study officers. Means and standard deviations were calculated and placed on contingency tables indicating gender, race, age, years of police
experience, precinct of assignment, and years partnering. The survey questions related to the perceptions of the BWC were analyzed in four main stages:

Stage 1: The volunteer pilot program officers’ perceptions toward BWCs were examined across a series of perceptual domains including their general perceptions and openness toward the BWC and their perceptions of the BWC on citizen behavior, their own behavior, and the impact of the BWC on their non-camera-wearing partner.

Stage 2: The non-camera-wearing officers’ perceptions toward BWCs were examined across a series of perceptual domains including their general perceptions and openness towards the BWC and their perceptions of the BWC on citizen behavior, their own behavior, the behavior of their fellow officers, and the impact of the BWC on their partnership.

Stage 3: The mean differences were compared across a series of perceptual domains by officer gender and officer race to determine if perceptions were significantly different between male and female officers and/or White and non-White officers.

Stage 4: The mean differences between years of service, years partnering, and the perception of the BWC were compared across a series of perceptual domains to determine if perceptions were different between tenured members of the NYPD and their patrol partners.

Cross tabulation is used when the researcher wants to compare two variables and the variables are non-parametric or categorical (Lee, 2003). Cross tabulations allow the researcher to compute the number of times that a value falls into each cell of a matrix (Hair, Anderson, Tatham, & Black, 1998; Salkind, 2000). Cross tabulations were used in this research to (a) analyze subgroups associated with age, education, precinct, and the
BWC wearers versus the wearers patrol partners’ years of experience and (b) examine the relationship within the data independent of the total results.

Chi-square tests are used to determine whether observed frequencies differ systematically from expected frequencies, or whether the difference may be due to chance or sampling error (Shavelson, 1996). A chi-square test was used to determine if there was a significant relationship between two variables, such as precinct A and precinct B; the acceptance or rejection of the BWC; the difference between high school graduates and college graduates’ opinions; and the perception of the BWC’s effectiveness or ineffectiveness.

An attribute that is measurable and is different among individuals is defined as a variable (Creswell, 2005). Essential to the study was the determination of relationships among the different variables. As for many response variables in social sciences, ordinal scales deliver a simple and convenient way to distinguish between rank-ordered possible outcomes (Czaja & Blair, 2005). Moreover, correlational studies include a correlational statistical technique to measure and describe the relationship between variables (Mills, 2003). Survey data using a Likert-type scale are examples of ordinal data. Ordinal categories are common in research situations in which the assignment of numbers representing successive categories of an attribute, construct, or behavior coincides with meaningful directional differences (O’Connell, 2006).

The Mann-Whitney U test is a nonparametric test that compares two unpaired groups (Creswell, 2005). This test is used to determine whether two independent samples come from the same distribution. In other words, it is used to determine whether two independent groups are homogeneous (Gray, 2009). Application of the Mann-Whitney U
test requires that measurement and sampling errors are minimal. The test also requires that there is independence within groups, and that the data is ordinal (Creswell, 2005). It does not, however, require the assumption that the differences between the two samples are normally distributed. The aim is to determine if there is a significant difference between the two comparison groups. When the sample size is greater than approximately 30, the Mann-Whitney U statistic follows the $z$ distribution (Kasunic, 2005). For the purpose of this study, the Mann-Whitney U test was used to test observed variation in the categories of gender, age, precinct of assignment, police experience, and amount of time partnering.

The structure and content for this research study, and the survey instrument, was submitted to the Institutional Review Board (IRB) of St. John Fisher College for research approval. The St. John Fisher College IRB approval document is shown in Appendix B. An online survey (Appendix C) was emailed to the research participants, and it consisted of three sections. The first section contained an informed consent form (Appendix D) explaining the intent of the study, the method of protecting each participant’s confidentiality, and the participant’s rights regarding the research study. The study participants were asked to read and electronically acknowledge consent to participate in the study. The second section of the survey contained closed-ended, fixed-response multiple-choice questions.

Summary

In the past few years, there has been a strained relationship between the police and residents in many communities (Gaub et al., 2016). BWCs have been advocated as a tool by which police-community relations can be strengthened, while simultaneously
increasing transparency and accountability (Smykla, 2015). While attention has been
directed toward a technological innovation, such as the implementation of BWCs in law
enforcement, there is little empirically-sound and published research on the perceptions
of the “consumers” of this technology (Jennings et al., 2014, p. 4). With
acknowledgement to this deficiency in the research, and to the importance of the BWC
debate, this current study sought to provide data to assess police officers’ perceptions of
BWCs. This research also sought to evaluate officer observations as to the effect that
wearing a BWC may have on citizen behavior, their own behavior, and the behavior of
their fellow officers. The study further examined the impact of BWCs on the officers’
own, and their non-camera-wearing partners’ use of force and overall behavior while on
patrol in New York City. Data analysis and findings are presented in Chapter 4, and the
discussion of the findings appears in Chapter 5.
Chapter 4: Results

Research Questions

The purpose of this study was to examine factors that may affect New York City police officers and their patrol partners’ perceptions of body-worn cameras (BWCs). These factors would provide insight into how BWCs may impact the New York City Police Department (NYPD), and to what degree BWCs are changing how the NYPD operates regarding proactive policing and community interaction. In order to understand police officers’ perceptions of the BWC, the following four tenets were considered: (a) how the use of the BWC affected patrol officer autonomy and the use of discretion, if at all; (b) the impact of the BWC on job satisfaction; (c) the nature of the camera wearers’ and non-camera wearers’ perceptions by precinct of assignment, age, gender, shift worked, and educational level; and (d) the impact of the BWC on the relationship between patrol partners in a two-officer patrol team, when one patrol partner does not wear a BWC during this 1-year pilot period.

Most of the research in this field focuses primarily on civil liabilities and how the BWC has affected outcomes of police officers’ interactions with the general public through measuring the frequency of civilian complaints (Miller et al., 2014) and the decline in excessive-force cases (White, 2014). Many studies have neglected to gauge the attitudes of police officers toward the BWC and whether they feel the BWC is a worthwhile investment. It is, therefore, important to determine the perceptions of the use
of BWCs as volunteer police officers and their non-camera-wearing partners, in a two-officer patrol car, piloted this technology.

This research looks at the implementation of BWCs that can be useful to both scholars and practitioners. Exploring BWC acceptance and determining if there is a relationship between particular officer characteristics, such as years of police experience, years working as partners, and the perceived impact of the BWC, might be the first step in a gradual implementation process. The study explores the nature of organizational change, or lack thereof, due to the implementation of BWCs. It also examines if the BWC changed the relationship of the patrol car partners.

The study focused on police officers from the largest police force in the United States, the NYPD. The NYPD has 77 patrol precincts, 12 transit districts, and nine police service areas, which patrol New York City’s public housing developments. Each of the participating police precincts are in the five boroughs that comprise New York City: Manhattan, Queens, the Bronx, Staten Island, and two in Brooklyn.

The target population in this study was 83 police officers employed by the NYPD and assigned to six precincts (Figure 4.1): the 23rd Precinct (Manhattan), the 40th Precinct (Bronx), the 75th Precinct (Brooklyn), the 103rd Precinct (Queens), the 120th Precinct (Staten Island), and Police Service Area 2 (Brooklyn). This chapter is organized to reflect the research questions and the results of the study, and it concludes with a summary of the results.
The research questions that guided this study are:

1. What are the perceptions of BWCs by volunteer pilot program police officers and their non-camera-wearing patrol partners?
2. To what degree did wearing the BWC impact the behavior of the volunteer pilot participant and his/her non-camera-wearing patrol partner?
3. To what degree did the BWC change the nature of the relationship between the BWC volunteer participant and his/her non-camera-wearing patrol partner?
4. What is the relationship between certain officer characteristics, such as years of police experience and years partnering, and the perceived impact of the BWC?

Data for this study were collected by a survey that recorded answers from individual police officers with respect to the above research questions. Reliability of the survey was determined by using Cronbach’s alpha, and was it computed that the survey was very reliable with a .89 score. Scores above .70 indicate that items in a survey are reliable (Urdan, 2010; Vogt & Johnson, 2011). Validity of the survey was provided by a review of the survey questions, which was conducted by an expert panel of police administrators and police officers. Data from the survey responses were analyzed using the R Project for Statistical Computing (R 3.3.2). Descriptive statistics were computed to measure demographic data on the participants, their command of assignment, and impact on the discharge of their duties.

One statistical measure used to analyze these data was a Pearson’s chi-square test, the most commonly used type of chi-square significance test (Preacher, 2001). When the researcher is curious as to the “frequency of cases possessing some quality that varies amongst levels of a given factor,” a chi-square test is appropriate (Preacher, 2001, p. 3). The main goal of a chi-square test is to show whether there are significant differences between the populations being tested (Gravetter & Wallnau, 2009). “To conduct the chi-square test, the researcher enters observed frequencies corresponding to combinations of levels of relevant factors . . . sums of elements within rows and within columns are then computed” (Preacher, 2001, p. 4).
The Mann-Whitney U test was selected as the most appropriate nonparametric, independent two-sample test to evaluate the responses of those who wore the BWC versus the non-camera-wearing partners (Howell, 2002; Siegel, 1956). According to Siegel (1956) the Mann-Whitney U test is a highly effective test when the sample consists of two independent groups. It is an appropriate method to use with a small sample ($n = 83$), as was the case in this current study. Further justification for the application of the Mann-Whitney U test is the fact that the survey data appeared to violate the normality assumption required of traditional parametric tests of statistical significance like an ANOVA.

**Data Analysis and Findings**

All of the participants who were surveyed were in the rank of police officer, and they were either officers who had worn the BWC or officers whose patrol partners were equipped with a BWC. Table 4.1 shows the breakdown of those who responded based on command of assignment and their role in the research.

**Table 4.1**

*Breakdown of Participants Based on Command of Assignment and Role*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Command of Assignment</th>
<th>Surveyed Officers Who Wore Cameras</th>
<th>Surveyed Officers Who Were Partners</th>
<th>Total Officers Surveyed from Respective Commands</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23rd Precinct (Manhattan)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40th Precinct (Bronx)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75th Precinct (Brooklyn)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103 Precinct (Queens)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120th Precinct (Staten Island)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSA 2 (Brooklyn)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Demographics: age, sex, and education level.** The age range of the participants varied from 21 years to older than 36 years. Most of the participants were from 26 to 30 years old or 33.3% of the total group. The next two represented groups were the 36-years-old and over group (35.9%), followed by the 31 to 35-years-of-age group (30.8%). In terms of gender, an overwhelming majority were male. Out of the 83 surveyed police officers, 71 were male and 11 were female \((n=82)\). One person skipped the question entirely. Table 4.2 below shows the gender and percentage totals of the research question asked in the survey.

Table 4.2

*Gender and Percentage Totals of the Research Questions Asked in the Survey*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender of Officer</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percent (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>85.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Advocates and pundits have claimed that professionalizing the police depended upon having college-educated individuals as police officers (Spangenberg, 2016). The NYPD hiring requirements have changed over the course of time and now demand that applicants have completed and earned, at a minimum, 60 college credits (Hayeslip, 1989). This study asked the respondents what degree of education they had attained. The results (Table 4.3) show that 35 of the 83 had at least a bachelor’s degree, accounting for 42.17% of respondents. Over 90% of respondents had pursued some form of higher education.

Respondents were also asked to indicate how many years of experience they had as police officers and these answers ranged from 1 year of service to more than 15 years.
The majority of those surveyed, 77.11%, stated they have 10 or fewer years of service as a police officer; 15.66% of those surveyed responded they had between 11 and 15 years of service; and only five of the respondents, accounting for only 6.02%, stated they had more than 15 years of service.

Table 4.3

Respondent’s Educational Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education Level</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Percent (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Master’s Degree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s Degree</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>40.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Degree</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade/Tech/Vocational Training Degree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some College Credits, No Degree</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>28.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School Graduate, Diploma, or Equivalent</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.4

Respondent’s Years of Police Service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years of Service</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percent (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>37.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>39.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15+</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Holdaway and O’Neil (2006) explained that police ethnicity is a byproduct of the police occupational culture. To that end, the survey participants’ ethnicities were also a demographic explored in this study. Of the 83 police officers surveyed, a total of 46
officers, or 55.42%, identified as White. Hispanic or Latino officers made up 18.07% of those surveyed, and Black or African American officers made up 3.61% of those surveyed. The remaining responses included 7.23% who identified as other, with another 4.82% identifying as Asian/Pacific Islander.

Table 4.5

*Ethnicity of the Surveyed Participants*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Percent (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic or Latino</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>55.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Research question 1.** What are the perceptions of BWCs by volunteer pilot program police officers and their non-camera-wearing patrol partners?

The first question sought to determine the feelings BWC wearers and their non-camera-wearing partners had regarding the BWC. When asked if the NYPD should adopt BWCs for all frontline police officers, non-camera wearers held a strong belief that it would be wise to do so (Table 4.6). Of the non-wearers surveyed, 60.47% agreed with the statement, and 18.60% strongly agreed. A few officers felt that the NYPD should not adopt the cameras. A total of 16.28% stated they disagreed and 4.65% strongly disagreed. The BWC-wearers had nearly similar responses to this question, with 52.50% agreeing that the department should adopt BWC for all frontline officers and another
25% strongly agreeing. Again, a minority felt otherwise with 17.5% disagreeing and 5% strongly disagreeing.

Table 4.6

Response to: I Think the NYPD Should Adopt Body-Worn Cameras for all Frontline Police Officers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wearer</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The second survey question asked if the officer felt comfortable wearing the BWC. A majority of officers, 62.50%, agreed that they were, indeed, comfortable wearing the camera, with 25% strongly agreed. Of those officers, only 5% disagreed and 7.5% strongly disagreed that they were comfortable wearing the camera. The non-camera-wearing patrol partners held similar views with 60.47% agreeing that they were comfortable that their partner wearing a BWC. A total of 25.58% strongly agreed that they felt comfortable. Only 9.3% disagreed and 4.65% strongly disagreed with the question concerning the camera, and how comfortable they were with it (Table 4.7)

Table 4.7

Answer to: I Felt Comfortable Wearing a Body-Worn Camera/I Felt Comfortable Having my Patrol Partner Volunteer to Wear a Body-Worn Camera

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wearer</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
When asked about how they perceived their effectiveness as a patrol team, the responses from both the wearers and their partners were different. When asked specifically if they felt that if the BWC had made them a better patrol team, 51.16% of BWC patrol partners agreed with the statement, while 11.63% strongly agreed. There were some negative responses, where 27.91% disagreed and 9.3% strongly disagreed that the BWC made the two a better patrol team. The BWC wearers did not feel the camera’s presence made them a better police officer, as 45% disagreed and 27.5% strongly agreed. Only 15% agreed, and another 12.5% strongly agreed that the BWC’s presence made them a better police officer (Table 4.8)

Table 4.8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wearer</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The study also prompted the participants to determine if the BWC made them feel safer while performing their duties as a police officer. The responses from both the patrol partners and the camera wearers were almost evenly split. The BWC wearers’ responses were near split on agree or disagree. Exactly 40% of those who wore the BWC agreed that it made them feel safer. At the same time, 32.5% of those who wore the camera disagreed that it made them feel safer. Moreover, as safety is concerned, only 5% strongly agreed that the BWC made them feel safer, while 22.5% strongly disagreed with
this statement. The patrol partners had similar feelings about the BWC with agree and 
disagree responses registering at 34.88% each; 18.60% strongly disagreed with the 
statement, with 11.63% strongly agreeing with the statement regarding the BWC making 
them feel safer (Table 4.9).

Table 4.9

| Response to: Wearing a Body-Worn Camera Made Me Feel Safer in the Performance of My Duties. My Patrol Partner Wearing a Body-Worn Camera Made Me Feel Safer in the Performance of my Duties |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Group | Strongly Agree | Agree | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
| Wearer | 2 | 16 | 13 | 9 |
| Partner | 5 | 15 | 15 | 8 |

**Research question 2.** To what degree did wearing the BWC impact the behavior of the volunteer pilot participant and his/her patrol partner?

The second research question explored how the BWC affected the behavior of the officers while in the field performing their duties. When asked if the BWC improved their behavior in the field, the BWC wearers disagreed, en masse, with this statement: 40% disagreeing and 40% strongly disagreeing. The remaining 20% stated they agreed the BWC improved their behavior. The patrol partners felt nearly the same as their counterparts with 37.21% strongly disagreeing and 46.51% disagreeing with the statement. Only 9.3% agreed and 6.98% strongly agreed, a slight difference with the responses of the wearers regarding the impact that BWCs had on their behavior in the field (Table 4.10).
Table 4.10

Response to: Wearing a Body-Worn Camera Improved My Behavior in the Field. My Patrol Partner Wearing a Body-Worn Camera Improved My Behavior in the Field

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wearer</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The survey also asked if the presence of the BWC increased the likelihood that the participants’ behavior would be more by the book. With this statement, the patrol partners also disagreed, with 32.56% strongly disagree and 46.51% disagree responses recorded. A minority of the patrol partners did agree that the BWC, to some extent, made it more likely they would act by the book: 9.3% agreed, with 11.63% responding with strongly agree. For the BWC wearers, they also disagreed that the BWC increased the likelihood of by-the-book behavior: 45% strongly disagreed and 25% disagreed with the statement; 22.5% responded with agreed and 7.5% responded strongly agreed with the idea that the BWC had an impact on their behavior being by the book (Table 4.11).

Table 4.11

Response to: Wearing a Body-Worn Camera Increased the Likelihood my Behavior Would be “By the Book.” My Patrol Partner Wearing a Body-Worn Camera Increased the Likelihood My Behavior Would Be “By the Book”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>No Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wearer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The tendency to use force was also researched, and when asked if the camera reduced their tendency to use force against subjects, BWC wearers disagreed in large numbers. A majority, 50%, responded with disagree and another 42.5% strongly disagreed. A small number felt the BWC reduced their tendency to use force: 5% agree and 2.5% responded with strongly agree. Regarding the patrol partners and their willingness to use physical force, they also disagreed in large numbers with the statement: 30.23% strongly disagree, 53.49% disagree. Only 9.3% responded with agree and 6.98% responded with a strongly disagree (Table 4.12).

Table 4.12

Response to: Wearing a Body-Worn Camera Reduced my Tendency to Use Force Against Subjects. My Patrol Partner Wearing a Body-Worn Camera Reduced My Tendency to Use Force Against Subjects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wearer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Willingness to respond to calls for service was also explored and whether the BWC was discouraging the officers to perform their duties. Patrol partners of those wearing the BWC did not feel like the BWC reduced their willingness to respond to calls for service. Strongly disagree garnered a 44.19% response with 46.51% disagree. Only 2.33% responded with strongly agree and 6.98% with agree that the BWC was discouraging them to respond to calls. The officers wearing the BWC had similar responses that they were not discouraged by the BWC to respond to calls. Of the response options, strongly disagree garnered 42.5% while agree received 47.5%. Only four
officers who wore the BWC chose *agree*, amounting to 10% of the responses (Table 4.13).

Table 4.13

*Response to: Wearing a Body-Worn Camera Reduced My Willingness to Respond to Calls for Service. My Patrol Partner Wearing a Body-Worn Camera Reduced My Willingness to Respond to Calls For Service*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wearer</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One statement evaluated was whether the BWC impacted the use of discretion. This statement was only offered to those who wore the BWC, and the results are interestingly split 32.5% responded that they *strongly disagree* with another 32.5% stating they *agree* with the statement; 25% of responses indicated that they *disagree* with the statement, and 10% of responses indicated that they *strongly agree* (Table 4.14).

Table 4.14

*Response to: Wearing a Body-Worn Camera Has Impacted My Use of Discretion*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wearer</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Using the behavior-related survey items, a quantitative composite score of overall perceived behavior change was computed. A comparison of this behavior change index across BWC wearers and non-wearers revealed a significant difference in the perceived impact of the BWCs on officer behavior across the wearer/non-wearer divide.
The BWC volunteers were less apt to perceive behavior changes than their patrol partners. The median behavior change perception in the wearer and the patrol partner groups were 1.6 and 2.25, respectively. The distributions in the two groups differed significantly (Mann-Whitney U = 940, \( p < 0.01 \)).

**Research question 3.** To what degree did the BWC change the nature of the relationship between the BWC volunteer participant and his/her partner?

To determine how the BWC affected the relationship between the officers, the survey first asked the two groups to evaluate how they viewed their patrol partner. The choices were between *friend, colleague, acquaintance*, and *no relationship*. Of the sample of camera-wearing patrol partners surveyed, 69.77% stated they believed their patrol partner was their friend; 23.26% responded describing them as a colleague, 4.65% stated they had no relationship with their patrol partner, and 2.33% stated they saw their patrol partner as an acquaintance. When asked if not having a camera had any impact on their partnership, 83.72% responded that it had *no impact*, with 11.63% stating it had *little impact*, and a minority, 4.65%, stated that it had a *negative impact*. There were no responses indicating a *positive impact* (Table 4.15).
Table 4.15

Response to: *I Consider My Patrol Partner a Friend, Colleague, Acquaintance, or No Relationship*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>No Relationship</th>
<th>Acquaintance</th>
<th>Colleague</th>
<th>Friend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wearer</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When posed with the same type of question to those who wore the BWC, the responses were quite different. Of those surveyed, 62.5% considered their non-camera-wearing partner to be their *friend*; 35% responded that they considered their patrol partner to be a *colleague*, with only 2.5% saying their patrol partner was an *acquaintance*. The choice of *no relationship* garnered no responses. The survey then asked what type of impact wearing the BWC had on their relationship with their non-camera-wearing partner, and their perception was slightly different than their patrol partners. *No impact* received 47.5% of the responses, followed by 35% stating that the BWC had *little impact*. Only 10% of those surveyed felt it had a *positive impact*, while 7.5% felt the BWC had a *negative impact* on their relationship. While the perceptions of what type of impact the BWC had on their relationship may be slightly different, the overall majority of those surveyed felt they had a professional relationship or a friendship with their patrol partner (Table 4.16).
Table 4.16

Response to: Wearing a Camera Had the Following Impact on My Partnership With My Non-Camera-Wearing Partner. Not Having a Camera Had the Following Impact on My Partnership With My Camera-Wearing Partner

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Negative Impact</th>
<th>Little Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
<th>Positive Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wearer</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Using the survey question that asked respondents about the impact of the BWC on the partner relationship, a measure of the magnitude of impact on the relationship was derived. This impact magnitude variable was compared across wearer/non-wearer groups to check for the existence of a perceptual difference between groups.

The BWC volunteers were more likely to perceive a shift in the nature of the relationship than their patrol partners. The median impact magnitudes in the wearer and patrol partner groups was 1 and 0, respectively. The distributions in the two groups differed significantly (Mann-Whitney $U = 545, p < 0.01$).

**Research question 4.** What is the relationship between certain officer characteristics, such as years of police experience and years partnering, and the perceived impact of the BWC?

A chi-square test of independence was performed to examine the relationship between years of service and level of comfort wearing the BWC. The relationship between these variables was significant, $\chi^2(9, n = 40) = 17.4, p < 0.05$. More experienced officers were less comfortable, on average, wearing the BWC.
The survey also asked how long the participants had been working with their current patrol partner, and 30.12% stated they had been working with their patrol partner for 1 to 2 years. Of those participants surveyed, 29.92% stated they had been working with their patrol partners for more than 2 years, while 20.48% stated they had only been working together for a period of less than 1 to 6 months; and 18.07% indicated being partners for a short amount of time, as well, stating they have been working together for a period of 7 months to 1 year.

In order to examine the relationship between the time in partnership and the perception of impact on partner relationship, a chi-square test of independence was performed. Among the BWC wearers, the relationship between these variables was significant, $\chi^2$-square (6, $n = 40$) = 13.2, $p < 0.05$. The officers in partnership for shorter periods of time were more likely to perceive a negative impact, whereas those who had more experience with their patrol partners were more likely to report no impact or even a positive impact.

Among the BWC wearers, officer age was a meaningful indicator of certain perceptions regarding the BWC, in particularly, whether the officer believed the BWC improved behavior in the field. A chi-square test of independence was performed to examine the relationship between officer age and the extent to which the officers reported believing the BWC improved their behavior in the field. The relationship between these variables was significant, $\chi^2$-squared (6, $n = 40$) = 12.6, $p = 0.05$. Younger officers were stronger in their belief that the BWC did not have a positive impact on field behavior.

Using the technology-acceptance model, it can be inferred that those participants with approximately 6 to 10 years of service were more comfortable with the BWC and
more apt to welcome the newer technology. Those who have been patrol partners for
more than 1 year also seemed to be rather comfortable with the presence of the camera,
which was due to the trust that had been built between the two officers prior to the BWC
being present.

Summary of Results

A large number of police officers surveyed for this study were experienced law
enforcement personnel, as the majority of the 83 surveyed responded that they had
between 6 and 10 years with the NYPD. Regarding their educational level, over 75% of
those surveyed stated that they had at least some college credits, and 40.96% of those
surveyed had a bachelor’s degree. Of the respondents surveyed, 71, 85.54%, were males
with a very few respondents identifying as female. The majority of the survey
respondents did not have ill feelings toward the wearing of the body camera and, in fact,
they felt comfortable with its presence.

This study suggests that police officers are more accepting of BWC technology
than might be perceived by the public and media. Most of those surveyed felt that the
camera did not have a negative effect on their performance of duty nor did it change their
normal behavior. More than 75% disagreed that the BWC made their behavior more by
the book, and 80% felt the camera did not improve their behavior in the field. The
perception, however, between those who wore the camera and those who were the non-
camera-wearing partners, were slightly different. Those who wore the BWC felt it had an
impact on their relationship with their patrol partner, while those not wearing the camera
did not feel its presence had any impact on their relationship with their patrol partners.
Chapter 5: Discussion

Introduction

The purpose of this quantitative study was to determine the attitudes and perceptions that New York City police officers had toward wearing a BWC or being the patrol partner of someone who was wearing a body camera. This final chapter summarizes the results of the study and compares this research to prior research on the use of BWCs in policing. The researcher was granted unique access to the first 54 patrol officers that piloted BWCs on the streets of New York City and their non-camera-wearing partners ($N = 108$). This chapter further looks at practical policy that can be set forth by a police agency when it decides to adopt a BWC program. The findings of this study suggest that police officers are comfortable with BWCs, and they even support more cameras being used by the New York City Police Department. The findings also suggest that the police officers felt that the BWC had very little, if any, effect on their behavior in the field and that the BWC had no significant impact on their relationship as patrol partners.

Implications of Findings

The research questions sought to capture the attitudes that police officers had toward the BWC, as well as asking if they believed that the use of BWCs changed their behavior toward each other or toward the public. The study also looked at patrol officers to determine if the presence of a BWC, during a 1-year period, affected their relationship as partners in a two-officer patrol car where one partner was not wearing a BWC.
Agency adoption. In some cases, new technology can have adverse effects or unintended consequences on an agency (Manning, 1992). Nevertheless, when 83 patrol officers were asked if the NYPD should adopt BWCs for all frontline police officers, a vast majority agreed. A total of 78.31% of the survey respondents held the belief that the NYPD should outfit all frontline officers with BWCs. Thereafter, the officers were asked if they felt comfortable wearing the BWC or felt comfortable having their patrol partner wear a BWC. Again, in an overwhelming majority, 86.75% of the participants felt comfortable recording interactions with the public throughout their shift. It seems that the presence of BWCs has the potential to make many aspects of police work more visible to people within the agency as well as outside the agency (Weiner, 2013).

As with any deployment of a new technology, program, or strategy, the best approach includes efforts by an agency’s leaders to engage officers on the topic, explain the goals and benefits of the initiative, and address any concerns officers may have (Miller et al., 2014). Particularly, the question of when officers should initiate the recording function on the BWCs or which interactions should be memorialized are issues of primary concern. The BWC has the ability to capture evidence for use in criminal investigations and administrative proceedings. However, the BWC may also potentially record every person, regardless of involvement, within the camera’s field of vision (OIG-NYPD, 2015). This current study found that only 27.5% of BWC wearers felt that the camera made them a better police officer, overall. Conversely, 62.79% of the non-camera-wearing partners reported that the BWC made them a more effective patrol team. Although contradictory, these numbers seem to echo the fact that the BWC wearers were self-selected and the BWC, itself, had little to no impact on their style of policing.
Nevertheless, prior to the implementation of the volunteer BWC pilot program, the participating officers \((n = 54)\) attended a 1-day BWC training session (OIG-NYPD, 2015). Although the non-camera-wearing partners did not attend any training sessions related to the operation or policies surrounding the BWC, the devices were deployed in December 2015. In conjunction with the implementation program, the NYPD issued Operations Order 48 (Appendix E), Pilot Program – Use of Body-Worn Cameras, which is a source of guidelines governing the use of the BWC during this pilot program (NYPD, 2014).

Determining when officers should or should not activate their BWCs, as well as how much latitude officers should be given in deciding when to do so, were policy questions central to every BWC program (OIG-NYPD, 2015). In essence, this operations order attempted to balance the benefits of memorializing a full range of street encounters with the fact that the BWC may pose some privacy and safety risks for both citizens and officers. For instance, if an officer decides to activate the BWC after a suspect is handcuffed or alternatively, deactivates the BWC before a use of force incident, it will likely not promote the intended outcome of increased transparency and accountability.

Police misconduct is often understood as behavior that leads to negative consequences, such as sanctions, which is an outcome that most officers wish to avoid (Klepper & Nagin, 2006; Nagin, 2013). This study asked those who wore the BWC if the camera would reduce their tendency to use force against a subject, to which 62.5% responded that they either disagreed or strongly disagreed. Comparatively, the non-camera-wearing partners were asked how the presence of the BWC on their patrol partner affected their own willingness to use force against a subject. The results combined for a
staggering 83.72% who responded that the BWC had no effect on their willingness to use force against a subject.

McCormick (2007) explained that “human beings are norm users, whose interactions with each other depend on mutually recognizable patterns that can be articulated in terms of right versus wrong conduct, or of what one ought to do in certain settings” (p. 20). Although unassuming, BWCs communicate a sense of deterrence through the self-awareness of being observed, and with their presence now acceptable, behavioral responses are less likely to include force (Ariel et al., 2015).

With this researcher’s experience in law enforcement, he thought that the implementation of the BWC program in the NYPD may prove beneficial from an accountability and transparency perspective. In addition, considering serious injury or death of police officers, in recent times, underscores the stipulation that BWCs are “not required to be activated . . . if it is unsafe or impractical to do so” (Peters & Eure, 2015, p. 15), and they require some concrete guidance by way of policy. Undoubtedly, officers should only invoke an activation exception when a clear and articulable threat has prevented them from activating their BWCs in a timely manner.

The New York City Police Benevolent Association (PBA) represents approximately 24,000 officers in the NYPD. They have argued that a requirement for officers to activate BWCs in the field will place them in danger and force them to manage more tasks than they are accustomed to during critical enforcement encounters, which may cause them to hesitate (Rosenberg, 2011). The PBA also contends that the BWCs may be the target of theft or increased violence by perpetrators (Rosenberg, 2011). These
facts notwithstanding, in 2016, Mayor Bill de Blasio offered a 1% salary increase to officers on patrol who opted to adorn themselves with a BWC.

**BWC impact on behavior.** Police officers are often characterized as street-level bureaucrats, where a great deal of discretion or decision-making power lies with those at the bottom of the organizational structure (Wilson, 1973). As such, this study’s second research question sought to gather the beliefs of how the officers felt the BWCs affected their behavior in the field. When asked if the BWCs improved their behavior in the field, 81.93% disagreed. This question was then followed up by asking if the BWCs made officers less likely to use force on a subject, and, again, a large portion of those surveyed disagreed. As stated earlier in the study, nearly nine out of 10 or 87.95% officers surveyed felt the BWCs had no effect on their decision to use force. Additionally, the BWCs seem to have no impact on officers’ willingness to answer calls for service, either. A staggering 90.36% of those surveyed felt the camera did not discourage them from answering radio calls.

Overall, it is widely believed that both police officers and the public will improve their behavior “based on the theory that human behavior changes under observation . . . when people are observed, they are more prone to socially acceptable behavior and sense a heightened need to cooperate with the rules” (Letourneau, 2015, p. 3). With BWCs providing a record of the behavior of police officers and the public, both parties should be keen to ensure that their behavior is not open to criticism, particularly if the officer or the citizen is arguing that his or her actions were improper.

Similar to this study, the potential impact on behavior and overall perceptions of the BWC were examined by Jennings et al. (2014). They reported findings from a survey
of officers in the Orlando (FL) Police Department. In their study, Jennings et al. (2014) received 91 responses to a survey out of 95 potential officers who volunteered to participate in a BWC pilot in the Orlando Police Department for a 95% response rate. This current study received responses from 40 officers from a potential 54 officers in the original pilot, for a 78% response rate. It is important to note that five officers did not complete the program due to attrition and were separated from service with the NYPD. Additionally, three other officers were transferred to different units within the NYPD and did not complete the survey.

Unlike this current study, Jennings et al. (2014) distributed a survey before officers began using BWCs in the field, to serve as a baseline for their research. Therein, officers were asked to respond to questions measuring their level of agreement with various statements on a Likert-like scale, from 1 to 5 (Jennings et al., 2014). Responses indicated that 62.7% of officers agreed or strongly agreed that their department should adopt BWCs, 77% said they would feel comfortable wearing BWCs, and 18.7% agreed that BWCs would increase officer safety (Jennings et al., 2014). Fewer than half (40.7%) of the officers felt that BWCs would improve citizen behavior, and only 19.8% felt BWCs would improve their own behavior. In addition, 29.7% responded that the BWCs would promote their own by-the-book behavior, and 42.9% responded that the BWC would promote the by-the-book behavior of other officers (Jennings et al., 2014). Most officers (84.4%) believed BWCs would not decrease their likelihood of responding to calls for service (Jennings et al., 2014). In terms of use of force, few officers (3.3%) believed that BWCs would decrease their own use of force, although more felt they...
would decrease external (30.8%) and internal (27.5%) complaints against officers (Jennings et al., 2014).

**BWC impact on partnership.** The BWCs’ ability to capture real-life situations may serve as a tool that can speak to the complexities of police work (Koen, 2016). As such, it was important to look at the impact that a BWC had on the NYPD’s two-officer patrol car system, where one patrol partner did not wear the BWC. Considering that patrol partners may be confined in a patrol car for more than 8 hours per day, strong bonds may develop between partners, as the result of shared danger, long hours, and the amount of time spent in conversation (Weldy, 1976). In dyadic relationships, satisfaction has been found to be related to increased contact with a patrol partner, believing a patrol partner is emotionally and physically available to meet the other patrol partner’s needs (Burke & Weir, 1977; Janis & Hoffman, 1970). Similarly, being able to choose a patrol partner instead of being randomly assigned to one also plays a significant role in the value of partnerships (Hill & Stull, 1981). As a consummate result, this research sought to examine if BWCs had any negative impact on the relationship that patrol partners had with one another.

Notably, 32 out of the 40 officers (80%) who wore the BWC during the pilot either agreed or strongly agreed that they had either a professional relationship or friendship with their non-camera-wearing partner outside of work. This study found that, 25, or 62.5%, of BWC wearers called their patrol partner a friend, and 14, or 35%, called their patrol partner a colleague, but only one, 2.5%, characterized his or her patrol partner as an acquaintance. None of the BWC-wearing respondents felt that they had no
relationship with their patrol partner, which illustrates the strength of the inherent bond inside the NYPD's two-officer patrol car.

Typically, police officers have strong psychological attachments to their patrol partners and a personal commitment to public service (Yalcinkaya, 2007). Such psychological attachment and personal bonds might be partially attributed to several factors that include the nonprofit nature of the organization, the relatively less straightforward peer competition for resources, the greater trust of peers for assigned tasks, the personal commitment to public service, and the comparatively long-term career pursuit (Yalcinkaya, 2007). Similar responses were received when the non-camera-wearing partners were asked about the relationship with their patrol counterparts. A comparable 35 of the 42 (83.33%) non-wearers felt they currently had a professional relationship or friendship with their patrol partners outside of work. Additionally, akin to the wearer, 30 of the 43 (69.77%) non-wearing respondents considered their patrol partner a friend, 10 of the 43 (23.26%) non-wearers considered him or her a colleague, one of the 43 (2.33%) considered their patrol partner an acquaintance, and two of the 43 (4.65%) surveyed revealed they had no relationship with their BWC wearing patrol partner.

One previous study looked at police partnerships and how they are integral in having an effective team (Slovac, 1978), but critics of the BWC feared it would alter the relationship slightly (Morgan, 2015). This research asked what impact, if any, the BWC had on the patrol partners, and 66.27% believed the camera had no impact on their relationship.
Theoretical framework. This study also contributes to the research of prior theoretical models that could potentially explain the willingness to record the police. In particular, the study provides support to both the technology acceptance model and social learning theory. Koper et al. (2015) explained that the impact of technological change is often mitigated using new technology in accordance with traditional police practices, which seemed to be the case with BWCs in the NYPD. Although BWCs afford an opportunity for structures and practices to be significantly changed, during this six-precinct pilot study, the majority the officers and their non-camera-wearing partners accepted the BWCs.

Koper, Lum, and Willis (2014) summarized the trouble with the implementation of technology within police departments:

Technology’s effects are complex and contradictory; technological advances do not always produce straightforward improvements in communication, productivity, job satisfaction, or officers’ effectiveness in reducing crime and serving citizens. Desired effects from technology, such as improving clearance rates and reducing crime, may take considerable time to materialize as agencies adapt to new technologies and refine their uses over time. (p. 9)

Implementing technology without user acceptance hinders the premise of emergency response and the safety of the responders and citizenry (Brown & Waters, 2000). Despite the organizational and capital investments into the NYPD’s body-worn camera program, acceptance may be difficult and significantly more challenging when additional training or procedural changes are involved (Colvin & Goh, 2005).
Police officers have a pragmatic, tangible, and anti-theoretical perspective to their job due to their focus on their daily work (Bruder, 2012). As a result, some police officers may be skeptical to the idea of research. Chen, Gillenson, and Sherrell (2002) claimed that police, particularly, are more pragmatic than those in business settings. The fact that job performance is a determining factor for technology acceptance, a police officers’ acceptance of the BWCs is liable to concentrate more on the usefulness of the BWC rather than on its ease of use.

Perception is an important determinant for use of information technology. Although information is perceived by many police officers as power, control, influence, and, later, a valuable personal asset and a gain, the impact of information technology on this process is not the same as the one in business settings because of the nature of police work (Manning, 2003). Rocheleau (1993) stated that unlike most private sector organizations, law enforcement agencies have not typically viewed an information system as a strategic and valuable asset.

**Limitations**

Similar to studies of single police departments, this research cannot be generalized to represent the perceptions that all police officers have toward BWCs. Although the NYPD is very diverse in its personnel, it is one police department in a unique environment that provides police services to over 8 million people. The 54 officers who participated in this pilot study were extracted from the approximately 24,000 officers who patrol the City of New York.

Another limitation was that this study examined the NYPD’s pilot program, which was offered to only nine of the 77 police precincts in the city. Interestingly, no
transit officers participated in the pilot program and, therefore, they were not selected to participate in the study. The unique experience of a transit officer, who typically performs solo subway patrol, is thus missing from this study.

Survey responses were also a noticeable limitation given that not all questions were answered by those surveyed. The survey was conducted online through an email link to a website via the participants’ NYPD email accounts. Anonymity was stressed but even with that promise, some officers seemed skeptical of the survey and did not respond. Another challenge of the department email messaging is that not all officers check their emails daily, as required, causing them to have missed out on the survey all together.

A final limitation involves the methodology employed to conduct the study. This study involved a quantitative analysis of 83 police officers who either wore a BWC or were a patrol partner to an officer who wore a BWC. A problem statement and four research questions were created to provide a framework for the study. What this study lacked, however, is a qualitative component to give voice to the participants. In-depth qualitative studies provide richness to the experience that statistical data does not necessarily reflect. Hearing directly from the officers as to how they were impacted by the BWC would have put a face to the numbers.

Recommendations

This study sought to determine the perceptions officers had regarding BWCs, their effectiveness, and impact on their own behavior. The results support the notion that police officers want to see more body cameras being used and that they are comfortable with the presence of BWCs.
Another component of this study revealed that the vast majority of those surveyed had at least some college credits. The participants who were surveyed having a bachelor’s degree accounted for 40.96% of the participants, with another 20.48% stating they possessed an associate degree, and 28.92% had some college credits but no degree at that point in time. A college education is significant in policing in order for a new generation of officers to handle the complexities of modern-era policing and ever-evolving threats (Paynich, 2009). Hayeslip (1989) argued that officers with a higher education are better able to utilize innovative techniques, display clearer thinking, have a better understanding of the world of policing, and have the necessity of education given the role of police. As a result, all civil service agencies should adopt minimum college educational requirements for their hiring process.

**Recommendations for technology acceptance.** A total of 79% of the officers surveyed during this research accepted the BWC, indicating that the NYPD should adopt cameras for all frontline officers. This research also revealed that 86% of non-camera wearers felt comfortable having their patrol partners wear a BWC. As a result, police agencies should seek to acquire more technology in the form of body-worn cameras. Overall, BWCs may help provide evidence of transparency and showcase a commitment to public service, thereby helping not only criminal investigations but also internal investigations of corruption and misconduct. BWC footage may expedite discipline for officers internally and prevent investigations from dragging onward and affecting officers’ career advancements, promotions, or transfers.

**Recommendations for training.** The training of officers in the use of the BWC is also important. Fyfe (1986) argued that departmental review of officer decision making
during critical incidents traditionally focuses only on the circumstances immediately preceding such decisions. Although wearing a BWC may itself be as easy as clipping a camera to a uniform shirt, the critical steps are those taken subsequent to the recording of incidents. Officers will need to digest procedures related to the daily uploading of video from their devices to a computer to ensure they are properly stored. Also, data storage will pose a challenge to the agency to ensure adequate storage is consistently available.

Given the current climate within citizen-police relations, training facilitators may examine specific measures of citizens’ preconceived opinions of the police apart from the current encounter. Since the policing literature suggests that citizen perceptions of the police are also built upon factors apart from their own encounters (PERF, 2014; Tankebe, 2009; Tyler & Huo, 2002; Tyler & Wakslak, 2004), one of the benefits may impact the overall perception of legitimacy within a given neighborhood.

**Recommendations for procedural justice.** It would be beneficial to better understand officer perceptions of procedural justice. Procedural justice is operationalized in research as the way in which police treat citizens and the perceived fairness of decisions made when exercising their authority (Jonathon-Zamir & Harpaz, 2014). The most direct perception of procedural justice comes from the experience that citizens have with law enforcement officers (Hinds & Murphy, 2007). The emphasis is placed on how police officers exercise their authority when upholding the law rather than the actual law they are upholding (Tankebe, 2013).

This present study surveyed officers using a closed-ended questionnaire to gauge officer perceptions of the BWC as well as their attitudes toward its acceptance. Further research could benefit from a mixed-methods approach to meeting similar goals. Officers
may shed light on their level of understanding of procedural justice as a concept and the extent to which they consider employing procedurally-just behaviors during their interactions, as well as ways in which their agency can encourage them to do so using a BWC.

Many factors impact behavior within a police-citizen encounter, and enhancing the instrument to better reflect these variables would be beneficial. Proponents of BWCs have argued that the technology will improve citizen behavior during encounters with the police, suggesting that they will be more respectful and compliant (White, 2014). Unfortunately, there is currently very little evidence to support this assertion outside of anecdotal reports in the media (Lovett, 2013) and preliminary results from a few evaluations (Goodall, 2007).

Overwhelmingly, procedural justice studies are conducted at the jurisdictional level (Hinds & Murphy, 2007). Reisig and Correia (1997) studied procedural justice at the city, county, and local levels and found varying responses by age, outcome, and initiator of the encounter. Their study suggests that there is value in contrasting varying agencies and locations, specifically regarding the unique characteristics of certain types of agencies (Reisig & Correia, 1997). These findings will help develop future studies that can examine the role of procedural justice within police-citizen encounters using BWCs to assess the behaviors of police officers and citizens. Future studies may consider a strictly qualitative or mixed-methods approach to examining BWCs.

**Recommendations for policy.** NYPD Operations Order 48 (NYPD, 2014a) is one of the few BWC policies nationwide that allows officers the breadth of discretion to record whenever they believe it may be beneficial and to stop recording in limited
situations where the interests of justice demand it (OIG-NYPD, 2015). Offering flexibility within the policy and relying on the best judgment to use BWCs has the potential to enhance community relations and quality policing when encountering witnesses who may be reluctant to speak while a BWC is activated. However, empowering officers with some discretion may appease officers who challenge the program and feel it is formulated to scrutinize and constrict police behavior. During this study, 87.5% of officers that wore the BWC responded that they felt comfortable wearing the camera on patrol. To this end, allowing discretion to record underscores the fact that activating a BWC may not always be practical in certain potentially dangerous, fast-developing, and dubious situations. Officers are required to “document in their activity log as well as in the narrative of any NYPD report any time a recording is captured of an incident” (NYPD, 2014a, note 3). Presumably, this encompasses all recordings without consideration as to whether the BWC was appropriately activated or whether the incident was captured fully (OIG-NYPD, 2015).

The policies in use by other large police departments to ensure compliance with recording requirements are similar to Operations Order 48 (NYPD, 2014a). At least four of the nation’s 10 largest police departments, including Chicago (IL) Police Department, Washington D.C. Metropolitan Police Department, and Phoenix (AZ) Police Department, require that officers note in reports that an incident has been captured by a BWC (White, 2015). Additionally, these same departments mandate that their officers report any BWC damage or malfunction to their immediate supervisor, while the Washington D.C. Metropolitan Police Department requires officers to note any failure to record in writing, either in a personal log or an incident report (NIJ, 2015). The Phoenix Police Department
also requires that a supervisor be notified in these situations (NIJ, 2015). None of these departments’ policies, however, describe any specified mechanism for addressing such failure, and several rely only on random quality assurance checks or review of footage for internal investigations to identify deficiencies (NIJ, 2015).

Unlike the NYPD, at least three large police departments in Chicago, Washington, D.C., and Phoenix require their officers to narrate into the device if and why they intend to deactivate their cameras when confronted with a prohibited recording scenario, such as a conversation with a confidential informant (NIJ, 2015). The Chicago PD requires officers to narrate any reason for interrupting a recording before the entire incident is recorded (NIJ, 2015). The MPD further requires that if ordered to deactivate a recording by a superior, the officer identifies the supervisor’s name and shield number in the recording (White, 2014).

**Recommendations for privacy concerns.** In public spaces, the use of the BWC poses fewer problems than when it is used by police within homes, businesses, or other non-public places, but important problems still remain (Newell, 2014). Even when these cameras are worn and activated during the execution of search or arrest warrants within a person’s home or other non-public place, privacy implications arise when the recordings may capture individuals, activities, or information that would otherwise not be relevant to the investigation at hand. Based on this researcher’s experience within the agency, the NYPD should provide officers with a model notification phrase to advise members of the public that they are being recorded, such as, “I am advising you that our interaction is being recorded.” While not mandatory for every citizen contact, a model notification phrase might serve to standardize notifications during encounters with the public and
minimize the likelihood that a situation might escalate. It also ensures that members of the public receive necessary information, and it would provide officers with professional language to fall back on should an encounter become confrontational.

**Recommendations for footage review.** The BWC policies of many large police departments include some mechanism for random review of footage by police supervisors (NIJ, 2015). Several departments (NYPD, Chicago PD, Washington, D.C. Metro PD) mandate regular random supervisory review of footage, while other departments (Oakland PD, Philadelphia PD) allow supervisors unlimited access to the BWC footage of their subordinates (White, 2015). The frequency and quantity of videos to be reviewed for quality assurance are not always specified and vary from weekly reviews of random footage, to six videos per month, to biannual reviews of all random officers’ footage.

Two of the aforementioned large departments provide a higher level of footage review. Chicago PD requires lieutenants to submit reports to the executive staff based on footage reviews that detail recommendations for the use of the BWCs (Miller et al., 2014). These recommendations are eventually made available to a BWC pilot program evaluation committee. At the same time, Metro PD tasks its risk management personnel with ensuring that footage is audited for officer performance and compliance with policy (White, 2014). Under NYPD Operations Order 48 (NYPD, 2014a), each incident report, which already requires a supervisor’s review, must note whether a corresponding BWC recording exists (OIG-NYPD, 2015). As a matter of improvement to this directive, the NYPD should have reviewing supervisors check related recordings for compliance with BWC policy upon approving officers’ reports. This would ensure that officers are
activating and deactivating their BWCs in accordance with Operations Order 48 (NYPD, 2014a). NYPD should also consider having a central unit, such as the Risk Management or the Quality Assurance Division, perform periodic, system-wide audits of random BWC footage to assess the efficacy of established policies.

**Recommendations for future research.** The findings and limitations of this study offer direction to future BWC research regarding technology acceptance. The majority of research by advocates and critics tested the perceived impact of the BWC on transparency (Katz et al., 2014), civilian complaints and use of force (White, 2014), and providing opportunities for police training (Goodall, 2007). This present study examined the perceptions of police officers as BWCs are pioneered into the largest uniformed police force in the world. In September 2014, the NYPD equipped 54 volunteer officers, in precincts with a high frequency of stop, question, and frisks, with BWCs for a year-long pilot program that motivated this research. As this study concluded in April 2017, the NYPD expanded its BWC-wearing officers from 54 to 1,200, unveiling cameras to 20 additional precincts throughout the city.

Unlike the original volunteer pilot program, officers in these 20 police precincts are being directed to wear the BWC, depending on the shift where they perform patrol duties. As a result, a future topic of research would be to expand upon this study, within the same agency, with the addition of specific questions that measure the level of police officer support for the BWC, now that it is no longer a volunteer assignment.

Another recommendation for future study would be to investigate if a correlation exists between the BWC and an officer’s enforcement activity, such as arrests and criminal court summonses. This study’s findings cannot help to explain or provide
support for the results of Katz et al. (2014) who found that arrest activity had increased with the emergence of BWCs. An examination of arrest and criminal court summons activity may prove useful to NYPD executives and public policy makers, particularly when factoring in the several high-profile, police-citizen situations that have occurred over the past few years. Specifically, high-profile cases in Staten Island, NY; Bronx, NY; and Harlem, NY have served to influence the researcher’s desire to conduct this study. Although existing research has shown that BWCs have increased both summons and arrest activity among patrol officers (Katz et al., 2014; Ready & Young, 2015), no definitive study has been done on the NYPD.

Few studies show that BWCs may help reduce officer use of force (Ariel et al., 2015; Farrar, 2013), but other studies have found that BWCs did not seem to impact the amount of force officers used (Ariel et al., 2015; Edmonton Police Service, 2015). Despite this study’s finding that almost 84% of non-camera wearers and 72% of wearers disputed the fact that the BWC influenced on their willingness to use force, this is still a rather understudied aspect of BWC outcomes in New York City. In addition, the study asked officers about their perceptions of the BWC and specifically about the perceived impact on their behavior, partnerships, and policing style. The study did not ask the participants, specifically, how many complaints of excessive force they had before and after using the BWC. Determining the current use of force complaint statistics of the 1,200 officers that were assigned a BWC would prove interesting and perhaps insightful.

Studies have also shown that BWCs can reduce the amount of complaints filed against officers and lessen the amount of time it takes to resolve official civilian complaints against officers (Ariel et al., 2015; Farrar, 2013; Goodall, 2007; Katz et al.,
The findings of this study did not assess the impact of the BWC at the Civilian Complaint Review Board, which investigates, mediates, and prosecutes matters within the NYPD. Understanding how BWC footage may be used during citizen-complaint investigations would be an important research avenue, because the technology would offer an opportunity for persons charged with investigating a complaint against an officer to view real-time footage of the incident.

While this study examined the experiences of police officers regarding the effect of BWCs, differences between the specific concerns were not addressed in the statistical analysis. As the NYPD continues to distribute BWCs throughout the city, an important direction for future research would be to address the nexus between user acceptance and individual or organizational usage outcomes. While not part of the original four research questions, assessing the impact of usage of BWCs requires further examination to determine if usage will result in positive outcomes amongst the rank-and-file officers.

**Conclusion**

This research looked at the perceptions of police officers who, for a 1-year period, volunteered to test the use of BWCs in selected New York City police precincts. It did not focus on the motivation for recording the police and the impact recording the police can have on the police-community relationship. It did not focus on some New Yorkers’ experiences with perceived racism, alleged structural inequality, and the fact that some minority neighborhoods are plagued with violent crime problems. Some of the frequent encounters with police officers, both positive and negative, may be perceived as appropriate, and some may be perceived as unjust. Notwithstanding these facts, filming the police may be one method used to address these issues.
BWCs have become a topic of discussion amongst citizens, politicians, law enforcement managers, and scholars since in-custody deaths, such as Abner Louima, Brooklyn, NY (1997); Sean Bell, Queens, NY (2006); Amadou Diallo, Bronx, NY (1999); and Eric Garner, Staten Island, NY (2014), transpired and became sensationalized in the media. BWCs were presumed to be a technology that could serve as a means of significant change in the way the police behave (Koen, 2016). BWCs may be used to make police officer actions more transparent to the rest of society, and therefore, the police would be held accountable for the way they behaved during citizen interactions (White, 2014). However, projecting BWCs as a solution to the growing presumption that police are abusing their power and infringing on the rights of citizens might not work if the police, themselves, do not agree with this presumption (Koen, 2016).

Nevertheless, in the NYPD, it did not seem as if the pilot program participants felt that wearing a BWC for a 1-year period was necessary to change or heighten their level of accountability. Of the 40 pilot program officers surveyed, who wore a BWC, 36 (90%) felt that the camera had no effect on their willingness to respond to calls for service. As such, considering they were self-selected, one can conclude that their perception is that most police officers are honest, hard-working public servants who respect the rights of citizens and value public safety.

While the results of this study indicate that BWCs did not make the NYPD pilot program officers feel more accountable for their behavior, it is evident they had no issues policing the streets of New York City impartially. In other words, this study’s survey participants did not feel as though the police needed to be held at a higher level of accountability because they engage daily in objective, nondiscriminatory, and unbiased
police practices. Instead, those surveyed saw the BWC as a tool to protect the police against what they presumed to be a growing sense of hostility toward the police (Koen, 2016).

A total of 32 (80%) of the BWC pilot-program participants disagreed that the camera improved their behavior in the field. It can be concluded that the BWCs, during this 1-year period, were a useful piece of technology, and using a body camera does not automatically imply that they perceived or accepted that fundamental change in their policing paradigm was necessary. Whether a change in the way police officers think about their work is actually necessary is a normative assessment that goes beyond the scope of this dissertation. However, if major change in how the police operate in the United States is to occur, the need for change would have to stem from the police themselves, and the change will certainly not be solely dependent upon the diffusion of BWCs (White, 2014).

Overall, the purpose of this study was to examine the perceptions police officers in New York City had regarding the use of the BWC that they either wore themselves or their patrol partners wore during a pilot period. Several police precincts were selected to participate in the pilot program for BWCs in New York City, which represented each of the five geographic boroughs. Prior research into BWCs did not gauge the feelings and concerns of the officers wearing the camera but, rather, focused on civil lawsuits against the police and the effect of the BWC had on civilian complaints or use of force complaints within the tested municipality.

This research found that officers were accepting of the BWC technology and did not feel as if it dissuaded them from performing their duties when it came to answering
calls for service or using force on a subject when needed. This study has also found that the camera did not have a negative impact on the professional relationship the patrol partners had with one another thus keeping the important bond between police partners intact.

The findings in this research are similar to the findings from Jennings et al. (2014) that suggest that police officers were fundamentally in favor of wearing BWCs. However, there is a paradox to be addressed with technology and BWCs (Farmer, 2016). These findings add to the existing emerging literature with data that reveals that despite years of service, age, precinct of assignment, or shift worked, wearing a BWC does not severely alter an officer’s use of discretion nor do BWCs effect their behavior.

Apart from these facts, officers having BWCs imposed on them, presumably to improve their work performance, does not distort their decision making. As a result of this, officers will remain in control of the medium, and this can actually lead to increased oversight and accountability (Farmer, 2016). According to Siegel and Senna (2007), “The changing police role is of critical importance to the criminal justice system because they are the gatekeepers of the criminal justice process” (p. 124).
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I am pleased to inform you that the Board has approved your Expedited Review project, “Perceptions of Body-Worn Cameras by New York City Police Officers”.

Following federal guidelines, research related records should be maintained in a secure area for three years following the completion of the project at which time they may be destroyed.

Should you have any questions about this process or your responsibilities, please contact me at irb@sjfc.edu.

Sincerely,

Eileen Lynd-Balta, Ph.D.
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Appendix C

Perceptions of the Body-Worn Camera Survey

Title of study: “From Behind the Lens: Perceptions of Police Officers as Body-Worn Cameras are Introduced into the New York City Police Department.”

Purpose of study:
The primary objective of this study is to understand police officers’ perceptions of the BWC as it includes three elements: (1) basic BWC technology acceptance, (2) the nature of the adorners’ perception by virtue of one’s precinct of assignment, age, sex, shift worked, and educational level and individual and task characteristics of the non-camera-wearing partner.

Please answer the following questions:

Part I: Demographic Questions.

1) What is your age range?
   a) 21 – 25 yrs.  b) 26 – 30 yrs.  c) 31 – 35 yrs.  d) 36 – 40 yrs.  e) 41 – 45 yrs.
   f) 46 – 50 yrs.  g) 51 – 55 yrs.  h) over 56 yrs.

2) What is your gender?
   a) Male  b) Female

3) What is your education level?
   a) High School Diploma/GED  b) Associates Degree  c) Bachelors’ Degree
   b) Graduate Degree

4) How many years have you been a police officer?
   __________ years.

5) How many years have you been partnered with your current patrol partner?
   ______
6) Please specify the ethnicity to which you most identify.
   a) White  b) Hispanic or Latino  c) Native American or American Indian
   b) Asian/Pacific Islander  e) Other (please specify)

Part II: Opinion Questions.

Survey Questions for the Partner (Non BWC wearer)…

1. What are your perceptions about the impact of body-worn cameras in policing?
   Please rate your level of "agreement" for the following statements.

A. I think this agency should adopt body-worn cameras for all front-line police officers.
   ○ ○○ ○

B. I would feel comfortable with my partner wearing a body-worn camera.
   ○ ○○ ○

2. What are your perceptions about wearing a body-worn camera while on duty?
   Please rate your level of "agreement" for the following statements

A. My partner wearing a body-worn camera improved my behavior in the field.
   ○ ○○ ○

B. My partner wearing a body-worn camera improved the behavior of citizens I contacted in the field.
   ○○ ○ ○

C. My partner wearing a body-worn camera made me feel safer in the performance of my duties.
   ○ ○○ ○

3. What impact did (your partner) wearing body-worn cameras have on your behavior?

   Please rate your level of "agreement" with the following statements.

A. My participation in the NYPD body-worn camera pilot reduced my partner’s use of force against subjects. ○○ ○ ○
B. My participation in the NYPD body-worn camera pilot reduced the number of citizen complaints submitted against my partner.

C. My participation in the NYPD body-worn camera pilot reduced the number of internal complaints submitted against my partner.

D. My participation in the NYPD body-worn camera pilot reduced my partner’s willingness to respond to calls for service.

E. My participation in the NYPD body-worn camera pilot increased the likelihood that my partner’s behavior would be "by-the-book."

Survey Questions for the volunteer BWC pilot participant…

1. **What are your perceptions about the impact of body-worn cameras in policing?**

   Please rate your level of "agreement" for the following statements.

   C. I think this agency should adopt body-worn cameras for all front-line police officers.

   D. I would feel comfortable wearing a body-worn camera.

2. **What are your perceptions about wearing a body-worn camera while on duty?**

   Please rate your level of "agreement" for the following statements.

   D. Wearing a body-worn camera improved my behavior in the field.
E. Wearing a body-worn camera improved the behavior of citizens I contacted in the field.
   ○ ○ ○ ○

F. Wearing a body-worn camera made me feel safer in the performance of my duties.
   ○ ○ ○ ○

3. **What impact did (you) wearing body-worn cameras have on your partner’s behavior?**

   *Please rate your level of "agreement" with the following statements.*

F. My participation in the NYPD body-worn camera pilot reduced my partner’s use of force against subjects.
   ○ ○ ○ ○

G. My participation in the NYPD body-worn camera pilot reduced the number of citizen complaints submitted against my partner.
   ○ ○ ○ ○

H. My participation in the NYPD body-worn camera pilot reduced the number of internal complaints submitted against my partner.
   ○ ○ ○ ○

I. My participation in the NYPD body-worn camera pilot reduced my partner’s willingness to respond to calls for service.
   ○ ○ ○ ○

J. My participation in the NYPD body-worn camera pilot increased the likelihood that my partner’s behavior would be "by-the-book."
   ○ ○ ○ ○
Appendix D

Informed Consent to Participate in Research

Title of Study: “From Behind the Lens: Police Officer Perceptions as Body-Worn Cameras are Introduced to the New York City Police Department”

Researcher: Kishon C. Hickman

Dissertation Chair: Dr. Michael Muffs
Committee Member: Dr. Jeannine Jennette

Introduction:
You are being asked to participate in a research study being conducted by Kishon C. Hickman for a doctoral dissertation under the supervision of Dr. Michael Muffs of the Ed. D. in Executive Leadership Program at St. John Fisher College. You are asked to participate because you are a uniformed police officer in the New York City Police Department. In this study, participants receive an online survey designed to obtain information on the perception of the body worn camera pilot in the NYPD. Participants agree to participate in the survey anonymously.

Purpose of the Study:
This study will assess the impact that the body worn camera had on your interactions with members of the public, your partner, fellow coworkers and the impact it had on enforcement action.

Study Procedures:
Your participation in this study is strictly voluntary. If you agree to participate in this study, you will be asked to complete an online survey that will take approximately 10-15 minutes to complete. The survey is designed to gather background information about you and employment with the NYPD as well as the ways in which the BWC impacted the action you take in the line of duty. The identifying data from these surveys will be destroyed once the data is transcribed and coded.

Approval of Study: This study has been reviewed and approved by the St. John Fisher College Institutional Review Board (IRB).

Risks and Benefits: The researcher will protect the confidentiality and anonymity of all research data. There is no risk involved in participating in this research.
Confidentiality/Privacy: All information collected in this study will remain confidential. In order to maintain the utmost confidentiality of the participants in this study, the names of research participants will not be collected. No data will be released identifying participants or their police agencies. All research will be conducted with the highest ethical standards for confidentiality. The researcher will maintain any records associated with this study in a locked cabinet for a period of one year following the completion of research and then will be destroyed.

The researcher acknowledges that recalling any traumatic events over the last year may cause emotional distress for some. For any reason during your participation in this research study, you may discontinue your participation. You may refuse to answer any question in this research study.

Your rights:

As a research participant, you have the right to:

1. Have the purpose of the study, and the expected risks and benefits fully explained to you before you choose to participate.
2. Withdraw from participation at any time without penalty.
3. Refuse to answer a particular question without penalty.
4. Be informed of appropriate alternative procedures or courses of treatment, if any, that might be advantageous to you.
5. Be informed of the results of the study.

I have read the above, and by electronically participating in this survey, I agree and consent to participate in the above named study.

If you have further questions regarding this study, please contact the researcher, Kishon C. Hickman at 845-629-2396 or by e-mail at kch09183@sjfc.edu.

Concerns or complaints about this study may also be addressed to the Institutional Review Board (IRB) at St. John Fisher College, 3690 East Avenue, Rochester, New York 14618, (585) 385-8000 or by e-mail at irb@sjfc.edu.
Appendix E

Operations Order 48

OPERATIONS ORDER

SUBJECT: PILOT PROGRAM - USE OF BODY-WORN CAMERAS

DATE ISSUED: 12-02-14
NUMBER: 48

1. The Department is issuing body cameras to certain uniformed members of the service as part of a voluntary “Body-Worn Camera” (BWC) pilot program. The BWC system has proven to be an effective tool in documenting on-duty-related police activity. The BWC pilot program will be examined to determine whether it contributes to officer safety, provides evidence for criminal prosecutions, helps to resolve personnel complaints and fosters positive relations with the community.

2. Therefore, upon the deployment and training in the voluntary use of the Body-Worn Camera, uniformed members of the service will adhere to the following procedure when so equipped:

PURPOSE To visually and audibly record specific categories of interactions between uniformed members of the service and the public and to retain associated video for a period of time.

SCOPE As part of a voluntary, pilot “Body-Worn Camera” (BWC) system program, the Department is issuing body cameras to certain uniformed members of the service. BWC systems have proven to be an effective tool in documenting on-duty-related activity. The BWC program will be examined to determine whether it contributes to officer safety, provides evidence for criminal prosecutions, helps to resolve personnel complaints and fosters positive relations with the community.

PROCEDURE When a uniformed member of the service is equipped with a “Body-Worn Camera” (BWC):

1. Prior to roll call:
   a. Draw the personally assigned BWC from the charging location
b. Inspect the BWC to ensure that the battery is fully charged and the device(s) is/are assembled correctly and operational.
c. Immediately report if a BWC is not functioning properly, becomes damaged or is otherwise unaccounted for to the desk officer and document in ACTIVITY LOG (PD112-145).
d. Position the BWC on the uniform to facilitate optimal recording field of view.

NOTE

The BWC is only intended to record anything a uniformed member of the service could potentially observe or hear using his or her sense of sight and sound. The BWC is not equipped with night-vision, infrared technology or enhanced audio technology.

2. Deploy BWC only when personally issued and authorized by the Department to record activity.
   a. The use of any other recording device is strictly prohibited.

UNIFORMED MEMBER OF THE SERVICE

3. Notify desk officer if a BWC is not functioning properly, becomes damaged or is otherwise unaccounted for at any point during the tour and document in ACTIVITY LOG.

4. Dock BWC in the designated location in the Department facility for transfer of data and to charge the battery at end of tour.

5. Document in ACTIVITY LOG as well as in the narrative of any Department report (e.g., UNUSUAL OCCURRENCE REPORT (PD370-152), COMPLAINT REPORT (PD313-152), ON LINE BOOKING SYSTEM ARREST WORKSHEET (PD244-159), STOP, QUESTION AND FRISK REPORT WORKSHEET (PD344-151A), etc.) any time a recording is captured of an incident.
   a. Include the serial number of the device as well as the date/time of the incident.

6. Activate BWC prior to initiating, or as soon as practical after initiating, the following police actions:
   a. All enforcement encounters where there is at least reasonable suspicion the person(s) has committed, is committing or may be involved in criminal activity consistent with P.G. 212-11, “Stop and Frisk.” This includes, but is not limited to, self-initiated stops and radio runs.
   b. All enforcement encounters where there is reason to believe that the individual is committing a violation/petit offense for which a summons may be issued (e.g., TAB summons, ECB summons, Criminal Court summons, etc.)
c. All vehicle stops
d. Taking or attempting to take an individual into custody (e.g., arrests, protective custody of an emotionally disturbed person, etc.)
e. All incidents involving the use of force
f. Any public interaction, regardless of context, that escalates and becomes adversarial, so long as it is not one of the prohibited situations in step “8” below
g. All interior vertical patrols of non-Housing Authority buildings and Housing Authority buildings conducted pursuant to P.G. 21259, “Vertical Patrol” and P.G. 212-60, “Interior Vertical Patrol of Housing Authority Buildings.” The BWC must be activated upon entering the building and will not be deactivated until exiting the building and terminating the interior vertical patrol along with any associated police action, if any.

NOTE

The BWC is not required to be activated as per step “6” above if it is unsafe or impractical to do so, or where a malfunction or other mechanical issues impeding the use of the device exists. In any case of a failure to record an incident as required in step “6,” such failure to activate and the reason for such failure to activate must be properly documented in the uniformed member’s ACTIVITY LOG and immediately reported to the desk officer.

UNIFORMED MEMBER OF THE SERVICE

7. Consider activating the BWC during any activities where, in the uniformed member’s judgment, it would be beneficial to record, so long as it is not one of the prohibited situations in step “8” below.

8. Do not activate the BWC to record any of the following:
   a. Encounters not directly related to official activities in the proper performance of police duties
   b. Performance of non-enforcement functions or administrative duties within a Department facility
   c. Places where a reasonable expectation of privacy exists (unless taking police action outlined in step “6” above), such as, but not limited to, hospital emergency rooms, locker rooms and restrooms
   d. Attendance at events covered under the “Handschu Guidelines” (see P.G. 212-72, “Guidelines for Uniformed Members of the Service Conducting Investigations Involving Political Activities”), unless taking police actions outlined in step “6” above
   e. A potential witness who requests to speak to an officer confidentially or desires anonymity
f. A victim or witness who requests that he or she not be recorded and the situation is not confrontational.
g. A victim who requests that he or she not be recorded as a condition of cooperation and the interests of justice require such cooperation.

9. Notify desk officer if an activity was recorded that should not have been recorded as per step “8” above, and document in ACTIVITY LOG.

10. Inform subjects being recorded by BWC that the interaction is being recorded, when practicable and consistent with officer safety.

11. Do not terminate recording until the completion of the police action, once the BWC has been activated.
   a. If for any reason a recording is interrupted, document the reasons for or factors contributing to the interruption in ACTIVITY LOG and notify the desk officer.

12. Notify the following when necessary:
   a. Appropriate assistant district attorney/assistant corporation counsel when a member of the service has knowledge that any portion of an incident relating to an arrest, prosecution or other criminal matter before the court is captured by a BWC.
   b. Assigned detective/investigator any time a recording is made at the scene of a police incident or crime under investigation.
   c. Legal Bureau any time a member of the service becomes aware of civil litigation involving a matter captured by the BWC.

13. Use the storage software to mark for automatic archival any portion of a BWC recording that captures an arrest and any related footage.
   a. For a BWC recording that captures an arrest, use the manufacturer’s software to burn a compact disc/digital video disc (CD/DVD) of the relevant footage and enter the CD into evidence, as per P.G. 218-01, “Invoicing Property - General Procedure.”
   b. All other archival requests should be made to the desk officer, who will comply with step “20” below.

14. Request from the integrity control officer access to review any video pertaining to an event captured from the personally assigned BWC when notified to give testimony (either sworn or unsworn) or to be interviewed in any criminal, civil or administrative case or matter or appear before an investigative body (e.g., CCRB, Internal Affairs).
Bureau, Investigations Unit, etc.).

a. This is consistent with refreshing one’s recollection by reviewing **ACTIVITY LOG** and Department reports.

b. Be cognizant of and distinguish between facts recalled independently, recollection refreshed by review of video and other sources, and facts not previously known but learned by reviewing the video.

**NOTE**

The BWC is intended to record anything the uniformed member could potentially observe using his or her sense of sight. That does not mean that the uniformed member is required or expected to have seen or recollect everything documented in the footage.

**SUPERVISOR CONDUCTING ROLL CALL**

15. Inspect uniformed members who are issued BWCs for their personally assigned BWCs and ensure that they are properly affixed to the uniform and functioning properly.

16. Conduct an immediate investigation when notified that a BWC is not functioning properly, has become damaged, or is otherwise unaccounted for during roll call, and comply with **P.G. 217-10, “Accidents - Department Property”** or **P.G. 219-20, “Loss or Theft of Department Property,”** as appropriate.

**DESK OFFICER**

17. Conduct an immediate investigation when notified that a BWC is not functioning properly, has become damaged, or is otherwise unaccounted for during a uniformed member’s tour of duty and comply with **P.G. 21710, “Accidents - Department Property”** or **P.G. 219-20, “Loss or Theft of Department Property,”** as appropriate, and record discrepancies in the Command Log.

18. Conduct an investigation when notified that a recording was interrupted or an incident that is required to be recorded per step “6” was not recorded:

   a. Make determination regarding the propriety of the circumstances surrounding the failure to record and document results in Command Log

   b. Ensure that any resulting failure to record is documented in the uniformed member’s **ACTIVITY LOG**

   c. Prepare report on **Typed Letterhead** detailing the investigation, findings, and actions taken and forward a copy to:

      (1) Deputy Commissioner, Legal Matters
      (2) Chief of Department
19. Ensure that all BWCs are returned to their docking station for video upload and/or charging at the end of tour.

20. Notify commanding officer of any requests to archive any BWC recording related to a citizen complaint involving a member of the command, or any other BWC recording a member of the command requests to be archived (aside from recordings of arrests, which are handled as per step “13”).
   a. Provide commanding officer with the relevant BWC serial number, uniformed member’s name, justification for the request and date/time of occurrence.

21. Notify commanding officer of any events recorded by a BWC that are prohibited to be recorded as per step “8,” above.

22. Allow uniformed members to review any video pertaining to an event captured from their own BWC prior to giving testimony (either sworn or unsworn) or being interviewed or appearing before any investigative body (e.g., Civilian Complaint Review Board, Department of Investigation, Internal Affairs Bureau, Investigations Unit, etc.).

23. Submit to Legal Bureau a request on Typed Letterhead (direct) to archive any BWC recording related to a citizen complaint involving a member of the command, or any other BWC recording a member of the command requests through the desk officer to be archived (aside from recordings of arrests, which are archived as per step “13”).
   a. Provide Legal Bureau with the relevant BWC serial number, uniformed member’s name, justification for
the archival request and date/time of occurrence.

24. Conduct an investigation and review the video in question when notified of any prohibited video recorded in error (as per step “21” above).
   a. In cases where it is determined that video was in fact a recording prohibited by step “8” above, submit to the Legal Bureau a report on Typed Letterhead (direct) detailing the findings of the investigation and request that the video be purged.

**OPERATIONAL CONSIDERATIONS:**

The BWC as well as video, audio and data captured by the BWC, irrespective of the content, are at all times the property of the Department. Uniformed members of the service may not copy, publish, share or disseminate any audio, video, image or data to anyone except as authorized by the Department. Furthermore, members of the service may not edit, delete or alter any video or audio captured by the BWC or stored on the Department’s network or approved storage media.

For technical assistance with the BWC, contact the Information Technology System Division (ITSD) Wheel Supervisor, 24/7 at: 646-610-7614 and provide the following:

- Name
- Tax Number
- Command
- Call Back Number (cell phone, if possible)
- Body-Worn Camera Serial Number
- Detailed description of issue including events during malfunction

For additional CDs/DVDs for burning of arrest footage, email bwc@nypd.org

Video captured by BWCs will be preserved for one year, at which time it will be automatically deleted, unless it is otherwise accepted for archival or directed to be archived by the Legal Bureau (with the exception of BWC recordings of arrests, which are archived as per step “13”). In addition to commanding officers, entities who may request archival of video include the Internal Affairs Bureau, Investigations Units, and members of the Deputy Commissioner, Legal Matters (DCLM) and the Legal Bureau, by complying with the procedure in step “23” above. Such archived material shall be retained and preserved until directed otherwise by the Legal Bureau or DCLM.

**ADDITIONAL DATA**

**RELATED PROCEDURES**

Vertical Patrol (P.G. 212-59)
Interior Vertical Patrol of Housing Authority Buildings (P.G. 212-60)
Guidelines for Uniformed Members of the Service Conducting Investigations Involving Political Activities (P.G. 212-72)
Accidents - Department Property (P.G. 217-10)
Invoicing Property - General Procedure (P.G. 218-01)
Loss or Theft of Department Property (P.G. 219-20)
Stop and Frisk (P.G. 212-11)

FORMS AND REPORTS

ACCIDENT REPORT-CITY INVOLVED (PD301-155)
ACTIVITY LOG (PD112-145)
UNUSUAL OCCURRENCE REPORT (PD370-152)
COMPLAINT REPORT (PD313-152)
ON LINE BOOKING SYSTEM ARREST WORKSHEET (PD244-159)
STOP, QUESTION AND FRISK REPORT WORKSHEET (PD344-151A)
Typed Letterhead

3. Operations Order 45, series 2014 is hereby REVOKED.

4. Commanding officers will ensure that the contents of this Order are immediately brought to the attention of members of their commands.

BY DIRECTION OF THE POLICE COMMISSIONER

DISTRIBUTION
All Commands