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Abstract

This thesis explores the perceptions of front-line police officers surrounding synoptic and panoptic surveillance and the implications of police body-worn cameras on community relations, citizen’s recording devices and police practice. The study involves a qualitative approach that utilized one-on-one, semi-structured interviews, in which participants were those members of the Toronto Police Service who wore body-worn cameras during an earlier pilot study of the device conducted by the Toronto Police Service. Police as a sampling group are very exclusive and hard to gain access to, as such this study relied on a snowball sampling strategy which resulted in a sample size of 7. While sample size is a major limitation of this study, these 7 interviews provided rich data that were able to provide a valuable and humanizing dialogue of police officers. Transcriptions of interviews were collected and thematically analyzed, resulting in commonalities among participant responses. These commonalities suggest that officers involved in the piloting project that were interviewed share similar perceptions and concerns of this new technology, whether it be positive or negative. Themes that were established include: Context; Synoptic Surveillance; Accountability; Police and Community Relationship and Trust; Impact on Officer’s Job, Career and Routine; Officer Repercussions & Protection from Accusations; Officer Change in Behaviour Due to Surveillance Devices; Officer Physical Safety; Citizens Behavioural Changes and Reactions Body-Worn Cameras; Social Media; Privacy Concerns; Officers Favourability toward Wearing Body-Worn Cameras; and the Overall Impact Body-Worn Cameras have on Policing. Participants reported while this surveillance tool is beneficial in theory, in practice the implications of this device are increasingly negative on police practice and community relations. Study results are framed using contemporary theories of surveillance and concepts central to police legitimacy, and for the purpose of this research the culmination of these notions has been termed the Surveillance Accountability Framework. The concerns surrounding police body-worn cameras raised by this research should be considered for further research and improvement, particularly due to the increasing amount of police services planning on adopting this new technology.
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CHAPTER ONE

Introduction

Policing has been greatly affected by the advancement in new media technology; specifically, an increasing visibility due to the use of highly available mobile cameras by public citizens. Community encounters were once only witnessed by bystanders enabling police to control their image due to this low visibility. Police officers once relied on their low profile on duty to conduct their investigations and arrests. The police had the upper hand in disputes with citizens because they were highly trusted officers of the law (Haggerty & Sandhu 2014). Recently, police officers have increasingly been subjected to video camera recording and scrutinized by the general population while they are on duty. Encounters that were once unreported or not challenged due to police officers’ low visibility are now being scrutinized through media outlets from uploaded cellphone videos (Haggerty and Sandhu 2014). With the growth of social media, public citizens have been recording police and community encounters and uploading them to the internet and mass media. Numerous videos of police arrests and questionable use of excessive force cases are featured over mass media and have influenced public views of police. Communities are now consciously surveilling and scrutinizing police, in contrast with police efforts to surveil society.

Police have recently introduced body-worn cameras (BWCs), a new surveillance technology that has the potential to increase their visibility and control over citizen encounters. These are video and audio devices that can be worn on various body areas such as on a helmet, or clip to an officer’s shirt. This small camera captures what the officer sees, and this device records and stores the video, which can then be uploaded to data storage services at the end of an officer’s shift (White 2014). This device has the capacity to record police interaction that previously could not have been captured on camera (Hayes and Ericson 2012). Police vehicle dash cameras, an earlier form of police surveillance technology, only allows for footage that is focused on the scenery in front of the car. In contrast, BWCs record everything in front of the individual officer and what they might encounter while on duty. BWCs target specific police and
citizen encounters and are suggested to increase accountability and transparency, and have a civilizing effect, resulting in improved behaviours of both police officers and citizens during an encounter (White 2014).

Canadian police services such as the Toronto Police Service (TPS) and Edmonton Police Service have recently been researching and piloting these devices in order to develop an implementation strategy that will benefit their community and services. Most recently, the TPS concluded a year-long body-worn camera pilot project which began in May 2015. This piloting project involved 85 TPS officers wearing the device during their shifts and is the focus of my research. These subjects were difficult to access due to the secretive and exclusive nature of police. As an outsider completing this research on insider culture that is difficult to access, coupled with the lack of literature and empirical research completed on police as a group in the past, I consider my research and findings novel as well as valuable in determining officer perspectives on the strengths and challenges of using BWCs.

This current study is exploratory in nature and aims to ascertain officer opinions regarding the advancement of police surveillance (i.e. BWCs); their visibility; public citizens’ use of surveillance tools of police (i.e. cell phones); and more generally the relationship between TPS officers and their communities/local citizens. This study provides insight into the TPS and the officers who wore the device, from their own perspective and does not provide generalizable data to represent all Canadian police services and Canadian police officers. It is important to mention that this research does not intend to test the effectiveness of BWCs on a given outcome nor theories of surveillance directly. Through interviews with TPS officers that wore BWCs during their pilot project this work intends to gain insight into their perceptions and experiences with panoptic and synoptic surveillance tools, the impact they have on their policing practice, and determine where this emerging technology can be situated within various theories of surveillance and concepts around police legitimacy in conjunction with practical implementation of this device.
Relevant existing empirical research will be discussed in chapters throughout. Chapter 2 includes a literature review discussing past case studies and evaluations of surveillance technology. This section will discuss police BWC technology and their impact on policing and will contain theoretical aspects of my research. Theoretical perspectives will be introduced and discussed after past literature and case studies have been presented. Surveillance theories will be the prevalent viewpoint in terms of theoretical connection to my research and results, as are concepts around police legitimacy. Mathiesen’s synoptic surveillance and Foucault’s panopticon will be of great focus, in addition to the concepts of police officer’s new visibility (Goldsmith 2010), procedural justice and legitimacy, and accountability and transparency. With these concepts in mind, I will introduce a new framework called the Surveillance Accountability Framework, which combines these surveillance theories and concepts related to police legitimacy in an effort to more succinctly explain the results of this study.

Chapter 3 explores the methodological strategies pertaining to my research. This section will include my population of interest, sampling methods, and my data collection technique. I will provide explanations of my research method, limitations of my sample, and ethical considerations.

The results of my research will be discussed in Chapter 4. This chapter has been categorized into the following prevalent themes: (1) Context; (2) Synoptic Surveillance; (3) Accountability; (4) Police and Community Relationship and Trust; (5) Impact on Officer’s Job, Career and Routine; (6) Officer Repercussions & Protection from Accusations; (7) Officer Change in Behaviour Due to Surveillance Devices; (8) Officer Physical Safety; (9) Citizens Behavioural Changes and Reactions to BWCs; (10) Social Media; (11) Privacy Concerns; (12) Officers Favourability toward wearing BWCs; (13) Overall Impact BWCs have on Policing. Chapter 5 will discuss how the results of my research fit within the existing literature, surveillance theories and concepts around police legitimacy. The final section of this research study will be my conclusion found in Chapter 6, which summarizes the findings and considerations regarding this research.
CHAPTER TWO

Literature Review and Theoretical Framework

In part due to an effort to increase accountability and restore legitimacy, police have introduced a new surveillance technology (BWCs), which can also succeed in increasing their visibility and control over citizen encounters. These devices can target specific police and citizen encounters and are suggested to increase accountability and decrease misuse of force (Ariel et al. 2016; White 2014; Rosenbaum 2015).

The purpose of this research is to interview TPS officers that wore BWCs during their pilot project and gain insight into their perceptions and experiences with panoptic and synoptic surveillance tools, the impact they have on their policing practice and attempt to ascertain how officer experiences compare to prevailing notions around police legitimacy. This review of the literature will outline past research on BWCs, including police sanctioned pilot projects and evaluations and academic case studies of police services. The theoretical framework which focuses on theories of surveillance and concepts around police legitimacy will include a discussion on the panopticon, the synopticon, visibility, procedural justice and legitimacy, accountability and transparency and their connection to BWCs and other surveillance devices. This review of literature will demonstrate the lack of empirical research on BWCs, a gap my research attempts to fill. Additionally, this review of literature compares synoptic surveillance (citizen cellphone videos) with panoptic surveillance (BWCs) and outline the prevailing paradigms around improving transparency and accountability of police. Accomplishing this through positively changing and increasing police visibility, procedural justice and legitimacy, which criminologist believe will lead to an improved relationship between police-community relations. Finally, I combine theories of surveillance and concepts around police legitimacy to create a framework I refer to as the Surveillance Accountability Framework. As will be demonstrated in my results and discussion section, many prevailing views on the pathways toward improving police practice through increased surveillance vis-à-vis BWCs which are inconsistent with the experiences of my sample.
Police Body-Worn Cameras (BWCs)

According to Drover and Ariel (2015) BWCs are an innovation in police technology because they can lead to increased transparency and visibility of police conduct. While cellphone videos of officers can be uploaded to the Internet within minutes, BWCs offer authorities a way to regain control of the narrative of the situation and provide officer protection as police recordings can offer evidence in instances of complaints or contested accounts (Mehta 2015; Drover and Ariel 2015). This tool can also be used for accountability purposes as the police can record the encounter that is in question and provide video evidence of behaviour and actions (CBC News 2015). BWCs challenge the public’s viewpoint because police will be able to record the same footage from their point of view and can further account for their actions regarding use of force. Therefore, these BWCs can be used to protect not only citizens but police officers as well.

BWCs provide judiciary evidence that goes beyond ‘a he said she said’ dispute. They provide evidence that is more reliable than human memory and give the officer’s perspective (Hanley 2011). Further, the presence of a video camera can often alter the conduct of an individual who is aware they are being monitored, resulting in someone behaving within socially accepted norms because they could potentially be under scrutiny when someone is watching (Ready and Young 2015). Research has shown that officers wearing the BWCs are more self-aware and cautious of their actions when engaging with citizens (Ready and Young 2015). This self-monitoring effect and the increased visibility through cameras are leading to police officers’ self-surveillance (Schellenberg 2000).

Results of comprehensive meta-analysis of multi-national randomised control trials from 10 tests of police BWCs, use of force, and assaults against officers indicated that there were no overall effects of using BWCs on police use of force (Ariel et al. 2016). Further, cameras increased the likelihood of officers being assaulted when wearing the BWC compared to officers not wearing the device (Ariel et al. 2016). The rate of assaults against officers per 1000 arrests was 14 % higher when cameras were present (Ariel et al. 2016). These results contradict theoretical assumptions that this surveillance device would
decrease use of force and provide a civilizing effect during encounters with citizens for both parties (White 2014). That being said there is generally a lack of empirical evidence supporting the implementation of BWCs, rather there is mainly only theoretical assumptions regarding this technology. There is an important need for more research due to the implications this device has on police-citizen encounters, police practice, and policy. Lum et al. (2015) mention that due to the lack of existing literature, it should be cautioned not to make definitive conclusions.

**Research Models and Case Studies**

This new level of visibility (Thompson 2005) of police officers in media has not been widely researched due to the contemporary and controversial nature of the topic. There have been limited theoretical articles concerning police and these new technologies due to the lack of piloting projects of these devices, given that this is a brand-new tool that is being implemented into few police services. However, there have been a small number of studies that have developed the suggested notion that the implementation of new technologies such as police BWCs is holding officers to more accountability and self-surveillance (Goldsmith 2010; Harris 2010; Ready and Young 2015; Schellenberg 2000; White 2014).

**United Kingdom Pilot Project**

Police BWCs were first introduced in the United Kingdom with the initial piloting phases taking place in Plymouth, England in 2005 and 2006. Three hundred officers tested BWCs that were mounted on the heads of officers during the 17 month study which resulted in several benefits (Harris 2010). First, BWCs allowed officers to record evidence with more accuracy during encounters, providing unbiased accounts and less doubt to the situation. Second, the police officers were able to quickly make and keep records for a swift resolution and guilty pleas of cases resulting in more time allotted on duty. Third, when the public saw the officers wearing the BWC it reduced public order offenses. The device also more accurately detailed police firearm discharge for investigations (Harris 2010). Overall, officers wearing the
BWCs reported less aggressive behaviour from citizens when they arrived at a crime scene (Ready and Young 2015). This study provided evidence that BWCs can provide more accurate and detailed evidence in investigations and encounters with citizens. However, this study did not focus on heightened accountability and self-monitoring of police officers.

**Rialto, California Pilot Project**

A more recent study on police BWCs was released in 2012 following a 12 month study in Rialto, California. This study tested the effect of BWCs on incidents involving the use of force and citizens’ complaints against the police department employing 115 officers (Ariel et al. 2014). During the experimental period, there were a total of 25 incidents of police use of force that were recorded by the department, with 17 incidents occurring during a control shift, while 8 occurred during the experimental shifts. There was a low number of citizen complaints within both the control and experimental groups, with only three occurring. The researchers did observe a significant overall reduction of citizens’ complaints from the previous 12 months before the trial, from 24 complaints to three during the experimental period (Ariel et al. 2014). Overall results suggest that BWCs affect police encounters with the public and suggest Deterrence Theory as an explanation of the results. Ariel, Farrar, and Sutherland (2014) explain: “we interpret this to reflect a fundamental tendency of humans to exhibit more desirable behaviours when they know they are under surveillance and subject to rules, but we acknowledge that even this will vary depending on the situation” (526). The study concluded with reduction in both use of force and complaints that could be attributed to the use of BWCs (Ariel et al. 2014). The Rialto study determined that use of force incidents were reduced 50% among officers wearing BWCs, but it is unclear whether the decline was the result of behaviour changes in the officer, the citizen, or a combination of both, due to the presence of the BWCs (Ready and Young 2015).
**Mesa, Arizona Pilot Project**

The study in Mesa, Arizona examined officer behaviour and perceptions of BWCs. Ready and Young (2015) examined 100 police officers in the Mesa Police Department during their encounters with citizens over a 10 month period. Similar to the previous study, they relied on officers and citizens altering their behaviour to meet a more socially acceptable standard when they were being monitored. This study hypothesized that officers wearing the BWC are more self-aware and conscious of their actions while interacting with citizens. They measured officer performance through recording the number of warnings, stop-and-frisks, arrests, and officer-initiated citizen contact. This study concluded that police officers were more cautious of their actions while wearing the BWC. This increased self-monitoring behaviour resulted in significantly fewer stop-and-frisks and arrests than officers who were not wearing the device (Ready and Young 2015). This suggests that video surveillance of officer’s actions that may be reviewed internally by supervisors can affect police behaviour. Furthermore, police officers wearing BWCs reported that this device was helpful during citizen encounters (Ready and Young 2015). This study, unlike the previous two discussed, reported changes in police officers’ behaviour due to this technology. This surveillance tool significantly impacted not only citizens’ behaviour but influenced police officers’ awareness of their behaviour through self-monitoring. This technology resulted in officer’s changing their performance during encounters due to the presence of this device where it became a positive influence over police and citizen encounters.

**Orlando, Florida Case Study**

Ninety-five police officers participated in an Orlando, Florida study which explored police attitudes on BWCs. This study measured “What are police officer’s attitudes and perceptions toward body-worn camera use within their department?” through an online survey (Jennings, Fridell, and Lynch 2014:551). The survey found: 77% agree or strongly agree that they would feel comfortable wearing BWCs; 18.7% agreed or strongly agree that they would feel safer wearing BWCs; 40.7% of the officers believe that BWCs would improve citizen behaviour; 29.7% agree that BWCs would increase the
likelihood of behaving by the book (Jennings et al. 2014). These results demonstrate that 6 of 10 police officers studied positively view BWCs, but less than half believe it will increase their feeling of safety. Interestingly, this study also resulted in the finding that only 3.3% of officers agree or strongly agree with the statement that wearing BWCs would reduce their use of force (Jennings et al. 2014). This study on police officers’ attitudes of BWCs does not entirely coincide with other studies previously mentioned. As stated earlier, the main objective of BWCs is to increase officer safety while on duty and during encounters with citizens. However, over half of this group of police officers would not feel safer wearing this recording device. This demonstrates that this tool could just be a way of more closely monitoring police and citizen behaviour. But as the Rialto study concluded, use of force incidents were positively affected by the use of BWCs. This finding contrasts with the attitudes of these Orlando police officers’ opinion that use of force will not be reduced or affected by BWCs. This study has limitations in the sense that it may not be generalizable to other police departments.

**Edmonton Police Service Pilot Project**

The Edmonton Police Service began a BWC pilot project in the fall of 2011 and finished in the fall of 2014. This pilot used qualitative and quantitative measures to assess the BWCs for technical performance, legal considerations, and practical value to everyday policing (Edmonton Police Service 2015). The TPS pilot project modeled its project similarly however, the Edmonton Police Service seemed to be more concerned with the technology and officer experience instead of the community aspect and engagement that the TPS largely centered around. There were 56 officers of multiple divisions who wore the BWCs during this pilot. The general public of Edmonton was mostly positive about the device, though this project did not have nearly as many community respondents as did the TPS pilot project.

It was found that there was no quantitative evidence that suggested the use of BWCs reduced the number of citizen complaints or impacted police use of force during the pilot. However, an important realization is the major financial investment (that being in the multi-millions) the BWCs require for the
size of the Edmonton Police Service. There were also significant technical issues regarding the BWCs and functionality (Edmonton Police Service 2015), similar to the TPS Pilot project.

**Hamilton Police Service Report**

In 2014, the Hamilton Police Service completed a report on the subsistence of BWCs and the cost-benefit analysis of such program. The estimated cost for a BWC program with 190 devices for shared front-line officer use would total an estimated $14,804,894 for the first five years. This, accompanied by another $3.25 million to begin the sixth year. The majority of the five-year estimated cost is due to cloud storage of the BWCs, estimated around $6,841,749; and the new staff positions required in the implementation, estimated around $752,696 annually (Hamilton Police Service 2014). This financial calculation is a tremendous expense for the limited number of BWCs that would be implemented with this service. In comparison to the TPS, at one time, there are 700 TPS police officers on duty each day (Toronto Police Service 2016), this cost analysis would be extremely difficult to justify for the city of Toronto, especially with the lack of evidence demonstrating the direct benefits correlated with the device.

**Royal Canadian Mounted Police**

The Royal Canadian Mounted Police (RCMP) Commissioner initiated the Body-Worn Camera project in October 2013 to determine the efficiency of this tool for front-line officers. Several aspects of the technology were tested and challenged. Battery life and lack of camera durability were seen as the major technology malfunctions and concerns (Royal Canadian Mounted Police 2016), similar to the TPS and the Edmonton Police Service.

The RCMP announced in December 2016 that after an extensive feasibility study on the implementation of BWCs, they will not consider the implementation of these devices until the technology can meet the specific standards and operational requirements. The financial component is essential
towards the use of these devices and the distribution to over 750 detachments throughout Canada (Royal Canadian Mounted Police 2016).

**International Association of Chiefs of Police Evaluation**

This surveillance tool is only effective if police officers positively incorporate them into their daily routine on duty. In the past, when new technology is introduced, police officers have felt that their discretion and autonomy was being challenged (Schellenberg 2000). There have been several studies on police attitudes toward video surveillance and police monitoring systems. A study by the International Association of Chiefs of Police found that police officers tended to resist cameras at first because they did not want “big brother” spying on them. But after a short time, police officers saw cameras positively because of their protection and safety purposes, as well as their ability to record evidence (Harris 2010). This study also found that recording officers’ actions increased professionalism and performance because it forced officers to give attention to agency protocols when engaging with citizens (Harris 2010).

Another study researching BWCs resulted in similar attitudes of police concerning this new level of visibility (Thompson 2005) and surveillance. In this 7 month study researching the Sacramento Police department, officers initially found recording all interactions with the public troubling because their discretion was being removed. The officers feared that their supervisors would view the footage and find opportunities to discipline (Drover and Ariel 2015). This study concluded that police resisted change to this new technology, but visible leadership from superiors, and continual engagement and feedback helped gain the support of a majority of the officers (Drover and Ariel 2015). The conclusion of both studies reaffirms the earlier suggestions that surveillance can potentially hold police officers more accountable for their actions while on duty.

**Toronto Police Service Pilot Project**

In May of 2015, the TPS began a year-long piloting project of BWCs. Throughout the study, a total of 85 officers (constables and sergeants) wore the device. TPS Staff Superintendent Tom Russell
claimed, “I think that this project has the potential to strengthen the policing profession, and I think it has the potential to strengthen our relationship with the community and enhance public trust” (Mehta 2015:1).

The BWCs were only activated by officers under formal circumstances such as during an arrest, answering calls for service, and responding to a crime in progress. Officers who were wearing a BWC arrived on scene and informed people that they were on camera at the first available opportunity. They only switched off the camera when the call for service or investigation was complete or when the officer determined that continuous recording is no longer serving its intended purpose (Toronto Police Service 2017a). Officers also wore a patch to show they were wearing a camera and only individuals, who were involved in the police encounter or investigation (including bystanders) were recorded. Footage was stored on an inaccessible drive and the footage cannot be viewed, edited, or deleted in the field.

Recordings were stored on the BWC until the end of the shift and then uploaded onto a secure police server (Toronto Police Service 2017a). Once uploaded to the secure server, only the officer who captured the BWC footage and his/her supervisor had access to review the images; however, only TPS Video Services were permitted to edit or vet the BWC footage according to service procedures (Toronto Police Service 2017a). The footage is stored for at least one year, but if the footage is relevant to an ongoing investigation or court case, it can be retained for longer (Elliot 2015).

The TPS observed a number of measures during the piloting project through the use of surveys distributed to the community. The results indicated extremely strong support from the community, and also strong support with members of the community who had law enforcement contact with an officer wearing a BWC. Officers who wore the cameras generally supported the device, however not as strongly as the community. Both the community and officers became more positive about the cameras throughout this pilot (Toronto Police Service 2016).

This pilot project provided no significant results due the small size of the pilot and the small number of officers and platoons wearing the device. Results from this pilot indicated that there was no significant quantitative evidence or such incidents or situations throughout the pilot recorded with the
BWC that would have provided an opportunity for the device to exercise its value according to the TPS report (Toronto Police Service 2016). This study provided more of an insight into what it would be like if the TPS implemented these devices and the general impact it would have on the service and whether it would be supported by the community and the City of Toronto.

**Overall Results and Implications**

**Issues & Challenges**

These case studies provide several concerns regarding police BWCs and their implementation. The most common issue regarding this device were technology malfunctions such as battery life and the lack of camera durability (Royal Canadian Mounted Police 2016; Edmonton Police Service 2015; Toronto Police Service 2016). These malfunctions were determined to be significant, especially with the large overall challenge regarding the overwhelming financial cost of BWCs (Royal Canadian Mounted Police 2016; Hamilton Police Service 2014; Edmonton Police Service 2015). Additionally, these case studies resulted in the inability to determine the mechanism through which change in police behaviour occurred (Ready and Young 2015). This inability cannot provide definitive empirical results to support the implementation of BWCs.

In conjunction to the importance of trust between police officers and their community, the use of BWCs has resulted in privacy concerns that could potentially hinder that trust. Officers have raised privacy issues for the public, including the use of BWCs while they are on duty in hospitals causing a conflict with medical confidentiality, issues around the use of conducting strip searches, and involvement with vulnerable population (Drover and Ariel 2015). The TPS piloting project of BWCs stated that only formal encounters between police and citizens were recorded and aspects of on-going investigations (Toronto Police Service 2016). The privacy issues that arise are generally on the basis of informal and private spaces, but police formal encounters with the community are less likely to be challenged with privacy issues. That said, what constitutes formal may be in the eye of the individual, especially if they
are discussing highly personal events with officers. Not only are these devices invasive on the public, they are invasive into the performance of police officers while on duty, creating privacy concerns for citizens and officers. Officers fear that they might be subjected to “unsolicited fishing expeditions by supervisors” (White 2014). Similarly, in the Sacramento Police department research study officers feared that their supervisors would view the footage and find opportunities to discipline (Drover and Ariel 2015). However, supervisors would have to go through hours of video in order to watch an individual officer’s performance.

This new technological era of the increased availability of recording devices for public citizens and police officers is changing the context of “evidence”. With more video footage becoming available during police encounters, it is unclear how this will affect the burden of proof. It could be argued that evidence could stray away from “he said/she said” disputes and directly depend on video footage of the encounter. There are several implications of this for police officers. Firstly, it could be stated that their “word” is not as trusted as it once was. By police officers having to wear BWCs to record their encounters and actions while on duty, officers could interpret this as their discretion and autonomy being challenged. Second, it is also unclear whether video footage from BWCs will be used in court as evidence. Several of the piloting projects and research discussed earlier did not include what will be done with the footage once it is stored or what the process of using footage in court. Considering that this technology is very new, it has a wide range of implications on policing practices.

The introduction of BWCs into police officers’ routine is changing the practice of police work. There will be several changes in police training and policy with the implementation of these devices, such as officers being trained properly in equipment maintenance, recording and downloading procedures, and the development of clear administrative policies that provide guidance to officers; for example, when or when not to record (White 2014). It is unclear how the device will affect policing practices; however, with more responsibility while on duty, there could be some backlash surrounding BWCs. One could ask if this device is complicating police work or if it is just another ploy to provide officers with more power.
over situations with public citizens. It is also unclear how BWCs will be received by public citizens and if they would want to have a BWC recording the encounter with police; especially if they are part of vulnerable populations or feel uncomfortable discussing private matters and/or when witnessing a crime. BWCs have the ability to affect the relationship between police and public citizens. Although this device is intended to improve the relationship due to heightened accountability and transparency, it could be seen that BWCs are giving increased power to police and could intrude on lines of communication between officers and citizens. After all, it is the police who have the ability to record what they choose. This could result in a power struggle between police and public citizens with regard to who can record the most accurate footage of the encounter or situation.

There is also a vast concern with the financial expense of this new technology. It is estimated that the direct cost of purchasing the device is $800-$1000 per camera, and there is also the concern of resource issues revolving around secure data storage and management (White 2014). The implementation of this new device would change the practice of policing, not only on a street level, but on a policy and agency level.

**Future Research**

There is a clear lack of available empirical evidence and research that demonstrates the possible benefits and implications of BWCs for police officers, police organizations, policy, and civilians. Moreover, there is a lack of research that explore specific and detailed attitudes and experiences of officers wearing the BWCs, and more specifically their reactions and attitudes toward different types of surveillance while on duty. This lack of research and critical evaluation of the possible implications of BWC adoption is necessary for future implementation and policy making, especially when this technology is suggested to be a ‘magic bullet’ to solve a numerous amount of problems pertaining to police and civilian interactions (Tanner and Meyer 2015).
Overall, there needs to be more academic literature and empirical research studies on police officers’ increased visibility and their attitudes and perceptions towards surveillance and the usefulness and implications of BWCs. The findings of such research would contribute to policing practice and policy and would provide an insight for police services on the effect of new technology on police officers and public citizen encounters. Additionally, due to the subjectivity of each encounter and different surveillance footage of situations (BWCs vs citizen’s cellphones), it is not clear how context of footage of encounters from different surveillance devices is interpreted and received from citizens and communities. Whether it is filmed from the viewpoint of citizens or from the point of view of officers, video footage cannot record the entire situation from every angle. Thus, more research is required to determine how different surveillance tools such as BWCs and citizen cellphones record situations differently, how each can be manipulated, and how interpretations of encounters are context specific. More generally, police officers and the relationship they have with their communities and citizens require more exploration by academics, not simply by police services. Further research is required on the implications of BWCs and these promises that suggest improved transparency and accountability, and ultimately viewing the police as legitimate.

This body of literature and police service case studies will guide my research in terms of questions and how I will approach this concept. Specifically, how officers react to not only BWCs but as well to citizens’ use of recording devices and where BWCs fit into larger discussions of surveillance theories and concepts around police legitimacy, collectively referred to here as the Surveillance Accountability Framework.

**Body-Worn Camera Theoretical Connection**

Police officers have recently introduced new technology, which is suggested to help combat synoptic surveillance (citizen cellphones) and reclaim control over their self-image through the use of BWCs. These devices are video and audio devices that record encounters from the officer’s perspective.
BWCs are a panoptic surveillance tool that some claim will change the policing practice. The New York Police Department (NYPD) Police Commissioner James P. O’Neil is quoted in the New York Times as saying, “I’m totally convinced now that this is the way forward...I truly believe that these cameras have the great potential to de-escalate, and the footage captured will benefit everyone involved” (Southall 2017). Not only will police officers be able to record public citizens, but their supervisors will be able to observe the footage of the officers while on duty. Officers are observed through a synoptic and panoptic lens due to their increased visibility and exposure through mass media and new technology. This panoptic tool challenges synoptic surveillance of citizens recording them because police will be able to record the same situation from their point of view, and can further account for their actions regarding use of force. Synoptic surveillance is used at times for citizen’s protection when interacting with police, however police BWCs can be used to protect citizens as well as police officers.

These two main theoretical notions of the synopticon and panopticon compete with each other in the realm of surveillance. Public citizens’ form of power is through synoptic surveillance of police, while officers’ power is aided through panoptic surveillance of the public. The theoretical debate between these two concepts asks whether synoptic or panoptic surveillance technologies are evenly productive in monitoring. Police officers’ new panoptic recording device, BWCs, is argued for the purpose of this research study to be a tactic to combat public citizen’s synoptic surveillance. It is unclear which surveillance tool will be more successful in terms of capturing the “true reality” of a situation, especially since each monitoring device is used from the point of view of the individual recording. Additionally, it is unclear if BWCs will aid police officers in regaining control over their public image and control over their visibility. It is also important to mention that each theoretical notion is directed and interpreted in a context specific point of view. In the case of synoptic surveillance, the camera angles are in the point of view of a citizen acknowledging their perspective of what they are witnessing during an encounter between a police officer and a public citizen. When an outside viewer watches the footage, they are viewing through the point of view of the recorder and, it could be suggested, are sympathizing with that
camera angle’s subjectivity. In contrast, in the view of panoptic surveillance of BWCs, the footage is from the viewpoint of the individual officer engaged in the encounter. Once again, the footage is subjective to what the officer is facing during an encounter, and one who watches the footage may sympathize with this viewpoint. This is why context of panoptic and synoptic surveillance is very important in the surveillance and new media realm, especially since footage from these surveillance devices become what citizens and their communities believe to be ‘reality’ which can directly impact police legitimacy.

In this next section, these surveillance theories will be discussed in conjunction with visibility, accountability, transparency, procedural justice, and police legitimacy. Based on these theories of surveillance and concepts regarding prevailing notions surrounding police legitimacy, I have created the Surveillance Accountability Framework. This framework suggests panoptic and synoptic surveillance individually in terms of separate influences from each other will not overtly change policing practice, rather general video surveillance in its entirety of police officers can increases police visibility and further impact officer accountability and transparency. These prevailing notions including citizens’ perceptions of procedural justice will directly and overall impact police legitimacy. Results of this study indicate that both surveillance (BWCs and citizen’s cellphones) influenced and changed some of the behaviour of officers interviewed. This result demonstrates that surveillance in fact does hold officers interviewed more accountable and transparent for their actions. However, while these officers’ perceptions of their accountability and transparency are genuine, other results contradict these perceptions. These contradicting statements from officers determine that the TPS does not release BWC footage which worries these officers because this is directly stopping their avenue of communication with the public in order to provide evidence of their increased accountability and transparency. This is suggested to impact officer visibility because even with the introduction of BWCs, they are unable to control their public image and visibility, further allowing citizens to continue to control the narrative of police-citizen encounters due to only synoptic surveillance being shared for the public to view and evaluate.
Surveillance Theories

Police officers’ new level of visibility (Goldsmith 2010) as a research problem can be theoretically explored by multiple sociological surveillance theories. David Lyon defines one aspect of surveillance as: “literally to watch over… the processes in which special note is taken of certain human behaviours that go well beyond idle curiosity” (Lyon 2007:13). This definition includes police officers watching someone, unlike Lyon’s everyday definition of surveillance such as information technology. In this case, watching over someone beyond idle curiosity can explain police officers’ actions and citizens recording police encounters. The surveillance theories that will be discussed are Foucault’s panopticon; Mathiesen’s synopticon; Goldsmith’s new visibility of police officers. Following this discussion, the prevailing notions of police legitimacy will be discussed, including procedural justice and legitimacy, accountability and transparency. Lastly, I will present how they are interconnected to form what I term the Surveillance Accountability Framework.

Synopticon

The act of public citizens recording a police arrest or incident of police brutality and uploading the video to social media such as YouTube, Facebook, or Twitter is an example of the synopticon. According to Mathiesen (1997), the tendency of ‘bottom up’ forms of observation is a process of synopticism, which is a parallel to Foucault’s panopticism, which will be discussed later. Synopticism describes a large number of individuals that are able to focus on something in common, for example monitoring the powerful due to the inexpensive availability of video cameras (Haggerty and Ericson 2000). Individuals are able to scrutinize the actions of the powerful and famous through contemporary mass media that publicizes powerful people’s actions (Ericson and Haggerty 2006). Through synoptic surveillances, police cases such as that of Rodney King are able to be made visible, broadcasted internationally, and given the opportunity to be scrutinized and morally questioned. This widespread availability of portable and concealable cameras on mobile phones allow citizens to easily upload videos online and has made police actions increasingly visible to the public. Due to the increased visibility of
police, encounters that were once unreported or not challenged due to police officers’ low visibility are now being scrutinized through media outlets weekly from uploaded cellphone videos (Haggerty and Sandhu 2014). In particular, police officers’ use of force is being challenged, which has made it apparent that police use of force is a highly sensitive public topic. Front-line officers’ daily performance or interactions with the public are increasingly becoming more scrutinized and made more visual with these synoptic surveillance tools.

Panopticon

In contrast to synopticism, police surveil citizens and their communities through a panoptic lens but are also surveilled by their superiors through the panopticon. Haggerty and Ericson explain “the panopticon was a proposed prison design by 18th century reformer Jeremy Bentham… this is an architecture designed to maximize the visibility of inmates who were to be isolated in individual cells such that they were unaware moment to moment whether they were being observed by guards in a central tower” (2000:607). This concept serves as a tool that promotes self-surveillance due to higher visibility. Foucault proposed that panopticism surveillance targets the masses to engage in self-discipline and monitoring (Haggerty and Ericson 2000). Police surveil their communities through a panoptic lens, resulting in citizens engaging in self-monitoring, and similarly the police engage in this self-awareness because of the added visibility and the potential to be watched and scrutinized by their superiors.

Visibility

Police officers’ visibility is determined by how they appear to the public, how society assesses their behaviour, and public reactions to police. This new visibility (Thompson 2005) pertains to viewer society (public citizens) that has become the media producer, which records and distributes images. Due to the wide circulation of mass media and public citizens’ recordings of police encounters, there has been an increase in the number of individuals that are engaging in a moral assessment of police actions (Goldsmith 2010). Police officers’ visibility and public image are increasingly being controlled and
manipulated by mass media, social media, and video-sharing, causing police officers and police organizations to lose control over their image and reputation which is essential for their legitimacy (Goldsmith 2010). A positive image ensures public trust and respect which is required for police to conduct investigations. Police are finding it more difficult to hide the negative aspects of their job, such as a physical or violent arrest, because of their increased visibility due to camera phones (Goldsmith 2010).

As previously mentioned, one of the first cases of captured police brutality on camera of a public citizen was the Rodney King incident in 1991 in which a group of California police officers beat Rodney King, a black man, on the side of a highway (Haggerty & Sandhu 2014). This video became visible across the world and marked the beginning of police brutality occurrences that have been captured and shared for millions to watch over mass media (Goldsmith 2010). After this video was made public, society increased its surveillance of police officers through the use of citizen cellphones. However, it is recognized that not all new visibility contributors to YouTube or other media sites are presumed to be acting benevolently (Thompson 2005). This form of synoptic surveillance negatively affects police images, resulting in an increased negative visibility. That being said, these new media technologies and the uncontrolled ability for citizens to become the producers as well as the receivers of messages and images, has resulted in the capacity to distort or mislead the true representation of events and images (Goldsmith 2010).

This increased synoptic surveillance is resulting in the increased negative visibility of police. In contrast, the BWC as a panoptic surveillance tool is suggested to increase visibility, however in a way that will increase accountability and transparency thus providing a more positive image. It can be argued that police visibility is an implication of surveillance, however officers have the ability to control their visibility with BWCs (panopticon) as opposed to citizens cellphones (synopticon). This control over police visibility and image is very important because legitimacy is formed by how the public view police.

**Police Legitimacy**

Cases such as those of Rodney King and Robert Dziekanski and how the police behaved in such instances make for befitting case studies in procedural justice. The concept of procedural justice is based
on the expectation that legal authority, namely police, are exercising their authority fairly. The public’s willingness to cooperate with police is associated with evaluations of police performance. This perspective suggests “that the police gain acceptance when they are viewed by the public as (1) creating credible sanctioning threats for those who break rules (risk), (2) effectively controlling crime and criminal behavior (performance), and (3) fairly distributing police services across people and communities (distributive fairness)” (Sunshine and Tyler 2003:514). In turn, procedural justice and people who feel they have been treated fairly by authorities are less likely to believe that they have been targeted or racially profiled, and are more likely to accept the legal authority (fines or sentences) (Tyler and Wakslak 2004). It is still not well understood whether or not positive encounters with police can influence beliefs about procedural justice, however literature suggests that if police are evaluated as exercising their authority fairly, they are viewed as more legitimate (Elliott, Thomas, & Ogloff, 2011; Murphy, Hinds, & Fleming, 2008; Reisig, Bratton, & Gertz, 2007).

Legitimacy is suggested to be one of the results of procedural justice. There are several definitions of legitimacy. According to Mazerolle et al. “legitimacy is known to be a by-product of how the police treat people and make decisions when they are exercising their regulatory authority. Fairness in decision making, through neutral and non-discriminatory behavior and fair interpersonal treatment that respects other people and their rights, is key to securing cooperation and gaining voluntary acceptance of the decisions made by legal authorities.” (2012:36). Similarly, legitimacy can be seen as a property of authority or institution that leads people to accept the authority or institution. This reflects the social value toward this external authority and the feeling of responsibility by the public to obey (Beetham 1991; Kelman & Hamilton 1989; Sparks, Bottoms, & Hay 1996; Tyler 1990).

Sunshine and Tyler’s (2003:514) procedural justice perspective argues, the legitimacy of the police is linked to public judgments about the fairness of the processes through which the police make decisions and exercise authority. If the public judges that the police exercise their authority using fair procedures, this model suggests that the public will view the police as legitimate and will cooperate with policing efforts. However, unfairness in the exercise of authority will lead to alienation, defiance, and noncooperation.
This legitimacy is dependent upon public views about the appropriateness of how police exercise their authority through “quality of treatment” and the “quality of the decision-making process” (Reisig, Bratton, & Gertz, 2007: 1006). For example, police use of force is subjective to real-time situations involving split-second decisions. The public’s view regarding the legitimacy of how much force is necessary is culturally sensitive (Haggarty and Sandhu 2014). Haggarty and Sandhu state; “Western nations have undergone a centuries-long process whereby citizens have become increasingly sensitized to, and uncomfortable with, displays of violence. And there is no avoiding the fact that while police-exercised violence may be legally authorized, that does not mean that it is appealing.” (2014:11). If communities view that police act in a procedurally just manner, this being with respect and neutrality, then legitimacy is increased (Mastrofski, Snipes, and Supina 1996; Reisig and Lloyd 2009; Sunshine and Tyler 2003) which encourages community engagement in crime management (Tyler and Fagan 2008; Huq, Tyler, and Schulhofer 2011). Voluntary community engagement with police allows for more intrusive police tactics being more tolerated by the public with this sense of increased trust and legitimate motives for those tactics (Tyler and Huo 2002). This voluntary engagement is useful because police require citizens to comply with their requests for information in order to do their job well, which is an aspect of procedural justice (Mastroski, Snipes and Supina 1996; McCluskey, Mastroski, and Parks 1999). This voluntary cooperation is also crucial for police to effectively get information out of citizens because the public has a greater capacity for informal surveillance compared to the police. Police require citizens to report crime and community problems in order to assist with their investigations (Tyler and Fagan 2008). If compliance is not voluntary, police can force compliance through coercion, though this involves risk to the officer and citizens and other negative consequences (Schulhofer, Tyler and Huq 2011; Sunshine and Tyler 2003). This would have negative consequences on the relationship between police and citizens further impacting procedural justice and legitimacy which is paramount for maintaining social order within communities. Procedural justice and legitimacy are important because they shape the relationship between citizens and police (Sunshine and Tyler 2003). There have been several research studies concerning the public’s compliance with the law under these circumstances.
A study of New York City residents used questionnaire based response surveys to examine the relationship between the public’s evaluation of the legitimacy of the NYPD and their behavioural cooperation with the law. The results of this research indicate that perceptions of police legitimacy and evaluations of police performance are primarily based on procedural fairness and predict citizen cooperation with the police and people’s support for the police (Sunshine and Tyler 2003). Sunshine and Tyler found that police legitimacy, not police performance, was primarily associated with compliance and procedural justice is more strongly associated with police legitimacy (2003). Sunshine and Tyler also found that global views of procedural justice are very important in terms of legitimacy, rather than judgements of police linked to specific police-citizen encounters (2003).

The first randomized controlled trial of police legitimacy was the Queensland Community Engagement Trial (QCET) which tested the impact of experimental manipulation of procedural justice; specifically, a global perception of police during police-citizen encounters. This research aimed to test the influence specific and generalized views of police legitimacy’s impact on citizen satisfaction and willingness to cooperate with police (Mazerolle et al. 2012). The components of procedural justice include citizen participation, dignity and respect, neutrality, and trustworthy motive. These concepts were implemented into a script delivered by police to motor vehicle drivers during 60 police initiated random breathalyser testing encounters (Mazerolle et al. 2012). Each driver was provided with a sealed envelope with a survey inside developed by the University of Queensland. Mazerolle et al. (2012) found significant differences between the experimental and control group’s views of the behaviours and drivers’ specific views of police during the encounters. The experimental group that received the script from officers were 1.24 times more likely to report that their views on drinking and driving had changed when compared to the control group. The experimental group also demonstrated a small but higher level of compliance, satisfaction, and perceptions of procedural justice with police during their encounter (Mazerolle et al. 2012). These results of the experimental encounter demonstrate that perceptions of procedural justice in a specific context influences specific attitudes about police and more general beliefs about police such as...
legitimacy, satisfaction, and cooperation. However, satisfaction with the police was not found to impact willingness to cooperate unlike legitimacy of police. More generally results indicate if police act more procedurally just during a short encounter, it is more likely that citizens will perceive the police as legitimate (Mazerolle et al. 2012). These results are similar to other criminological literature that suggests “pre-existing opinions of the police have a lot to do with shaping citizen perceptions of their encounters with police” (Brandl et al. 1994; Rosenbaum et al. 2005: Mazerolle et al. 2012). Global attitudes of police impact specific assessments of police performance (Brandl et al. 1994) and often people are going to form their general impressions of the police before they have any personal encounter as a result of these global attitudes (Hawdon 2008). These global attitudes include vicarious experience perspectives such as stories from friends, family, and media influencing the public’s interpretation and evaluation of police (Brunson 2007; Gallagher et al. 2001; Hohl, Bradford, and Stanko, 2010; Reisig and Parks 2003; Warren 2011; Weitzer and Tuch 2005).

Skogan (2006) analyzed data from a 2003 survey on citizen encounters and evaluations of police in Chicago and from 7 other samples in different states and countries. The analysis found little support for the argument that police can gain globalized feelings of legitimacy from the public by acting in a “satisfactory” way. However, this analysis found that police can lose their legitimacy easily by acting in an unsatisfactory manner. Having a bad experience with police is much more impactful on an individual than a positive experience (Skogan 2006). These positive experiences include procedural justice aspects which were found to have a minimum and nonsignificant effect on Skogan’s outcome measure of generalized confidence in the police. Overall, Skogan (2006) argues that fair treatment during encounters does not necessarily produce more public confidence or trust, rather negative encounters can produce more harm and consequences due to the imbalance between types of encounters.
Accountability & Transparency

In addition to operating in a procedurally just manner, officers can re-establish legitimacy through being held accountable for their behaviour in a transparent fashion with regard to policies and procedures. One way to do this is through BWCs.

Police officers’ new level of visibility (Goldsmith 2010) is thought to result in increased accountability for their actions. Accountability is defined by Richard Ericson as “the capacity to provide a record of activities that explains them in a credible manner so that they appear to satisfy the rights and obligations of accountability” (quoted in Goldsmith 2010:920). Police officers have no choice but to explain their actions while under this increased level of visibility and synoptic surveillance, especially in the increased scrutiny over use of force and police brutality. Similarly, transparency “requires that accountable individuals and organizations are reviewed and questioned regularly” (Koppell 2010:35). In this new transparency (Brucato 2015), “the production of images and video is said to render transparent the behaviors of those documented” (458). In this case, BWCs and cellphone footage from citizens provide efficient surveillance tools to increase police accountability and transparency due to the increased level of visibility (Goldsmith 2015).

This issue of society’s suspicion of police officers’ behaviours and the crucial requirement for officer accountability and transparency has broad implications in regards to trusting authority figures within communities. Community trust is essential for police legitimacy as citizens will not cooperate and comply with police if there is limited trust between them. According to the General Social Survey on Social Identity, 2013, “About three quarters (76%) of Canadians aged 15 and over, or almost 22 million, indicated that they have a great deal or some confidence in police” similarly the 2014 General Social Survey on Victimization found “the majority of Canadians believe police were doing a good job at being approachable and easy to talk to (73%) ensuring the safety of citizens (70%), promptly responding to calls (68%), treating people fairly (68%), enforcing the laws (65%), and providing information on crime
prevention (62%)” (Cotter 2016). Trust in law enforcement is a global necessity and is essential for police units to function effectively (Sharp and Johnson 2009).

High profile cases such as Robert Dziekanski demonstrate that reduced legitimacy is the product of misuse of force and negligent procedural justice. In 2007 Robert Dziekanski boarded a plane from Poland to Vancouver International Airport. When he arrived, and waited near the baggage carousel he was spoken to by the Canadian Border Service Agency (CBSA). He was processed then held in a secure area, where he began throwing a computer and a chair in attempt to break a window in order to exit. Four RCMP constables arrived and one of them used a TASER X26 conducted energy weapon (CEW) on Dziekanski, without any apparent effect on him. During the struggle between officers and Dziekanski, the RCMP officer stunned him twice with the weapon, however the struggle continued for 45 seconds before the constable could handcuff him. Once handcuffed, Dziekanski became unconscious without a pulse, he then shortly after went into cardiac arrest and died (Criminal Justice Branch 2008; Braidwood 2009,2010; Williams 2011).

The encounter was recorded by a citizen’s cellphone and uploaded to Canadian media outlets and went viral, with millions of people worldwide seeing the footage (Williams 2011). This event raises questions about use of force by Canadian law enforcement and the CEW as a police tool (Luchak 2013). This case represents a fundamental shift in the public’s capacity to monitor the police or authority figures and mobilize politically to hold law enforcement and government agencies accountable (Goldsmith 2010). This case influenced views of police and the reduction in legitimacy that occurred during this event and afterwards, further impacted by the RCMP media release of what occurred and the officers involved being acquitted (Williams 2011). These calls for increased accountability led to the Braidwood Report, noting 19 recommendations, six of which would restrict the use of CEW devices under certain circumstances, such as when the subject is causing bodily harm (Braidwood 2009).

These publicized calls for more accountability have resulted in the formation of groups such as “Cop Watch” programs who seek to record police arrests in an effort to reduce instances of police abuse
of power (Haggerty and Sandhu 2014) that are publicizing specific information about police encounters. This group is a community based organization that monitors and observes the police, using cameras and video-recording technology (Goldsmith 2010). The Cop Watch website states, “The Cop watch database is a permanent, searchable repository of complaints filed against police officers. It was designed and intended both to promote public safety and to ensure that police officers remain accountable for their actions” (2015). This kind of publicity further increases police scrutiny and visibility by publicly listing individual police officers’ names and accusing them through this website.

BWCs, as a panoptic surveillance tool has the potential to change the practice of policing, namely the way officers behave and interact with their communities. Synoptic surveillance also has the ability to impact the practice of policing, however police have no control over this form of surveillance and how they are portrayed, leading to a negative type of increased visibility when shared through mass media. BWCs can give police services control over their new visibility (Thompson 2005) which can impact their image with the public for the better. Police visibility can be linked conceptually with procedural justice and police legitimacy because surveillance of the police is how these concepts are channelled and communicated with the public. Procedural justice means treating citizens fairly with all aspects of the law through direct encounters. This can ensure legitimacy, which means viewing the police as an authority to be deferred to. Visibility from the synopticon has arguably eroded police legitimacy due to instances of procedural injustice caught on camera (i.e. King and Dziekanski), but BWCs allow officers to take back their image in the face of the synopticon from cellphone videos. This form of panoptic surveillance is a tool that represents the police “side of the story” and can increase police accountability and transparency due to the increased footage and visibility. This could improve legitimacy by making police appear transparent and accountable.

*Surveillance Accountability Framework*

My research cannot be easily framed by current surveillance theories; but rather it was thought the combination of surveillance theories and prevailing ideas around police legitimacy would provide a
suitable framework through which to hypothesize about officers’ perceptions around surveillance devices and the impact they have on policing practice. This framework, which aims to provide insight into my results, is termed the Surveillance Accountability Framework. This framework includes aspects of the panopticon, the synopticon, visibility, procedural justice and legitimacy, and accountability and transparency. Based on the above body of literature, one can expect that police use of BWCs to improve transparency and accountability begins with the shift from the dominant use of synoptic surveillance of officers to panoptic surveillance of officers. This shift in surveillance should logically result in police services having more control over their visibility. This new control over their image can lead to a more positive public image, leading to improved legitimacy. The increasing surveillance in general whether it being synoptic or panoptic, can be thought to increase police accountability due to the footage produced, the ability to review it and hold officers responsible for their actions with direct evidence from encounters. More accountability due to surveillance should improve procedural justice because officers’ actions are becoming more transparent during encounters with citizens. Rather than explaining their actions, officers in theory should behave in a procedurally just manner, (because they are being monitored by their superiors and scrutinized by the public vis-à-vis camera footage) in order for video evidence to provide a more positive visibility, rather than officers having to defend their actions due to negative visibility. This surveillance shift can improve police-community relations because now each side of the encounters has their “side of the story” represented and documented. This in turn should result in more transparency and increased police legitimacy and trust due to improved procedural justice and increased accountability because of the increasing surveillance of officers and their policing practice. See Figure 1 for a visualization of this process. This framework rests on the assumption that transparency and accountability are primary goals of BWC use. The TPS asserts the intended purpose and goals of the pilot to include; “enhance public trust and police legitimacy, enhance the commitment to bias-free service delivery by police officers to the public” (Toronto Police Service 2016:6). This framework also rests on the assumption that officers will be held accountable because the public will be able to see the video footage.
This framework in theory is practical with regard to framing officer perceptions of BWCs, however the results of this research are surprisingly inconsistent with popular surveillance theories and prevailing views about police legitimacy. As will be shown in the Results section, my hypothesis that the Surveillance Accountability Framework is an accurate portrayal of the process through which legitimacy of police can be improved through BWCs is incorrect in several ways due to the implications of BWCs that could not have been predicted from an outside researcher due to the lack of experience that non-police personnel possess. This surveillance tool was suggested to improve accountability and transparency resulting in more procedural justice and increased police legitimacy. However, with no avenue to present this increased accountability and transparency through BWC video evidence due to TPS policy to not release camera footage to the public, these suggested benefits cannot be communicated for public evaluation and influence over their perceptions of the relationship their community shares with the police and overall police legitimacy. The implications of BWCs further influence the overall impact they have on police practice more so than the theorized benefits.
Figure 1. Surveillance Accountability Theory Visualization Flowchart

The Panopticon (BWC Surveillance) \(\leftrightarrow\) The Synopticon (Citizen Cellphone Surveillance)

Increased Visibility which promotes increased Accountability and Transparency of Police

Increasing Procedural Justice

Overall Result: Positively impacting Police Legitimacy
Concluding Thoughts on the Literature

Mass media that broadcasts videos of police and citizen encounters that are scrutinizing police officers publicly are forms of distrust in these authority figures, which is creating a new issue for not only authority figures, but public citizens. This problem is affecting everyday life of not only individual encounters with police officers and public citizens, but also on a community level with the new level of visibility (Thompson 2005) and distrust of police officers (Goldman 2010). Overall, officers recording encounters through their panoptic surveillance device (BWCs) fosters accountability/ transparency, which can help to increase or repair legitimacy because the “self-monitoring” effect impacting procedural justice for the better.

This literature review demonstrates the lack of research regarding BWCs as a surveillance tool. More importantly it is still vastly unknown what police perceptions are of BWCs and the increasingly limited information of their perceptions of synoptic surveillance. This literature review also outlines theories of surveillance and prevailing ideas around police legitimacy, raising questions on how this shift in visibility changes how police behave and interact with the public and where BWCs fit in this larger discussion of those concepts that make the Surveillance Accountability Framework. The purpose of this research is to interview TPS officers that wore BWCs during their pilot project and gain insight into their perceptions and experiences with panoptic and synoptic surveillance tools, the impact they have on their policing practice, and attempt to ascertain how officers’ experiences compare to prevailing notions around police legitimacy.
CHAPTER THREE

Methodology

The Purpose of the Research Study

Policing has been greatly affected by the advancement of new media technology, specifically an increasing visibility due to the proliferation of mobile camera use by public citizens. Issues such as use of force and police brutality are being surveilled by citizens and scrutinized, resulting in police officers being subjected to a digital microscope and a loss of control over their public image. Police BWCs are being introduced as a new strategy to positively affect citizen and police encounters and relationships.

The objective of this research is to explore police officers’ attitudes and perceptions of the impacts and advancement of police surveillance technologies (i.e. police body-worn cameras) and public citizens’ use of surveillance tools of the police (i.e. cell phones); ascertain their insights into the practical implications of such technology, as well as situate BWCs within the larger discussion of surveillance theories and concepts around police legitimacy which I have collectively termed the Surveillance Accountability Framework.

Population of Interest

The TPS consists of 5366 officers as of 2016 and serves a population size of 2,826,498 (Statistics Canada 2016). In May 2015, the TPS began a year-long BWC piloting project. The sampling frame for that pilot project was by Primary Response Unit\(^1\), police officers from 43 and 55 divisions, Traffic Services, and the Toronto Anti-Violence Intervention Strategy (TAVIS) rapid response team (Otis 2016) for a total of 85 officers (Toronto Police Service 2016). The population of interest for the present research is all 85 Toronto Police Service officers who wore BWCs during that pilot project. Only those officers

---
\(^1\) Primary Response Units officers operate marked police vehicles and are responsible for responding to emergency 911 calls for service and other non-emergency calls for service (Toronto Police Service 2017b).
involved in the pilot project are of interest in the present research due to their intimate knowledge of BWCs and related experiences.

The purpose or intended goals of the pilot was to explore the issues and challenges with BWCs and whether this device would enhance public and officer safety; enhance public trust and police legitimacy; enhance commitment to bias-free, professional service delivery by police; protect officers from unwarranted complaints and accusations of misconduct; and provide improved evidence for investigative, judicial, and oversight purposes (Toronto Police Service 2016). The findings of the pilot suggest that the majority of the community supported BWCs and felt that they would make the community safer, however officers were not supportive of the device in terms of safety and overall support (Toronto Police Service 2016). There were no significant quantitative results. Similar to the TPS pilot project results, the Edmonton Police Service completed a piloting project of BWCs from the fall of 2011 to the fall of 2013. This pilot project did not result in significant results, but rather the need for more sufficient and reliable technology (Edmonton Police Service 2015).

Note on Hardware used by Population of Interest

The TPS pilot project used two different devices: the Panasonic and the Reveal. The Panasonic MK2 (Mark 2) camera included a 30-second pre-event buffer which captured video with no audio from the 30 seconds prior to the camera being activated (Panasonic 2017). The TPS was the first law enforcement service to test this specific device. This camera allowed officers to classify footage out of the station which was beneficial for time efficiency (Toronto Police Service 2016).

The second camera used in this pilot was the Reveal RS2, which had features similar to the Panasonic; however, it had additional features, such as outward-facing LED screen which allowed the public to view themselves. This specific model is mainly used in the United Kingdom (UK). This device did not allow officers to classify video out in the field (Toronto Police Service 2016). This device has encrypted memory, 8-hour battery life, and “superior low light performance by automatically allowing
more light into each frame in darker environment” as the Reveal Media (2017) website advertises. The different models are 4.5 ounces, and 5.1 ounces, 3.9” x 2.2” x 1.0” or 1.2” in dimensions, all ranging in different memory space 8 GB or 32 GB (Reveal Media 2017).

These camera manufacturers claim that their BWCs have sufficient battery life, however, this was a significant challenge of both the Toronto and the Edmonton Police Service pilot projects (Toronto Police Service 2016; Edmonton Police Service 2015). Issues during the TPS pilot include cameras not lasting a whole 10-hour shift, and several problems with improper docking for charging and uploading purposes (Toronto Police Service 2016).

**Sampling Methods**

The present research consisted of snowball sampling from the 85 police officers who wore the BWCs during the pilot project and yielded a sample size of 7 officers. I completed an application to conduct research through the TPS, which included a research proposal and copy of my interview guide. This process took approximately one week. I was provided Inspector Michael Barsky’s contact information, we discussed my research, and he provided his guidance and access. Inspector Barsky soon became my primary contact with the TPS. After a formal meeting with Inspector Barsky at the TPS headquarters, he introduced me to a secondary sponsor. This secondary sponsor provided me with the contact information of officers who expressed interest in participating in this research. Upon interviewing that first pool of interested participants, more officers who were equipped with the device during the pilot demonstrated interest, resulting in a snowball effect. Furthermore, a second pool of participants demonstrated interest in this research through my secondary sponsor, once more producing another snowball effect. This technique may be necessary when the target population is a difficult to locate or identify, interconnected population (Maxfield & Babbie 2014:228; Bachman & Schutt 2012:121). Further, the snowball sampling method is preferable when respondents may feel hesitant to respond to or participate in research studies if they are approached by someone they do not know (Gravelle & Rogers 2014:174). Indeed, Inspector Barsky and my secondary sponsor cautioned that officers would probably
not respond to “outsider” emails if I was given direct access to contact information of the entire population of interest. Additionally, simple random sampling would have required extensive cooperation from the TPS to facilitate the subject selection and subsequent field work.

The central limitation of this non-probability sampling technique is that generalisations to all officers involved in the original pilot study cannot be made, “as this technique will only reach members of the population who are involved in the particular social network, missing out those who are isolated from such networks” (Gravelle & Rogers 2014:174).

This sampling strategy produced a $n$ of =7 TPS police officers. While this sample size is quite small, it was difficult to gain interest from officers who participated in the piloting project. In the Introduction to Police Research: Taking Lessons from Practice (2016) it has been stated:

Gaining access to study police officers has proven difficult (Weatheritt 1986; Marks 2004; Pogrebin 2010; Punch 2010. As cited in Brunger, Tong & Martin 2016). gaining and maintaining rapport with officers who are often highly suspicious of motives (Marks 2004; Pogrebin 2010; Reiner 2010. As cited in Brunger et al. 2016). This is even the case where access has been agreed by the organisation, with officers suspicious of the motives of their supervisors (Marks 2004. As cited in Brunger et al. 2016:113).

I was in contact repeatedly with my secondary sponsor in order to increase interest. I urged this sponsor to contact officers in the pilot to promote my research. I was careful not to be too persistent while contacting my secondary sponsor repeatedly for fear of damaging rapport. In contrast, the TPS Police Body-Worn Camera piloting project interviewed 24 officers through specific interview guides developed by the TPS (Toronto Police Service 2016). In terms of the TPS research pilot in comparison to this research, “internal or in-house (inside) research on policing is generally undertaken by police officers or police support staff (insiders) from within their own police force…outside outsiders are described as professional academics who undertake research on policing on behalf of academic institutions…they are individuals who are independent of, and do not receive funding from the police service” (Brown 1996. As cited in Gravelle & Rogers 2014:7). An “insider” for the TPS had the opportunity to interview a large number of officers wearing the device during the pilot due to their research status. Evidently, the TPS did not have a difficult
time finding subjects to interview. As an “outsider”, I was unable to gain access to a large sample size of willing participants. My small sample size demonstrates the difficulty of “outsiders” attempting to research police as a subculture, since “elite groups are in positions of power and authority, they are often quite guarded about what they say in order that their status is maintained and not threatened” (Crowther-Dowey & Fussey 2013:145), they tend to consolidate with only each other (insiders).

Data Collection: Qualitative Interviewing

This study is interested in exploring the attitudes and perceptions of front-line TPS officers. In order to determine these specific perspectives and personal experiences, open dialogues were necessary and were accomplished through the use of semi-structured interviews. In contrast with structured interviews, “semi-structured interviews can make better use of the knowledge-producing potentials of dialogue by allowing much more leeway for following up on whatever angles are deemed important by the interviewee” (Brinkman 2013:21). This style of interview was discursive and conversational in order for the interviewer to observe the participants speech and language to further decipher their attitudes and experiences. Since the police profession is highly inaccessible to the public, this style of interviewing provided insight to new areas of interest that have been overlooked or not considered: open ended questions were utilized in the hopes of gathering such detailed responses. This style of interviewing is used to gain insight into diverse experiences and perceptions individuals have, especially officers and their role in crime control (Crowther-Dowey & Fussey 2013:142-143). Reiner’s 1991 research study on police chief constables demonstrated the use of semi-structured interviews and the strength and usefulness of discursive style of questions, allowing participants to express their own feelings and views (Crowther-Dowey & Fussey 2013:142-143).

This conversational style of interview aimed to gain the trust of the officer in order for them to feel comfortable discussing experiences and attitudes toward this technology and their community of citizens they encounter. Gaining the trust of officers was difficult due to the nature of their work and the importance of confidentiality when discussing police business. I was considered an “outsider” and not
trusted because I am not a uniformed police officer nor am I part of the TPS. In order to solicit trust and professionalism as an outsider I dressed in formal attire: a business suit with my hair tied back into a professional pony tail. I conducted myself formally through introductions and interviews, however throughout interviews, conversations became more informal, as I started to present myself as relaxed and laid back. I looked professional and conducted myself similarly, however as a graduate student, young and polite female, it could be suggested that I did not seem like a threatening outsider. If my non-threatening appearance impacted interviews, this could have elicited truthful responses because I do not pose a threat as a young student. A few officers I interviewed even commented on my young appearance and asked about my schooling and thesis. Each interview included humour and a sense of small talk; for example, university lifestyle and academia. This professional, yet easy going approach may have impacted the tone of interview and the response I received. For example, participants acknowledged the importance of this research and “getting their side of the story”. It is possible that despite being an outsider, I was viewed as someone who could represent their thoughts and feelings as officers, being that the TPS did not necessarily do so in their pilot project. It was also beneficial that I shared similar backgrounds with participants, for example similar under-graduate degrees, completing a master’s degree, or being a varsity athlete in university. These similarities could have aided conversations and their sense of familiarity being that I am an outsider and could possibly “fit” in with them. I believe this informal approach and relaxed conversation enabled officers to feel comfortable, providing me with controversial opinions and private experiences.

Interviews consisted of questions and scenarios regarding attitudes and perceptions of the participants surrounding BWCs, the benefits and limitations of these devices, and the impact they pose on encounters with citizens with respect to synoptic and panoptic surveillance. It was important for this research style of interviewing to allow participants to “express their views via their own frames of reference”, but give the data from each respondent enough structure to allow their responses to be compared to other participants (Crowther-Dowey & Fussey 2013:144). Interviews began with open dialogue, discussing participant’s
prior knowledge of BWCs before the pilot project, and their general opinions of the device. This allowed the participant to guide the interview at the start and gain a sense of control of the discussion with open ended questions. Throughout the interview, questions began to be more specific in order to elicit certain responses. This qualitative method questioned these participants on whether they have noticed a positive, negative, or no effect during particular situations once equipped with the BWC, and provided in depth focus on each participants’ experience. Interviews provided immediate knowledge and interpretation from the view point of each participant for the purpose of analysis. These interviews were audio recorded, transcribed and conducted at a TPS detachment in a private room for the convenience of participants. The private interview location was used in order to provide a sense of security and commonality for participants, as it is a private room used by the TPS for conducting interviews of their own, with no windows or outside access from the public and the video recording function turned off. In order to gain access to this room you must pass security measures in place by the TPS.

**Coding & Analysis**

Overall, seven audio recorded interviews were completed of participants from different TPS platoons that participated in the BWC piloting project. The group of participants all provided a different level of experience and seniority as a police officer working in Toronto.

Once the interviews were completed and transcribed, they were cross-referenced and coded. Closed ended questions were pre-coded which ensured that each answer has a code or number attributed to it. These questions included “Yes” or “No” answers to simplify research collection. The next series of questions were open ended questions which involved the participant providing an unscripted response. These unscripted responses were analyzed and the themes were coded in order to categorize and compare with other participants’ answers. For example, respondents were asked specifically about whether these devices had a positive, negative or no effect on encounters with citizens and their open-ended responses following this question were measured based on their response as either ‘positive’ or ‘negative’ as code words.
Analyzing the data and identifying commonalities throughout each interview proceeded to develop themes among the participants’ perceptions and experiences. These themes are discussed and the focus of the Results section which aims to truly represent the perceptions and prevalent experiences of TPS officers that wore the BWC. Direct quotations from participant responses throughout interviews were used in order to represent respondent perceptions most accurately.

As discussed previously, my presence as an interviewer could have solicited certain responses from subjects. This being said, my bias towards police officers could impact my interpretation of the results. Searching for themes in the data could be seen as misrepresented due to my positive view of police and my inexperience with dealing with officers and police practice. This misrepresentation is certainly possible, however to limit this chance and amount of interpretation, quotations from participant interviews are used, thereby attempting to remain objective.

**Ethical and Problematic Considerations**

This research study aims to provide an insight into perceptions of BWCs from the point of view of officers, however it cannot make generalisations to all police officers who wore BWCs during the TPS pilot project nor the TPS entirely. I am aware I was not able to include all 85 subjects who wore BWCs and I was not able to sample randomly. My present results will not be a representation of those TPS officers who wore BWCs during the pilot, nor are they representative of Canadian municipal police officers. That said I feel the views I was able to capture provide valuable insight into officer perceptions of BWCs given that access to this population is very difficult to attain and no other public or published research has been done in Toronto following this pilot study.

This study was granted ethical clearance through the Queen’s University General Research Ethics Board (GREB) prior to data collection. This study’s target population of TPS police officers who wore BWCs during the piloting project are crucial to answering the research questions posed here due to their qualifications and immediate knowledge of the device and experiences. In this case, there was extreme
caution over ethical considerations regarding participant confidentiality. Police have an extremely high
level of confidentially in their line of work due to the vulnerable situations and the individuals they
encounter. They witness individuals on the worst days of their lives and deal with a tremendous amount
of scrutiny over their code of conduct due to the high authority they hold within their communities. In this
research, participants’ identities have been kept confidential in order to protect individual officers and the
TPS. Identifying markers of participants were not recorded at any time during data collection and names
of participants were not required on the consent forms due to this confidentiality strategy. It is important
to protect the officers’ identities from not only the community but also from their supervisors in order for
the officers not to fear reprimand for answers pertaining to conduct during specific experiences they
shared during interviews. To ensure confidentiality, these interviews were audio-recorded to protect the
visual appearance of the participants and once interviews were transcribed, the audio recording of each
interview were deleted in order to protect participants against voice recognition.

There is a potential career risk to participants, if particular information came out during the data
collection. If a supervisor were to find out which officer had divulged this information, the officer in
question might be reprimanded. There is also a risk due to indirect identification of participants. For
instance, if someone saw the officers meeting with the interviewer or due to the small size of the piloting
project. Due to this risk of career reprimand and indirect identification of participants, officers’ names
were not mentioned in the research study, rather pseudonyms using only an initial were used. No names
or identifying markers were recorded at any time during the data collection or on the consent forms.
Because of the precautions taken to protect the identity of the participants, risk was minimized.
Participants were assured of the confidentiality procedures and that their participation was strictly
voluntary and they could stop the interview at any time. Interview recordings were stored in a secure
location and once transcriptions were completed the audio recordings were deleted from all locations.

The TPS might be concerned with the final results and conclusions of the study. They might not
want the public to have access to the knowledge that was provided by their police officers involved in the
study. If the findings do not result in a specific conclusion this service was anticipating, they might feel this study poorly represents their service and might receive negative feedback. This is why the notion of confidentiality is important and was communicated clearly to the participating officers and their Service prior to and throughout the data collection strategy.

**Research Questions and Hypothesis**

This research intends to assess and provide insight into these research questions:

1. What are the participating police officers’ general attitudes and perceptions towards and experiences with, the device?
2. What are the participating police officers’ perceptions of officer and citizen behavioural changes during a police encounter when BWCs are present compared to encounters that do not include BWCs, and how do these behaviours differ from those observed while in the presence of public citizens’ surveillance tools?
3. Do BWCs, from the perspective of the participating TPS police officer, have a positive, a negative, or no effect on citizen trust in police and willingness to communicate during police encounters?
4. Could possible behavioural changes in officers be the result of increased visibility and accountability due to citizens recording encounters, rather than BWCs?
5. Where do BWCs as a surveillance tool fit into the larger discussion of theories of surveillance and police legitimacy concepts that are included in my Surveillance Accountability Framework?

My research intends to provide insight into these research questions through the use of interviews with officers that wore the device. Based on the surveillance theories and notions that have been developed into my Surveillance Accountability Framework, I predict that officers will have the ability to re-gain control over their visibility and public image through this increased accountability that enables encounters to be made public in an effort to appear transparent and result in more procedurally just behaviours.
CHAPTER FOUR

Results

Seven participants were interviewed for the purpose of this study. All seven participants were TPS officers involved in the TPS BWC piloting project from 2015-2016. While participant demographic characteristics were not recorded during data collection in order to protect the identities of the subjects, it can be said that participants ranged in experience level from less than 5 years to more than 20 years on the job. As mentioned previously, pseudonyms using only an initial are used to represent participants where interview quotations are presented.

All interviews were transcribed and analyzed in search for commonalities throughout. Codes were developed for common and frequent answers to interview questions, or reoccurring experiences, resulting in the development of themes. Themes are categorized together in terms of applicability and similarity; then further condense into more specific individual themes. The following results represent the 12 major relevant themes identified through coding and the frequency of similar answers and dialogue among the interviews with officers.

Context

A major theme to come from the interviews was that of context. By this I mean circumstances around an incident that cannot be fully captured by BWCs or citizen cellphone video for a number of reasons; including being positioned physically outside of the camera view, the fact that the camera was not turned on when the incident began, human emotion that is indiscernible to those who did not experience the incident in person, and other such gaps in information. Six of my 7 subjects were concerned about context and how it impacts public perception of police and police legitimacy due to a perceived lack of procedural justice when context is misunderstood or unclear. One subject was somewhat concerned. This concern is reflected in the following passages:
"it [BWC] will provide a more accurate version. It is still a one-dimensional thing…one of the down falls, people are going to assume it’s gonna show everything and capture everything…Yeah, so say an officer is on the ground and then kicks somebody in the head, poke them in the eye to save their life and get them under control, it’s going to look bad to anybody but it is a necessary evil sometimes and we have to do it to save our own lives, save their lives, save somebody else’s life." [P.]

"you don’t see everything, it’s just what the camera sees it’s not necessarily what other people see, or what I see, right it’s just a different vantage point… One thing again with the vantage point, what I see is not necessarily what the camera sees, especially there was one time we had a girl and we were just investigating her and everyone in the house and she was sitting in a chair, and she took drugs off of her and threw it under the chair, so we didn’t see that but luckily the way my body is facing my camera was on her when I was talking to someone else, my camera captured it all." [G.]

“media does not release the full video, if there is a minute video, they will release a 10 second clip that scrutinizes the police officer…It would be beneficial to police service to release the full video with the full story. It’s hard to dispel the wrong story once it has been put out there…You still have to take it in mind with what the officer perceived, their head could see things the camera might not capture and vice versa. So, it has to be used in tandem with the officer’s perceptions. It cannot be a sole device just for that reason, there might be something we are not getting on camera.” [R.]

“we have 5 senses, the camera can only pick up visual. They can’t figure out what you are smelling, what you feel, what you are sensing”. [S.]

It is important to note that officers are fully aware that video surveillance is not the “silver bullet” in terms of reviewing and providing evidence of an incident, largely due to the context that is lost. Subjects believe it is important that BWCs be used in “tandem with the officers’ perceptions” as they cannot interpret the officers’ senses and feelings during an encounter; rather it provides a perception of a “first person shooter video game”, as D. mentions in the interview.

Another issue regarding context subjects identified as a problem is that the TPS does not release any BWC footage for the public to view and see officers’ “side of the story”. Officers are concerned that their “side of the story” is not shown to the public in conjunction with snippets the media shows of an encounter that citizens record and upload to the media outlets. In this instance, only citizens’ “side of the story” is being released and available to influence communities through mass media. This could have direct consequences on police visibility and public image, as the public has direct control over what footage is made available for interpretation by citizens. This could directly impact police legitimacy,
especially in terms of accountability and transparency. Communities could call into questions why the TPS is not releasing BWC footage to refute negative visibility and evidently not being as transparent as they claim to be. This was a concern by most officers, as releasing BWC video could provide footage with more context and evidence that officers are behaving in a procedurally just manner, therefore controlling and positively impacting police legitimacy. Not releasing BWC footage could contradict the benefits of BWCs in terms of police visibility and the re-claiming control over their public image and legitimacy.

**Synoptic Surveillance**

Synoptic surveillance, which includes citizen cell phones recording officers, has led to increased visibility of officers. However, 5 of the subjects indicated concern around heightened scrutiny of officer performance. While this intensified scrutiny has the potential to improve transparency around police activities and force a police service’s hand on accountability, 2 subjects raised significant concern around citizens interfering with police business in the pursuit of video footage. The following passages indicate that subjects were concerned about the increase in scrutiny surrounding police officer performance as a result of synoptic surveillance:

“a citizen can record and it makes the officer look bad but the whole event is innocent in nature. Our video that filmed in its entirety, may never be disclosed to the public and the citizen that is recording a snippet will get the media attention, which then influences peoples’ minds, where we don’t have the same ability to say hey look at our side. Unless the service decides to show it. They will use it internally to clear us, or reprimand us, but I don’t know if they would ever show it to the public.” [J.]

“What you are going to see from them is only what they want you to see.” [P.]

My research indicates that in general, officers are accustomed to being filmed by citizens’ cellphones on a daily basis. As J. stated, “it’s a part of the job now”. Subjects indicated that they realize they can be filmed everywhere they go, whether it is from street cameras, private security cameras, or from citizens on the street. However, citizens concern the officers interviewed when they attempt to come closer to an incident to record closer camera footage and angles. This raises officer concern because they
do not know this outsider’s intentions on the situation, causing some officers to second guess in situations. Some subjects suspect citizens may sometimes join an encounter because they are trying to record the incident from closer vantage points, leading to more potential for safety risks for the officer and other citizens. The following passages exemplify these concerns:

“We can look at [with the BWCs] the whole conversation and interaction versus the 10 seconds where it could be negative or very dynamic where something happens. I think it will give you a much closer point of view, from the officer’s standpoint...I am probably more subconsciously aware [of synoptic surveillance], but it does not change my approach to calls or change my behaviour. I’ve been in a situation where a camera has changed my approach and actually put me at risk, I realized this after the fact. I made the choice myself to any actions that I am going to take that’s the action I am taking because I made that choice. The situation, it was just letting someone walk off to my side and not think about it, they were filming and they wanted a different angle for their film, and he was at my side, you know I don’t want people to my side, the side of my fire-arm. In ways that is a concern and I need to be aware of where it is and what is around me and I let him go that way and the next thing was, the guy that was in front of me, I got into a physical altercation with him...and this individual is now to my side. It raised my attention that people are going to step back and take videos and you have to be aware of your surroundings and you do not know what their intentions are. Younger officers are second guessing their actions with the cameras on them or questioning themselves.” [R.]

“I don’t know if you are just a random person coming up or are you a friend of theirs and you are getting in there trying to be a distraction with the camera, but you could have a weapon or you are going to attack me.” [S.]

R. and S. share the concern regarding synoptic surveillance regarding the safety issues they could face, especially due to the unknown intentions of random citizens that are not involved and engaging them during an incident. They must protect themselves in order to do their job correctly and efficiently. This protective nature could be seen as aggressive or unapproachable, especially if they are suspicious of all unknown civilians video-taping a scene. Below M. provides insight for potential motives surrounding synoptic surveillance:

“The YouTube videos and the videos you see in the media where they show officers allegedly doing something wrong…but all of those videos are missing a portion, whether its 10 seconds, 15 seconds, a minute...we don’t know. Someone had to say to themselves, hey I want to film this, take out their phone go to the recording and click record, where all that time could be critical information that shows the context of why the officer is doing what they are doing...Cameras are also used to try and fluster an officer.” [M.]
This description of synoptic surveillance can be seen as the contribution to the negative visibility of officers that this surveillance can have. Several officers mentioned throughout interviews that citizens’ cellphones can be used to try and fluster or provoke officers into behaving inappropriately, such as yelling or swearing at citizens in order to re-gain control over citizens and the situation. As M. mentioned, often times the first part of an encounter is not present in the footage, rather a snippet portion of the encounter is broadcasted. This missing information could be beneficial to police visibility and public image as it could provide explanation and more context to the situation as to why the officer is behaving in such a manner. This could have direct impact as to whether a citizen watching synoptic footage of police over mass media could see the officer as behaving in a procedurally just manner or whether their legitimacy and trust should be questioned and scrutinized. Regardless of the outcome in terms of police visibility and their legitimacy, synoptic surveillance holds police to a higher level of accountability and transparency.

**Accountability**

For those on the outside, BWCs promise a decrease in misuse of force, and heightened accountability for those officers who do use force inappropriately (Ariel et al. 2016; White 2014; Rosenbaum 2015). This is because BWCs are thought to provide a credible record of officers’ behaviours during encounters with citizens. Six of my subjects share this sentiment, indicating BWCs will improve accountability. The following passages demonstrate this:

“If it’s recording you, you are going to be accountable because it is recording you. You’re going to be reacting to the letter of the law...I was narrating what I was doing, I am doing this for this reason, I was telling a story…it’s kind of necessary because six months or a year later if it goes to court, it’s like I am putting my thoughts out on the camera and it’s making the person hearing that I am justifying the heck out of myself.” [M.]

"I think it will also get officers that aren’t the best behaved, that try to be cowboys out there. It’s going to make them have to change as well because they are going to know that their actions are on camera and the people around them are also on camera." [S.]

With that being said, some of these officers found this question regarding accountability difficult and were often reluctant to provide a direct answer. Most officers interpreted “accountability” as a way for
officers to prove innocence rather than deviant officers being held accountable for improper behaviour.

This can be seen in the following quotation:

“we can’t just say what we did, you show what you did. You have to explain, let’s say if you did something harmful or negligent you have to explain why you did it, not pretending like it never happened.” [G.]

One subject indicated that BWCs do not foster accountability. This officer’s response implies that officers who do not operate under the philosophy of procedural justice should be held responsible regardless of whether an incident has been filmed or not:

“No, we are still accountable to the same respect. We are accountable regardless whether or not we are being video-taped.” [D.]

**Police and Community Relationship and Trust**

As previously mentioned in the literature review, it is very important for police and their community to have not only a relationship but for that to be trusting. Interviews provided that 4 officers had mixed opinions of whether BWCs will improve the relationship and increase trust with their communities. In the following, an example of such a mixed opinion, while the officer believes there is the potential to increase trust, the subject makes it clear this cannot happen without transparency which includes releasing the footage to the public:

"We are working hard to get the public’s trust and there is always going to be a bad seed every where you go, we are humans, we make mistakes...I think the police have to start releasing the footage to the public to the news outlets to get the actual video out there, and that will maybe improve the public’s trust...Subjective [characteristic to the situation or the individual and open to interpretation], depends on the community that they are involved with. We are very unique detachment where we work. We have a very diverse community in Toronto. With different communities in Toronto it has different reactions and interactions with us, so some communities it would be positive and I think it would help build their trust up, other communities I do not see it having an impact, they don’t feel the difference of policing in their neighbourhoods or community.” [R.]

One subject believed that trust would improve with the addition of BWCs, but again this subject uses the transparency and accountability afforded to officers through the use of BWCs as evidence of this:
“I think it will improve public trust, because then we have nothing to hide and what could people really say because everything is on camera and recorded...we call it the best evidence; video. I think it will be good for public trust.” [G.]

One subject claimed that BWCs would not improve trust with the community, and 1 had a mixture of opinions, however overall was more negative in regards to the effect of BWCs on the relationship between police and their communities. Below is an example of an officer demonstrating a negative orientation toward the notion of BWCs restoring trust:

“It has a negative effect, less rapport and communication. Who likes to be video-taped and filmed...we will lose out drastically getting to know people and helping people who want help that are willing to give information and be friendly with other people, because now they don’t want to be associated when we have them on video. They could feel like they are snitches.” [D.]

General observations from the interviews suggest that BWCs could lead to improved trust, however video from the BWC encounters are not released to the public. Without that step towards transparency, it is difficult to demonstrate accountability, thereby creating a roadblock to improving trust between police and citizens.

**Impact on Officer’s Job, Career and Routine**

BWCs had several impacts on officer’s daily routine and overall career management. This theme has been separated into two different categories that impact officers’ jobs in ways that often compel them to adapt: technology malfunctions, and impact on daily routines.

**Technology Malfunctions**

Six officers reported that they are concerned with technology malfunctions and issues with BWCs, and the impact these malfunctions can have on their daily routine and career. One officer was slightly concerned about this. Officers expressed concern with the functionality of this technology and the “annoyance” of it, as well as how malfunctions could impact their careers and negatively impact them as individuals. These officers share their concerns:

“issue of technology, the cameras battery life, videos issue, videos not being recorded properly. Sound being missing from the video and if you have an instance where you did the right things on
the device, but the device malfunctioned, it goes to court, and court will be like where is the sound?” [J.]

“the camera just turns on or off sometimes, I know one time it turned off in a really bad spot with something we were dealing with. It looked like we could have looked like we personally turned it off. Battery life was really bad.” [G.]

“most cameras battery does not last the full 10-hour shift and most other services have 12-hour shifts. After we finished with our first set of cameras, the batteries started to go on them, so instead of lasting even 6 or 7 hours they were lasting 4 or 5 hours. The inspector in charge of the piloting project said it best, ‘I’m not going to issue you a gun and say it’s only going to last 6 hours’ so when hour 7, 8, 9, 10 comes, all of a sudden I can’t use it and you can imagine the media field day for if something happened in hour 8 and I say my camera was dead…If we have body cameras that are not adequate for a full shift and function properly then it can lead to a lot of distrust because like hey he had a camera why didn’t you put it on. If there is a malfunction, what did that officer do or trying to hide.” [M.]

There was general consensus of the sample that this technology as whole needs to be improved significantly, and is not ready or appropriate for implementation into the TPS or into daily routine.

**Daily Routine**

All 7 officers interviewed indicated that BWCs impact their daily routine specifically with increased workloads, adapting to additional equipment, and intrusions into their police performance. P. mentions the issue of an increased workload as a result of using the device:

"The problem with it, it took so much extra time spent of everyone’s day just because of the camera, signing it out, making sure it worked, every time there was an arrest made, there was extra paper-work the officers had to fill out. “ [P.]

This increased workload has implications for the number of police officers available to patrol the community, which ultimately may impact public safety. J. shares this concern regarding the limited amount of police officers on the streets:

“right now, we are pretty short on the road, there was a time where there was a ton of guys being paraded, you know men and women heading out the door, now it’s like a skeleton crew…So you have people being taken from the road and placed in the station to classify videos when they need to be outside taking calls.” [J.]

J. and R. provide their insight on the issues of having additional equipment and adapting to the requirements they pose on their daily routine:
“it takes and distracts away from the job that we are supposed to be doing... we are not video processors, we are police officers.” [J.]

“I change my behaviour, more cautious when they first came on. Where is the camera facing? Am I capturing what I need to capture? Pointing the right direction and recording, is it seeing what I am seeing, and at the same time you don’t always remember to activate the camera.”[R.]

Common threads from interviews demonstrate that officers need to be very aware if the camera is turned on or off, or to remember to turn the camera on and off. There are also considerable liability issues and career concerns if you forget or do not have time to turn the camera on to record an incident. These officers share their concerns regarding these intrusions into their daily routine:

"things happen like that *participant snapped their fingers* and you are trying to turn this thing on and you are dealing with something dynamic, doing this and trying to worry about this, ‘cause I know this might be a huge liability concern for me personally in the service, it’s distracting me from doing what I need to be doing, is protecting myself, my partner, or the person behind this man or woman that is aggressive or assaultive.” [J.]

"the public has a camera on you, there is a camera on every corner for whatever you do, and now add a body camera on you, that is excessive to me...I am concerned about how the body cameras are going to change me and how I do this job, letting my guard down, having to worry about something that is quite intrusive when dealing with people.” [D.]

D. mentions the excessiveness BWCs add to the daily routine. This could be seen as a form of resistance towards this increased surveillance and visibility. BWCs could be seen as an invasion into their performance as an officer. ‘Big brother’ is always watching and could scrutinize their actions.

**Officer Repercussions and Protection from Accusations**

Technology malfunctions could be potentially damaging to officers such as in the example of BWC footage being used in court with faulty audio outlined by J. above. When functioning properly, subjects indicated that this device can be damaging for officers when the camera footage results in the unintended consequence of repercussions to officers. In contrast, when recording properly BWCs could also protect officers from accusations.
Repercussions to Officers

Officers shared concerns regarding risk to their careers. As mentioned earlier, if the BWC is not working properly this could be cause for concern for several reasons. Generally, most officers shared these concerns such as the negative image it could portray if an incident went the wrong way and there is no video evidence to back up the officer’s statement of events. It could potentially look like the camera was purposely turned off. It is also concerning for officers if a supervisor watches the video footage because they could scrutinize and reprimand officers for small infractions. Two officers mentioned uniform infractions as an example, such as not wearing their hat, or traffic vest. Here are some quotations regarding repercussions from some officers interviewed:

“There’s a lot of extra work, uploading it, what if I have my notes which is what I saw and what I thought happened, and then they are not the same as my body camera notes. That is always an issue, I wonder if I go to court, and now they say you wrote this in your notes but your body camera shows this, can you explain that. And now I look like an idiot or a liar, when really that is how, at that time I interpreted it, and how I felt.” [G.]

“We sometimes have a blink of an eye to make a decision or what action we are going to take, whether it’s use of physical force or use inappropriate language because people are not necessarily compliant when officers come in they don’t listen to us. Sometimes we have to raise our voice and use swear words in order to control the situation and calm it down. But giving someone the opportunity to see the video to say you could have done this or this, but we have a split-second choice which is very difficult to do, where if we had three minutes or three weeks to make that choice we could make different choices. You are going to handicap some guys by constantly scrutinizing them ‘cause they will not want to engage, or be involved in situations, they are going to be more hesitant and nervous going into a situation where there is a camera.” [R.]

A common trend that is mentioned from these officers is how dynamic their job is and how it is very subjective to each and every situation. R. mentions how they have a split second to make a decision and what course of action they are going to take. Several officers included that it is very easy for someone to watch the video footage and scrutinize every aspect, especially when they are not in the moment during the incident. This is where the element of context is very important when it comes to video footage as well.
Protection from Accusations

All 7 officers agreed that this technology can protect them from accusations, such as improper behaviour and use-of-force incidents. Footage of incidents in question can protect officer’s careers and exonerate them from false accusations. P. discusses their experiences with this theme:

“it [BWCs] protected us afterwards against law suits, complaints ... I had 2 where the officer was wearing the body camera and it completely exonerated them right away.” [P.]

Similarly, G. says:

"we have had some allegations come forward that were totally false, and that were just dealt with right there and if we not had the cameras and those allegations have gone public, because they were serious allegations, had that gone through an investigation, I think that would really affect people’s trust in us but I think having the cameras improves it." [G.]

Overall observation from interviews suggests that BWCs serve as first-hand evidence in cases such as false accusations against officers. This will protect an individual officer’s career as well as the TPS in its entirety, and as G. mentions, BWCs can produce the effect of avoiding negative press which would increase the chance for a more positive relationship between police and citizens.

This form of protection demonstrated through video footage made available to an officer that has been wrongly accused or unfairly scrutinized for their actions can restore legitimacy of police. However, if this video evidence is not available to the public to view (transparency and trust), while officers may be exonerated internally by their police service and evaluation, this footage is useless in attempting to restore legitimacy through a shift in visibility. Transparency can lead to legitimacy but the footage must be made available. As subjects mentioned in the previous section, this would also impact the relationships police hold with their communities.

Officer Change in Behaviour Due to Surveillance Devices

The self-monitoring effect of surveillance tools and the increased visibility through cameras is leading to police officers’ self-surveillance (Schellenberg 2000). This process of increased self-awareness
is evident in how officers interviewed slightly alter their behaviour and patterns of speech when they are aware they are under direct surveillance either from BWCs or citizens’ cell phones.

Results from interviews indicate that 3 officers did alter their behaviour due to camera surveillance of either kind (panoptic and synoptic). Three officers had a mix of responses as to whether they changed their behaviour, however they did not make a definitive answer regarding behavioural changes. One reported they did not change their behaviour. General tones in interviews suggest that officers are more conscious and aware of their actions when a camera is surveilling them, however in situations that have safety concerns, it was mentioned that cameras are more of an afterthought and do not alter behaviour. The theme of behavioural changes due to surveillance devices is separated into more specific undertones that arose during interviews: officer behavioural changes due to BWCs, officer behavioural changes due to citizens recording, and overall behavioural changes due to cameras.

**Officer Behavioural Changes due to BWCs**

P. mentioned that when they were reviewing BWC video footage, they noticed that officers wearing the BWCs were changing their demeanor and the way they spoke:

“they get all nervous about the body camera going on.”

Similarly, R. mentioned that officers are most definitely more aware of this panoptic surveillance:

“you are more conscious of your behaviour because it is being recorded and can be played back later in court...I think you are going to see more officers being aware of their behaviour and actions with the body camera because it’s in more situations and it’s on every call all the time, it’s more formal.”

Several officers mentioned how they are unsure how these videos will affect the court process and how they will change officer testimony. They mentioned that they are worried about how they will be represented in court with this technology and how they can be scrutinized for their actions or non-actions when the video is reviewed. R. alluded to the fact that this cautious behaviour could foster procedural justice if officers are considering that their actions during incidents could be played in court. Procedural
justice is the most important predictor of legitimacy (Sunshine and Tyler 2003), therefore this increase in officer awareness should be beneficial to their relationship with the public.

**Officer Behavioural Changes due to Citizens Recording**

Throughout interviews, it became apparent that officers were more worried about synoptic surveillance than they were panoptic surveillance due to the lack of control they have over citizens recording encounters. These quotes from interviews provide an insight as to how these officers feel and their concerns when they are recorded by citizens:

“I go out there the minute I leave the lot, or I’m in the lot, I can be recorded. I know that. But I started working here at a time where cell phones were already everywhere. Everyone I work with is very aware that we are always being recorded by everything at any time. We are already aware of it, someone pulls out a cell phone it’s part of our jobs now.” [J.]

"if I am struggling with a guy and I have to say ‘drop the fucking knife’ I would be like oh wow I just used the f-word and someone is recording me. Now I am thinking of what kind of ramifications and distracting me from the task at hand." [D.]

"you always feel nervous if someone is video-taping but I am comfortable with the way I conduct myself...You are always nervous when someone else is videotaping you because you do not know what they will be doing with that video...but if we have our body camera we are not concerned about that." [S.]

These experiences of these police officers demonstrate their uncontrolled visibility which has the ability to diminish their power (Goldsmith 2010) and legitimacy. S. is worried about what citizens’ agendas are while video-taping and what their intentions are with the video; whether it is uploading it to social media, Photoshopping video, or uploading a snippet of the video that puts a negative twist on the behaviour of the police officer involved. D. mentions how being cognizant of cameras resulted in changes to his behaviour in order to put forth and treat people in a more procedurally just manner, such as avoiding using foul language with a citizen.

Officers’ reactions and concerns regarding this synoptic surveillance has relevance for the 6 officers who showed concern for the level of context the video has and the way people interpret video footage. This unknown level of context that synoptic surveillance provides is concerning with regard to
the lack of control police have over citizen footage and their public image and visibility. This in turn impacts their legitimacy if synoptic camera footage is negatively portrayed.

*Overall Behavioural Changes due to Cameras*

In addition to specific concerns about behavioural changes related to BWCs and citizen surveillance devices, subjects brought up video recording generally and how it impacts their actions. These general concerns surrounding all surveillance camera tools include: hesitation and professionalism.

There was not a direct question in the interview schedule related to hesitation, however 4 officers mentioned either second guessing their actions or hesitating due to surveillance tools. They felt that this is apparent in their reactions and behaviour towards both citizen cell phone cameras and BWCs, albeit more from synoptic surveillance.

Discussing synoptic surveillance:

“there was a domestic situation and it had to do with the custody of their child, the law is very iffy about that with us, just make sure everyone is safe, it’s not really up to us to decide who goes where. So, he started recording because he felt everything was unfair about how we were doing things, and then I had to back off and I actually had to call a supervisor to figure out what I do from here, because I don’t want to keep saying things that might be wrong, and I end up in trouble later and it could compromise the safety of the child too. So that kind of made me rethink everything, like hold up I don’t know what I am doing here so I got to call for help.” [G.]

“it does change me and make me more aware of what I am doing but it also puts me at jeopardy a little bit because I am a little too hesitant or less focused when I have to act on my training and make sure we are all safe.” [D.]

“It sucks that you need to be cognisant that they are there...because it takes you away some mentally from being fully engaged in performing your duty with the person you are dealing with or the situation.” [S.]

Discussing BWCs:

“[BWCs] Caused a lot of officers to second guess their actions as in hesitation, and that is a risk to officers. So, if we are in a situation and someone is being violent and they are second guessing their actions that could cause someone’s life. That second is very vital in some situations and that hesitation is going to cause an issue somewhere...You are more conscious, more hesitant sometimes, sometimes it does pose a risk to the officers because they are hesitant to take action, say if an individual has a weapon, that half second to access that weapon, that could be life or death to someone.” [R.]
This behaviour change of officers hesitating and second guessing their actions could put themselves and the public as risk. This concern was raised by a couple of officers, as a potential consequence of this behaviour change. This could result in police being less efficient at their jobs and namely result in a lack of procedural justice simply due to this behaviour change.

Six officers in this research mentioned that they conduct themselves more professionally when they are under camera surveillance. However, they also mention that their change of demeanor is becoming more ‘robotic’. Once again P. gives their take on how officers are conducting themselves when they reviewed BWC footage:

“I do know that officers behave differently with the body cameras, from watching them...I watch them and they don't normally talk like that. They are more robotic, more professional.” [P.]

Similarly, M. mentions how they conducted themselves differently:

"My behaviour does not change much when there is a camera...But maybe I won’t use any slang or jargon or anything like that, I will be more robotic." [M.]

This is similar to the TPS officers that mentioned they would change the way they speak (try not to swear) or their level of professionalism (for example speak more eloquently) when wearing the BWC; however, they do not change the way they do their jobs in terms of policy and procedures, especially when safety is a concern. These changes in the way these officers conduct themselves through their speech may also foster procedural justice if the public is impressed and appreciative towards the level of professionalism they are treated with or witness.

**Officer Physical Safety**

In terms of officers’ physical safety while wearing the BWC as opposed to not wearing the device, 5 officers indicated BWCs would not increase physical safety for officers. The following passages exemplify this sentiment and focus on BWCs as a device that has no deterrent effect on potential combatants:
“if you are dealing with people that are being combative with you that’s the last thing they focus on, if they are going to be combative and that’s their desire to hurt you, they will do it either way regardless of the camera being there.” [J.]

“It did not deter anyone’s actions or behaviours, even telling them that they are being recorded, again many of our situations are very dynamic people are very heated and emotional, not always thinking in a logical state of mind. In terms of the physical aspect, I don’t think it protected us in that sense. Maybe some people second guessed their actions thinking about it, but if they are going to be physical with us, it did not deter them at all.” [R.]

One subject stated that whether or not BWCs would improve officer safety, it is situational and depends on the encounter:

“It’s situational. It could deescalate a situation when someone is yelling at you, they see it and they don’t want to fight. But I have also had times where they see the camera and it eggs them on, they say ‘oh ya get this on your film’. I have had some good footage on when I have been holding someone down and you see this fist punch the camera or kick the camera.” [D.]

While 1 officer did indicate BWCs would increase officer safety overall, my data suggests that officers do not feel that BWCs improves physical safety of officers; rather it has the potential to protect the officer afterwards from accusations from citizens.

**Citizens Behavioural Changes and Reactions to Body-Worn Cameras**

Subjects were asked if officers noticed any changes in behaviour of citizens when officers were wearing the BWC during the course of the pilot. Three officers observed that citizens had issues with the camera and that there were changes in citizen behaviour when being filmed. Below, J. describes the diverse communities police encounter daily and he provides experiences with BWCs and citizens:

"I found that they [BWCs] sometimes could be a bit of interference depending on people’s cultures and because Toronto is very diverse, we deal with people from every background and although it’s diverse in culture, it is diverse in mental health. A lot of times we deal with people who have schizophrenia, whole bunch of different disorders, especially if they are more on the paranoid side. They see the cameras and it can be in cases a bit of a catalyst, it sets them off...when we are going to a call for a homicide, now we are talking to people trying to get information from people, trying to get people’s cooperation. That is for me a barrier, they would see that [BWC] and be like ‘no no no no no’, something like a homicide, in a gang ridden community, one person that comes up to police maybe they saw something, another comes up to police and says to the camera, ‘bye.’" [J.]
J. indicates how BWCs can negatively impact encounters with the public, which could impact the relationship police have with communities in its entirety. It is unclear of the repercussions to police visibility if BWCs acted as a “catalyst” and an encounter turned aggressive between a civilian and officer, but this could negatively impact police visibility. An encounter like this could appear to lack procedural justice, especially with the unknown reaction to the context of a snippet provided by citizen cellphone footage. This negative media attention of citizens having issues with BWCs could decrease police legitimacy.

Two officers found that citizens have no issues and no changes in behaviour due to the BWCs. R. includes some instances of citizens not changing their behaviour because of the BWCs, however R. also includes some of the negative implications BWCs could have on the communication between police and citizens:

"If they are in an emotional state or volatile state my experiences [with the BWC] did not change their behaviour whatsoever, he flat out said he does not care about it, and got into a physical altercation and we arrested them... I have noticed it more in victims, they kind of get more hesitant with the camera on them, they get nervous, especially if you are going into a situation where they have been victimized and it was very traumatizing and very hard and very vulnerable, and now they are being video recorded with it, it kind of raises their awareness and concerned about that. It has changed their behaviour in a sense and doesn’t necessarily make them a better victim, they kind of get more nervous about telling the details. But for the most part I cannot see a change in most people’s behaviour...you want them [citizens] to approach police and talk to police freely and openly not worried about if they are being recorded, is this going to be released to the public, or YouTube. I have been asked by a lot of people, is this going to be on YouTube, this is a big concern for them. Is the perpetrator or the accused going to see this video or see me, and know who I am. This causes a lot of safety concerns...People were talking to the camera and not to us, it almost took the human aspect out of the engagement. The communication is now with the camera, not with us. " [R.]

This demonstrates the subjectivity in how civilians react to this form of camera surveillance. R. mentions that BWCs, as a surveillance tool might take the human agency or aspect out of the encounters rather than victims and citizens speaking directly to an officer, they are speaking directly to the camera. This questions the relationship between police and their communities, especially with the instances of officers feeling they are becoming more “robotic” as previously mentioned; this is in conjunction with R. indicating the potential of privacy and safety concerns and implications of the footage. Civilians have
shown concern for where the footage of the BWC is going, such as concerns regarding if they would end up on YouTube. Civilians are seemingly hesitant in R.’s testimony to communicate openly and with detail with police in some instances. This could potentially damage police legitimacy, in contrast to the perceived opportunity BWCs provide for increasing accountability and influencing officers to behave in a procedurally just manner. It could also be mentioned how the interpretation of police visibility and image representation differs significantly from civilians. Communities believe police should be surveilled to hold them accountable and force transparency, however citizens (as seen in R.’s description) do not want to be filmed and in some cases, are hesitant to openly communicate. How can accountability and transparency be forced by citizens onto police if they are not willing to be video-taped during encounters? This raises questions regarding how this device can please all parties.

Two officers found reactions towards the device were subjective depending on the type of situation or encounter. The following provides insight into what an officer noticed during their time wearing the BWC and some specific experiences they encountered:

“Traffic stops…were fairly beneficial; impaired arrests. Again, traffic related, you are able to; the physical camera itself; people can see it and basically curbed their attitude. Why are you giving me a ticket? Knowing most likely they’ll fight it and it potentially go to court and have it shown before the court. They did not want to look like a fool, swearing which they normally would. I found that situation very beneficial…However, that is not beneficial going into an investigation and someone seeing a camera, [the officer] saying if you do not feel comfortable, I can turn this off. Even it being off, putting it in my pocket and hiding it, their knowledge and idea, these were the victims here. In one incident, I had to put it in the car because they felt that they were being audio recorded. Paranoid. Their first initial reaction [to the BWC] was to put their back up or shut the door to communication because, I feel I am being recorded. That sort of eliminated the rapport we had…victims as well as accused. In my experience, it really shuts people down, almost everyone…this bad guy might shut down but he might have information that otherwise he might want to say, it could lead to further investigations and they are now like no, not saying anything… It’s a brick wall for them... A lot of times from our smaller crimes we get bigger crimes and now they don’t want to talk because of the camera.” [D.]

This demonstrates the different reactions BWCs can elicit from the public. In this case, it can act as a third party reviewing traffic stops to deescalate situations. However, it can also act as a barrier to communication with the public. This barrier in communication can directly affect police legitimacy and procedural justice. If police do not have clear lines of communication with the public, and the public is
hesitant to share important details due to fear of safety and privacy issues, police will not be able to efficiently do their jobs.

Similar to the importance of open communication between citizens and police. Police discretion is important in order for them to do their jobs effectively. S. provides their experience of practicing discretion and why it is so important. S. broke privacy policy (no recording in hospitals) in order to cover bases and liability for the TPS and S.’s career:

"At a hospital, there was a guy saying you are going to have to kill me, this isn’t going to happen, it was a person that was arrested for drugs, taken to the hospital to get the drugs out of him, for the search he was saying a lot of things, it was going to be a fight once the cuffs came off, it wasn’t going to happen and that we were going to have to kill him. I made a decision then that the camera has to go on, it’s not supposed to be on in the hospital. I put it on and let him know and it just deescalated the whole situation and allowed us to talk to him...the doctors were able to do what they had to do and he apologized to the staff on camera and he was the perfect person. Being able to have that camera on, they knew and deescalated it to have a conversation and that was one of the great positives." [S.]

S. provides an experience of how BWCs can positively impact an aggressive situation where safety and liability were a concern. If S. did not turn on the BWC, there could have been potential allegations from the suspect.

BWCs can positively impact perceptions of procedural justice as well as legitimacy through police protection against false accusations. BWCs, as well as surveillance in general, have the ability to immediately clear officers where their actions have been challenged. M. provides a specific example he experienced when dealing with a suspect in the back of the cruiser. While not a BWC, the dash camera was on the inside of the car recording the events. This is an example of how video surveillance can mitigate false accusations:

"Sometimes citizens go over the top and say they are being beaten. I have had people smash their head into the back of the car, as hard as they can against the glass and yelling ‘they are beating me’ to try and get people, but there is a camera right here, they smashed their head for no reason...the guy had a huge gash on his head and we get him checked out by doctors and bring him to the station, well how did that happen, there is a great camera shot showing the male smashing his head, attempting to make it look like we injured him.” [M.]"
M. provides an example of how this device can protect officers in cases of false accusations and such experiences officers face. This is a way of protecting not only an individual officer but police legitimacy, and police visibility and image in its entirety.

Generally, it seems the notion of how citizens react to BWCs is very subjective to the individual and to the situation. As mentioned by officers, this device could hinder the communication between police, victims and witnesses, due to the direct surveillance and citizens not wanting to have a camera in their face and be recorded.

**Social Media**

Social Media platforms have been an essential part of police officers increased visibility. Synoptic surveillance’s outlet is social media and for the purpose of this research can be seen as responsible for the increasing lack of control police have over their image and the large impact it has over citizens’ view of police. In terms of this research, 3 officers were not concerned about social media. D. provides an unconcerned approach to social media in terms of its normalcy and redundancy:

“**You don’t want to be that guy...because when this hits snapchat, twitter, Facebook you become that officer...On a wider lens, the social media aspect is almost public shamming. Social media is never going to stop and it always going to be out there.**” [D.]

D. includes a perspective that is very casual about social media and how it is a normal part of the policing practice that one cannot control or stop this visibility due to the huge popularity of it. In terms of visibility, D. is aware of the uncontrollability they have over this form of publicity and the negative aspects of this visibility, such as “public shamming”. Two officers were concerned with social media and the implications of such media attention for police:

“**Bigger impact is social media [than BWCs] I think, because it’s just very powerful. Even when it’s not related to policing...public opinion can be so powerful and can be influenced so easily, especially today and in the future.**” [J.]
J. argues that social media has a larger impact on officer behaviours and more generally policing practice due to the world-wide reach of social media platforms. Similarly, M. shares concerns regarding the lack of control over this visibility and representation in the media:

"The body-worn camera shows my perspective, Facebook and YouTube is missing that first part. Missing that first part is exactly what people need to see in order to see why he did what he did [the officer] ...The body-worn camera shows that, and the backlash, no one get to see the body-worn camera unless the police release it. On YouTube, anyone can put a video up." [M.]

This demonstrates the concern regarding context of video footage: social media is a platform where citizens can share and publicly shame police with snippets of encounters that could potentially be skewed negatively to represent the police poorly. M. includes the importance of showing BWC footage to the public and having that control over the representation and context of an encounter in question. This would allow for the full video footage to be shown and interpreted with the “first part” that explains and includes more context. These officers are concerned with the level of legitimacy police hold that could be undermined by social media and this form of public shaming.

One subject shared a mixture of opinions, and 1 is slightly concerned with the impacts of social media. R. shares their feelings and concerns towards social media and the impact it could have on police legitimacy through a negative representation:

"Social media is going to be there and you have to take it for what is it worth, not everyone is reporting the truth on social media, it’s just their perceptions...An afterthought in a situation where you could possibly end up on social media, YouTube...the increased social media is just going to skew the officers’ view and public’s view because they are reporting a perception of an event, and people are going to be defensive of what happened and it’s not going to give an accurate portrayal. Where the body camera is going to give a more accurate portrayal of what happened." [R.]

R. includes how BWCs can help counteract some negative consequences of social media through the ability to represent the officers’ “side of the story”, and “provide a more accurate betrayal of what happened”. However, for police to positively impact their legitimacy and prevent social media from skewing their representation, they must release the BWC footage, as several officers discussed and emphasized this importance.
An overall consensus during interviews demonstrates that officers are fully aware that they have a high chance of ending up on social media when citizens are recording them. However, while social media is described as an influencing platform by officers interviewed it seems to be more of an afterthought that is not necessarily changing their behaviour as directly as BWCs as was previously described. It could also be mentioned how social media is now becoming part of officers’ daily routine.

Social media’s impact on police legitimacy is significant due to the large audience it can influence. However, if officers are not deterred from behaving in a certain way by the prospect of ending up online, how can BWCs really improve legitimacy? BWCs and social media increase police visibility, resulting in more transparency and accountability (if the footage is made public and misconduct is reprimanded), though there will be no benefit or change if police are not deterred from engaging in questionable behaviour. Regardless of what panoptic tool police are using, police behaving in a procedurally just manner is important for the public’s trust and relationship. Furthermore, policing encounters will continue to remain and be uploaded to social media and seemingly attempt to hold officers accountable for their actions, though context can be lost in translation to negatively impact police legitimacy.

**Privacy Concerns**

Privacy concerns regarding BWCs are an important factor in determining the benefits of this device and its impact on the relationship between police and their communities. Six officers indicated that there are or might be privacy concerns for citizens. The following passages are an example of this concern:

“one time we brought a guy that we apprehended under the mental health act to the hospital, when we were waiting for a doctor we are still in the waiting room, we didn’t get into an actual bed, and we had our cameras off being we aren’t supposed to have them on in a hospital, and he just started trying to fight us, so we were like we have to turn it on, because this is what we are getting into, so now you have all these patients that are in a waiting room and we have to black all that out.” [G.]
“If it gets played in court, that could be traumatizing for them [victims] in that state. You are showing them at their most vulnerable state to the public.” [R.]

Several officers indicated their concerns for the privacy of victims and vulnerable people. As discussed earlier in the section of how BWCs can impact citizen behaviours, it was mentioned by R. that “it was very traumatizing and very hard and very vulnerable, and now they are being video recorded with it, it kind of raises their awareness and concerned about that”. This privacy concern for citizens, especially if citizens share the concern themselves, could negatively impact communication with police where the citizen or victim is vulnerable. R. mentions that victims are in jeopardy in terms of privacy due to the vulnerable state they may be in. This is particularly the case when the intimate footage recorded on the BWC is played in court, showing up-close and personal images of the victim. However, it is important to mention that R. only included privacy concerns for victims, not random citizens on the street. This privacy concern from the citizen’s point of view could negatively impact police legitimacy due to the potential power imbalance between police and citizens surveillance technology. This could impact procedural justice if victims and citizens are concerned for their privacy and are unwilling to discuss events on camera. It was mentioned in interviews that officers had to turn off their cameras in some instances due to citizens being concerned over this privacy, however no footage of an encounter could be a liability issue and decrease accountability and transparency of police. Officers face a catch-22 in that respect.

Similarly, four officers indicated that there are privacy concerns for officers. The following passages are concerns of officers surrounding this panoptic surveillance:

“we use our cell phones all the time. Sometimes the camera is on and we forget or the camera just turns on. Like we have this footage but if the whole conversation we have, that’s a personal one and I’m entitled to that at work, I can take a break and have a personal conversation on my cell phone but if it is recorded it’s not cool, or we use our cell phones to talk a lot and what if I get a text message from someone, like a personal text message that isn’t work related then I pull it out, then you can see it on the footage. So, you pull it out and it is right in front of the camera on our chests.” [G.]

“we need to go to the washrooms, we have our lunch time, we have private conversations, everyone at work no matter what business you are doing, you need to have to take calls from
family. I am a parent and I am married, you need to still have those conversations with family and be accessible to them and freely be able to talk to them and not worry about trying to vet what you are trying to say because you have a camera on you. You still need to be able to have privacy as officers.” [S.]

G. and S. demonstrate their concerns regarding their daily routine and privacy, not only as an officer but as a normal employee. S. mentioned during the interview that one person on the police committee during the pilot project recommended that BWCs should be on for the entire shift, running continuously. Continuous recording would increase accountability and transparency; however, S. indicates concerns regarding this and how often people might forget that officers are human as well and have the right to privacy. Below R. shares a privacy concern regarding police practice:

“there are some things you do not want captured on camera, tactical approach we make to a house or tactical team come out, we don’t want to capture them on video because their tactics are kept that way for a reason, we don’t want them being known. Or you are having a conversation in the car with your partner about something personal, if the camera is on that’s invading our privacy.” [R.]

One officer said they had a mixture of opinion as to whether there are privacy concerns for officers. Two officers mentioned that they believe there are no privacy concerns for officers and one believes there are no privacy concerns for citizens. S. includes the perspective of how they do not think there are privacy concerns for citizens, mainly due to the extreme vetting that occurs during video processing.

"if we are involved in any type of situation, it's a police matter, if we have body cameras they should be on. It should not matter if we are in your house, if we are in your house for a domestic and you don’t want the camera on, well you called us, this is an investigation and for accountability it needs to be seen. The evidence that’s going on how is each party reacting, what are their emotions, the camera catches all of it, that goes to show stronger proof of what the offense is that happened or how fearful someone is or how aggressive someone is, things like that.” [S.]

Overall, there are definite privacy issues and concerns regarding both citizens and officers, however it seems that officers are aware that in some cases it is part of the job. Also, footage from BWCs can be vetted in order to protect citizen identities or other identifying markers. It is unclear as to whether these privacy concerns outweigh the ability to increase accountability and transparency of police.
Officer’s Favourability Toward Body-Worn Cameras

Subjects were asked how they felt about wearing BWCs. There is no overall consensus in the case of the officers interviewed for the purpose of this research. Four officers were conflicted as to whether they like to wear the BWC. Two said they do not like to wear them and 1 said yes, they do like to wear the device. Below is some insight into some of the factors determining officers’ thoughts toward the BWCs:

“I can't say I liked wearing it. I am all for the idea of wearing it. It’s just due to the...technology of the one we had...it wasn't an enjoyable thing.” [P.]

"I loved them, I felt comfortable and confident and protected...not having to worry...if people do not like how an investigation goes they will put in a complaint, so I always felt protected that everything I am doing and all my interactions are recorded. Career wise and credibility wise you felt protected...The only way it goes to a hinder effect where we are dealing with certain types of people that are willing to give information, informants...there needs to be certain people that don’t wear the cameras because they need to do certain things." [S.]

"So, the camera, it depends on what kind of call you are going to how useful it is going to be. I am not against it, but we also haven’t seen the implications of the camera in court...would kind of slow down investigations where people might be more likely to talk to you otherwise...it can kind of be a barrier in communication and make things take longer to get to a solution." [J.]

J. mentions a mixture of factors impacting their thoughts towards BWCs. They claim that BWCs and their effectiveness is subjective to the situation. It has been mentioned by a few officers that this device is beneficial to traffic stops because the situation can record the encounter entirely. However, like J. and S. mention, the device can be a barrier in communications in terms of gathering information from citizens.

There are multiple benefits as well as costs of the device, however it appears that the cons outweigh the pros. The technology and device as a whole is not good enough for implementation, and this seems to be a large factor for officers not wanting to wear the device. Also, the majority of officers’ mention that this device is changing interactions between citizens and police for the worse. In terms of less communication, it is taking officer discretion away and taking human agency and empathy away from subjective situations. D. includes a specific example that influences their opinion of BWCs and why they would prefer not to wear one:
“I don't want them. It’s taking our discretion away...domestic situations our hands are tied and our procedure and the law saying that we shall arrest if there is any sort of violence and new law has come forward...for example if there is a husband and wife and you get into an argument and they both own the house and the husband punches a hole in the wall out of anger. Because of this, the husband is going to get arrested because there was violence, a form of aggression, our hands are tied with this [BWC] video. I don’t necessarily agree with that, I am actually happy that this person put their fist through the wall and not her face and this person may be a little intoxicated but he still has the where- with-all to make the decision to never lay hands on his significant other. Say she cheated or he cheated, and he had some sort of outlet that he needed to take, be on the couch, the tv, the wall, despite, our hands [as police officers] would be tied. Our discretion is taken away and it’s not for the betterment of society. It would have been, yeah there is an argument, some things were pushed over, no physical violence to each other, we are humans, we get angry, things happen, you have to size up that situation. They both have no criminal record, good employment, good jobs, there is a child that they left at the daycare or their parent’s house or sent away because they were having this argument, they are great people and our discretion is taken away, and now this guy has a criminal record.” [D.]

This is an example of how the BWC can take officer discretion away.

Officers knowing that BWCs are recording them might make them feel restricted in their interpretation and application of law (Taylor 2016). This is the case when I interviewed M., who stated that the law says you may arrest, not you shall arrest:

"Negatives are it eliminates a lot of discretion because the person is telling you things and there is whole lot of ‘big brother’ is watching right now.... It takes away my choices and I feel like I can’t be as empathic to a situation. We have the option to give a break, the criminal code does not say you shall arrest, it’s you may arrest, so there are situations where you hear the totality of the circumstance, you say ‘ok I am not going to charge you now’. Without a camera, you have made that decision, you articulate why you did what you did. With the camera...it’s like who is going to be scrutinizing this, who is going to come at me saying you should have charged...I would say in a perfect world they [BWCs] are great, because it doesn’t really change what I do because I am utilizing this piece of equipment. It protects me from people alleging anything they want. The technology is not quite there yet...Currently in the state of things, I would want more officers on the road, I would rather have a Taser [CEW]...They say they don’t have money for that, but they have money for body-worn cameras. I would rather have it that I have the ability to use a Taser and maybe diffuse a situation where a person is armed with something, than have a video of something where I was forced to shoot that person because they were going to give serious bodily harm to me or someone else. Give me that tool [CEW] and enough officers on the road and then say you still want to buy body-worn cameras. I’m ok with that.” [M.]

M.’s experiences suggest that BWCs can impose on the communication between officers and citizens.

This could limit the amount of empathy police can demonstrate which could influence citizens’ feelings towards police as being unreasonable, when simply they are just following the law. This could damage police rapport with their communities, further negatively influencing police legitimacy.
**Overall Impact Body-Worn Cameras have on Policing**

In the final part of the interview I attempted to gather officers’ overall opinion of BWCs and the overall impact this device and synoptic surveillance could have on policing. The general observation I gathered from interviews is that this surveillance tool is not the “silver bullet” it is promised to be due to several implications this technology poses on policing practice. Such implications include officers indicating that they were wary to get involved in potentially volatile situations, and expressed concerns for the financial costs of BWCs even when they were generally in favour of adopting this technology. The following experiences and feelings are those of officers that have long-term vested interest in the matter of introducing new technology into the practice of policing:

"I think you might see a more cautious approach by officers which is not necessarily better, especially in a dynamic situation. If you are going to a violent situation, you do not want the officer to be hesitating, you want them to go in and take action immediately. You don’t want them thinking that they are going to get in trouble or scrutinized by media [synoptic surveillance], it is going to cause me my career." [R.]

"I think they [BWCs] are very beneficial, because everyone else is recording you anyways. Everyone has a cell phone, so why not have your take on it to because who knows if someone could edit their own video…With people having social media and having their own little cell phone cameras, so I think the culture is going to change a lot, the way police officers act will too. Very formal at all times, I think people forget that police officers are humans to." [G.]

G. and R. mention changes in the way officers engage with their communities, in terms of more formality and hesitation in communication. Officers are knowing that every day on the job they are going to be scrutinized in some form, however with this increased camera technology they are starting to change their behaviour because they do not want to be “that officer” that ends up on mass media. While they are becoming increasingly cautious of their actions, it should be noted that it may be negatively affecting their policing practice in terms of open lines of communication with the public and hesitating on their actions. Though G. is very positive about the BWCs in terms of recording evidence of encounters, at the end of the statement, G. includes that officers might become more formal in terms of communications with citizens. This could take the human aspect, empathy and rapport out of relationship between police and citizens.
Another consequence of BWCs is the numerous financial costs. Throughout the interview S. was very pro-BWCs, however even this officer had reservations about the implementation:

“I believe we should all have the body cameras now. But we are in massive budget cuts right now to get things down and it’s cutting down on officers...if it had nothing to do with budget I think every officer would have them and a Taser [CEW].” [S.]

M. and S. throughout interviews were concerned in terms of finances and the cost of the BWC, especially since most officers are not equipped with a CEW. They were also very family oriented and mentioned that they would really benefit from more uniformed officers being hired in their detachment. They mentioned that it is very hard to schedule vacation days or take one day off due to the huge decrease in number of officers employed. Several other officers mentioned the effect the BWC has on officers; first being that with the increased workload it was pulling officers off the street due to the demand of administrative tasks, such as classifying videos. Second, concerns regarding the “skeleton crew” as one officer put it while describing each police detachment in terms of the size of the uniform staff, and the pilot with BWCs where it was even worse. Like M. and S. suggested in their interviews, in a ‘utopic’ world, BWCs with improved technology would be beneficial, not only to policing, but for communities as a whole. However, they were very adamant to say they would like to see money going towards more officers on the street and all officers equipped with CEWs before they are equipped with BWCs.

M.’s take on the current/future state of policing suggests that police are using their own strategies to protect their own careers in ways that could be seen as deviant from a policing perspective. M. provides insight into this with his term F.I.D.O.:

"It’s a sad state of affairs in one respect, have you ever heard the term F.I.D.O.? FUCK IT DRIVE ON, unfortunately F.I.D.O. is becoming a thing, where it may not be an outward crime but a suspicious circumstance where you see something isn’t right about this. Prior to huge amounts of scrutiny and analysis of what an officer did, what he thought. Seeing my coworkers get grilled and then defiled in the media for doing good police work, but because someone who doesn’t understand policing or the officer can’t effectively convey what they did and why they did it, we are seeing those officers get grilled and being called liars and being called dirty cops. It leads to officers not wanting to go with that ‘Spidy Sense’ where you are saying ok my training shows me that this situation I can probably investigate but will I investigate or will I come under huge scrutiny. It’s not worth it, we have to have an offense committing before we can start
investigating. We can talk to anyone, but for us to start investigating people, you should have something, the reason for why you started to talk to those people...If you see something driving by but nothing specific that is going on at the time that is an offense, officers are saying FUCK IT DRIVE ON. Officers saying I’m not even gonna go there because I am not trying to come under scrutiny so I am leaving the situation. Which unfortunately that maybe they didn’t prevent a crime that they could have prevented or a crime was being committed but they did not see it at that exact second they chose to leave because they didn’t want to come under scrutiny." [M.]

This quotation provides first-hand experience as to how BWCs are not the ‘silver bullet’ to police legitimacy. In this effort to regain control over their visibility and image management, while at the same time show the public a commitment to transparency and accountability, officers are electing to avoid situations that they deem could be damaging to their image if the public were to see things out of context through BWCs or synoptic surveillance. In an effort to improve legitimacy from the perspective of the public, police are now afraid to actually engage in aspects of “policing” which makes any type of surveillance negative for policing and ultimately public safety.

### Table 1:
Interview Themes and Common Orientations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Common Orientation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Context</td>
<td>Concerned (n=6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Synoptic Surveillance</td>
<td>Slightly Concerned (n=5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Accountability</td>
<td>Improved Accountability (n=6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Police and community relationship and trust</td>
<td>Conflicting responses (improved/not improved (n=4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Impact on officer’s job, career, and routine</td>
<td>Concerned (n=6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Officer change in behaviour due to surveillance devices</td>
<td>Yes to altering behaviour (n=3); Yes and no (n=3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Officer physical safety</td>
<td>Does not protect officer’s physically (n=5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Citizens behavioural changes and reactions to BWC</td>
<td>Citizens’ issues with camera or evident changes to behaviour (n=3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Social media</td>
<td>Not concerned about social media (n=3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Privacy concerns</td>
<td>Concerned for citizens and officers (n=4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Officer’s Favourability toward wearing BWCs</td>
<td>Conflicting responses (n=4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Overall impact of BWCs on policing</td>
<td>Mixed responses.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER FIVE

Discussion

The purpose of this research was to explore officer perceptions of the impacts of BWCs and synoptic surveillance tools on policing practice, ascertain their insights into the practical implications of such technology, as well as situate BWCs within the larger discussion of surveillance theories and concepts around police legitimacy. It should be noted this research did not attempt to test any surveillance theories directly, as the study design is not amendable to doing so. Rather this research aimed to explore how BWCs fit within a hypothesis consistent with the Surveillance Accountability Framework; which, again, is the culmination of the literature on surveillance theories and police legitimacy.

This study answers the following research questions through in-depth interviews with TPS police officers who wore the BWC during the TPS pilot project:

1. What are the participating police officers’ general attitudes and perceptions towards and experiences with, the device?
2. What are the participating police officers’ perceptions of officer and citizen behavioural changes during a police encounter when BWCs are present compared to encounters that do not include BWCs, and how do these behaviours differ from those observed while in the presence of public citizens’ surveillance tools?
3. Do BWCs, from the perspective of the participating TPS police officer, have a positive, a negative, or no effect on citizen trust in police and willingness to communicate during police encounters?
4. Could possible behavioural changes in officers be the result of increased visibility and accountability due to citizens recording encounters, rather than BWCs?
5. Where do BWCs as a surveillance tool fit into the larger discussion of theories of surveillance and police legitimacy concepts that are included in my Surveillance Accountability Framework?

My research reveals that the majority of officers interviewed feel that BWCs are a positive addition to police in theory. However, in practice this technology did not provide adequate benefits that outweigh the potential consequences of this device on police practice and the relationship they share with their communities. Results indicate that officers are feeling the wrath of synoptic and panoptic surveillance, and surveillance technology in general. Subjects feel they are being scrutinized while on the job. This is
evidenced by M.’s discussion of F.I.D.O., which can be seen as an example of changing one’s behaviour due to surveillance technology.

**Surveillance Theories**

**Panoptic and Synoptic Surveillance**

This mixture of synoptic and panoptic surveillance of police may be influencing and affecting police visibility because it appears to be holding officers more accountable and transparent. However, these behavioural changes in police officers do not appear to be associated with BWCs alone; rather the results of this research suggest behavioural changes can be attributed to camera surveillance in general. Synoptic and panoptic surveillance working in conjunction with each other is resulting in, according to statements made by research subjects, officers’ increased self-awareness of their actions. Previous literature and case studies of BWCs and police have attributed behavioural changes to solely BWCs. However, I argue that officers have been engaging in increased self-surveillance and caution surrounding surveillance technology for several years due to the increasing synoptic surveillance and increased visibility of police over recent years. Several officers I interviewed mentioned that this is the case. They realize they are being watched and possibly recorded at all times for the past several years, and that they must act accordingly regardless of who is recording.

The US Department of Justice mentions the need to “help police departments ensure events are also captured from an officers’ perspective in a world in which anyone with a cellphone camera can record video footage of a police encounter” (Miller, Toliver, and Police Executive Research Forum 2014:1). That being said, panoptic surveillance (BWCs) remains a concern for officers because supervisors can review BWC footage, resulting in unintended career consequences for officers unrelated to police misconduct involving citizens. This was mentioned by a few officers during interviews. It is unclear if officers in my sample had been reprimanded for these minor rule infractions caught on BWC, however several subjects did mention violations with uniform such as traffic vests or hats or other “petty things”
(as one officer put it when discussing the supervisors reviewing footage). This type of surveillance and
scrutiny used by higher ups could result in career consequences for individual officers; albeit, the TPS
assured officers that this would not be the case. As D. mentioned in the interview, this device is
“excessive” due to the amount of surveillance already in place. He provides a narrative that is defensive
over officer privacy and the illustration that officers are held accountable already, and are scrutinize
enough without the implementation of BWCs.

The presence of a video camera can often alter the conduct of an individual who is aware they are
being monitored, resulting in someone behaving within socially accepted norms (Ready and Young
2015). This surveillance monitoring effect directly correlates with deterrence theories. Deterrence theory
requires a sense of self-consciousness of being observed by some form of surveillance (Ariel et al. 2014).
When negative reinforcement is likely, deviant behaviour will be less common. This being said, BWCs
can be seen as a solution in deterring given, “the certainty of getting caught for non-compliance” and the
transparency it is suggested to have. This is unlike CCTV cameras where finding and identifying the
suspects is considerably low (Ariel et al. 2014). S. mentioned this civilizing effect the BWCs had on an
incident in a hospital with a citizen that was belligerent. Once S. informed the person that the BWC was
being turned on, this person calmed down and surprisingly apologized for their actions. However, there
were no suggested instances shared by subjects that can indicate that BWCs have a civilizing effect on
officers, other than more professionalism and formal language. This ‘mild’ civilizing effect the device
may have on officers and the moderate effect on civilians could further improve the relationship between
both parties, due to the increased accountability that is made available with this device, as well as the
higher likelihood of officers behaving in a fair and procedurally just manner.

**Accountability and Transparency**

BWCs can be used for accountability purposes as the police can record the encounter that is in
question and can provide video evidence of behaviour and actions (CBC News 2015). Several studies
suggest that the implementation of new technologies, such as police BWCs is holding officers to more
accountability and self-surveillance (Goldsmith 2010; Harris 2010; Ready and Young 2015; Schellenberg 2000; White 2014). These devices target specific police and citizen encounters and are suggested to increase transparency, accountability and have a civilizing effect, resulting in improved behaviours of both police officers and citizens during an encounter (White 2014).

Police services in several past studies and pilot projects have mentioned this is what they are striving for with the implementation of BWCs. Accountability is said to differ in meaning and significance, though overall citizens are concerned about police brutality and abusive behaviours and the need for assurance that this device will offer them protection from these behaviours. To police on the other hand, accountability offers the opportunity to exonerate themselves and their agencies form false accusations (Brucato 2015). This promise of accountability and transparency is crucial for a successful implementation of police technology.

Several academics and citizen groups argue that BWCs should be continuously recording during an officer’s shift to ensure transparency and accountability (Taylor 2016). Taylor argues that continuously recording would resolve four issues: “officers forgetting to resume recording when interacting with the public, officers being taken by surprise or events unfolding rapidly and so are not recorded, the activation of the camera aggravating the situation, and the wilful switching off to avoid capturing misconduct” (Taylor 2016:130). These issues were mentioned by officers during interviews, especially with regard to the initial activation of cameras during dynamic situations. However, continuous recording threatens police autonomy and discretion to turn the camera on and off. Logically, this is not practical due to limited battery life and the huge amount of footage and data storage this would produce (Taylor 2016). Continuous recording would hinder police discretion and investigative strategies. This also poses severe officer and citizen privacy concerns.

Privacy issues are a severe consequence of surveillance tools for the public and for police. The concerns officers raised were primarily related to vulnerable populations, such as victims and hospital patients, as well as related to themselves and keeping their personal relationships and behaviours private.
As mentioned in the Result section, officers had concerns regarding their right to privacy, including taking calls from family members, keeping personal conversations with their partners in private, and keeping tactical strategies secure. As employees, police officers are also allotted breaks for lunch, dinner, and bathrooms. In terms of officer privacy, officers have the right not to be monitored during their work hours as an employee (Coudert, Butin and Metayer 2015). This issue of privacy is also a concern regarding fear of reprimand from supervisors, as well as BWCs can create privacy concerns for victims and police informants. Officers mentioned in interviews that defense councils can request BWC footage and potentially identify informants or witnesses that were recorded on BWCs that provided the police with information but wish to stay anonymous for safety concerns. This tactic of keeping informants off camera is a strategy of the TPS for a number of reasons privy to the TPS, namely for keeping the informant safe and secret from official evidence. This privacy and safety concern was brought to my attention during interviews with officers.

In the case of maintaining citizen privacy, trust in police can be lost if that privacy is breached, threatening police legitimacy. As for officer privacy, subjects in this research mentioned that they are used to or are becoming used to being recording at all times due to the pervasiveness of synoptic surveillance. However more fundamental questions of working conditions for employees in general have been raised. It is unclear if these privacy issues are a reasonable consequence of BWC surveillance, or if they should be weighted significantly in determining if BWCs should be implemented into the daily routine and practice of officers. Should police officers working conditions in terms of privacy be different or held to a lower standard than other careers and employment because of the nature of police work? Is police accountability and transparency more important and crucial to their communities than officer privacy as an employee and in terms of the secretive nature of their duties where discretion is important? There is no easy compromise for this debate, regardless of which side is taken. It appears that no matter what, citizens and police are going to have concerns.
These promises of accountability and transparency from police services are difficult to evaluate. Especially since the TPS does not release BWC footage to the public which would enable direct illustrations of accountability and transparency on behalf of the police rather than a civilian or outside source, as well as allow for police to have direct control over visibility. Almost all officers interviewed raised the concern that if false accusations occur and the BWC has footage of it, the officer will be cleared internally; however, the TPS does not release the footage publicly in order defuse the accusations publicly. This is problematic on both ends of the spectrum. For officers, their “side of the story” is not being released for the public to see and possibly try and understand their viewpoint. This could provide more transparency and accountability on the behalf of the Service and this could foster increased public trust that directly impacts police legitimacy. Not releasing BWC video is problematic from a media and citizen standpoint because the public has to take the word of the TPS on what “actually” happened during an encounter. Without being able to see video evidence from the officer’s perspective, the only evidence the public may have access to is the product of synoptic surveillance, which often does not provide a complete representation of the encounter. Not releasing the video of BWCs could decrease public trust as well. Citizens could question the TPS in terms of what they are hiding. Questions could arise such as: why won’t you let the public see what happened? Could the service be lying about the encounter and protecting themselves? Questions of this nature raise concerns for police legitimacy or viewing the police as an authority to be deferred to.

In interviews officers mentioned that BWC footage does go to court (although there has not been any case at this time that has used BWC footage); however, by the time the court sees the footage of the encounter, the public image has already been damaged and it is too late for police to provide their side of the story due to the delay in directing the issue. This delay was mentioned to be anywhere from 6 months to years. Once their visibility has been negative impacted, police legitimacy may already be eroded.

Regardless of whether this surveillance technology holds police accountable and transparent, if the public will not be privy to the full encounter from the police perspective and must simply rely on
snippets from cellphone videos uploaded through mass media, this technology is pointless in the effort towards increasing and positively impacting police legitimacy and promoting trust.

**Visibility**

Police officers face an increase in visibility due to the pervasiveness of portable cell-phones and video-recording devices that provide an easy route to upload videos to mass media and other outlets (Goldsmith 2010). Police officers’ overall view of their increased visibility is suggested to differ depending on whether cameras are being operated by a police organization or by outsider groups, especially ones with unclear motives (Haggerty and Sandhu 2014). Through the use of BWCs, police organizations have more ability to control this visibility, however synoptic surveillance has the platform to continue to influence public opinion and police legitimacy.

This new increased level of visibility (Thompson 2005) has subjected police officers to a new level of exposure to mass media and mass scrutiny. Exposure has been defined by Kristie Ball as, “the act of subjecting someone to an influencing experience…presentation to view in an open or public manner…the states of being vulnerable or exposed” (Ball 2009:647). Police officers have been over-exposed in the mass media by citizen’s recordings of police encounters or arrests. This exposure has introduced police officers to a new level of vulnerability on duty because of the synoptic lens they are seen through by the community and media. Public citizens are exposing police to a new level of scrutiny, and this publicity is built on “the public’s right to know and the right to be informed” (Ball 2009:650). This new visibility (Thompson 2005) is leading to citizens questioning police legitimacy and increasingly scrutinize the level of procedural justice in each instance of police-citizen encounter caught on video footage.

This increased visibility/scrutiny has the potential to impact officer confidence for the worse. According to my subjects, front-line officers can find themselves hesitating and second-guessing their actions due to cameras of all kinds. As determined by interviews, the results indicate that hesitation and second-guessing behaviours and the course of actions officers take as a result of synoptic and panoptic
surveillance is a challenge for officers. This issue raises concerns for both public and officer safety. These findings compare with that of the Edmonton Police Service pilot project which found BWCs to be associated with officers being more hesitant to use appropriate levels of force (Edmonton Police Service 2015). This is similar to the London, UK BWC study wherein an officer reported “it just makes you think for that split second longer about what you are going to do and what you are going to say first…” (Grossmith et al. 2015:26). It may be that camera technology in general is associated with hesitation, however more research is necessary in order to determine this.

My subjects felt that those who offer scrutiny towards the actions of the police based on what is presented in video footage do not have enough police experience and knowledge to judge behaviours. Interviewees felt that media (and upper-management) scrutiny of all actions and behaviours of police officers promotes less communication throughout police services and with civilians. The results of this research reveal that the majority of officers interviewed believe BWCs have the potential to improve the relationship they have with their communities in theory; however, in practice there are too many barriers to achieving this improvement. Several officers foresee this potential communication problem if BWCs were to be implemented in the future. The basis of a trusting and beneficial relationship is open communication, though this was not evident with all officers’ experiences with citizens while wearing the BWC.

Changes in Officer’s Behaviour

The results of the present study indicate officer behavioural changes cannot be directly associated with BWCs, but rather video surveillance in general is impacting officer behaviour and demeanor. Subjects interviewed claimed that camera surveillance impacts their behaviour in terms of behaving in a more formal manner, such as speaking more formally by using no slang, and attempting not to use offensive and aggressive language when communicating. This change in behaviour could translate into officers becoming more procedurally just and motivated to do things “by the book”. However, officers interviewed mentioned that this change in communication and behaviour is perceived by officers to be
more ‘robotic’ and less informal, which can have implication against building rapport and getting people to cooperate. Similarly, the Edmonton Police Service officers felt that they may be more careful and patient during encounters with citizens but also more ‘robotic’ in the way they communicate and conduct themselves (Edmonton Police Service 2015). It could be gathered that subjects in my study indicate that wearing BWCs are not overtly changing their behaviours or how they do their jobs but they might change the way they speak, their demeanor, and try to conduct themselves in the most professional manner possible when under camera surveillance due to the possible scrutiny they could face.

Job discretion and autonomy are important aspects of front-line police officers job and in matters of enforcement discretion is built into the law. Police are not able to enforce every law to the extent to which the law suggests; this is why discretion is key. Enforcing the letter of law to the strictest level could harm relations with the community and pose a barrier to maintaining a just society (Forcense 1992; Lipsky 1980; Pepinski 1984). The majority of decisions officers make are on the front-line where ambiguity, lack of resources, and threat of violence can undermine their job performance (Bayley & Bittner 1984; Brown 1981; Lipski 1980).

This lack of communication and this direct surveillance of encounters could result in officers not being able to show a reasonable amount of empathy towards citizens and their subjective situations. This technology could be seen as limited in the amount of human agency police can deliver, which can directly influence their behaviour. BWCs limit their actions to ‘black and white’, and decrease officers’ ability to take grey areas and subjectivity into consideration because this surveillance device captures incidents where the police may not be doing their job to the full extent. This could have consequences for officers’ careers especially if supervisors review BWC footage.

Police enforcing the law without the use of discretion can be considered ‘mechanical policing’. For example, citing a speeding driver for the exact speed over the limit, without considering the circumstances and the possibility of lowering the speed, and the overall ticket consequence. In this case, officers might try to avoid appearing too lenient (Schellenberg 2000). In terms of BWCs, it has been
mentioned that they “may facilitate long term changes to the nature of policing, such as the expansion of low-level arrests to meet quotas because officers are more inclined to follow procedure while being recorded on the job, or the use of footage to coerce individuals to take plea bargains even where video evidence is not definitive” (ODS Consulting 2011:10 as cited in Mateescu, Rosenblat, and boyd 2016: 123). This can be seen in a study of BWCs by the Phoenix Police Department which found that the number of arrests increased by about 17% in the target group compared to 9% in the comparison group. The average daily arrests increased significantly from the pre- to post-camera implementation. Officers wearing the BWC showed a significant increase in the number of arrests made daily compared to officers without the device. (Katz et al. 2014:31). This is similar to the TPS pilot project where officers felt they were less able to use discretion; for instance, giving out tickets instead of a warning (Toronto Police Service 2016).

If officers are concerned with enforcing the law to its fullest extent, in many ways this could foster procedural justice because they are not breaking any rules and are treating people fairly. Additionally, in terms of accountability, if officers are being held accountable through video records of their behaviour, it could be suggested that they will avoid engaging in misconduct. The challenge then is balancing the requirement to follow policy due to this increased accountability but also trying to foster trust through the ability to be reasonable and understanding of subjective situations, such as letting someone off for a traffic violation due to circumstances pertaining to that situation. If police encounters with citizens are not handled with empathy and compassion, this can have the opposite effect of instilling trust, and actually damage community relations despite the goal of accountability. This could directly impact police legitimacy.

Video surveillance has been pervasive for several years now with the development of CCTV and personal camera technology. Officers in this study generally feel that in every encounter or situation where they have a split second to decide their course of action, their actions or decisions are being scrutinized due to camera technology and footage. In terms of individual officers, interviews provide
insight as to perceptions of this constant scrutiny where “F.I.D.O.” is the becoming the motto of street officers in the TPS in an effort to avoid risk to their careers. While officers fear being publicly shamed by the media or reprimanded by supervisors, the concept of ‘Fuck It, Drive On’ is no less disturbing given that citizens depend on police to maintain public safety.

These changes in behaviours can have immediate effects to police legitimacy. Behavioural changes for the better due to heightened visibility could increase procedural justice and benefit the relationship police have with their communities, thereby improving police legitimacy. However, as some subjects described, some officers are now unwilling to properly investigate crimes or put themselves in positions that might result in scrutiny due to a fear of repercussions. This new form of dereliction of duty could negatively impact procedural justice and impact the trust citizens have in police that they are effective in their jobs, negating legitimacy.

Overall, this concept of F.I.D.O is a fascinating and significant research finding due to the implications for police practice and subsequent police legitimacy. Regardless of how many benefits BWCs are said to have, if police are not wanting to engage with citizens due to synoptic surveillance and panoptic surveillance, this device and surveillance in general will remain problematic.

**Consequences of Surveillance**

*Context*

Context was revealed to be a substantial issue with officers during interviews. Most are concerned with the context of both synoptic and panoptic surveillance tools; primarily citizen cellphones, and to a lesser extent BWCs. Several officers mention that video surveillance is “one dimensional” and will not pick up everything in terms of the complete narrative of the situation. Not only do the results of this research suggest that officers are worried about the context lost with video footage and interpretation of such images, they are worried about the implications of the loss of this contextual information. From the camera angle of BWCs, the device is able to follow an officer wherever they go; however, it only sees
what is in front of the officer if it is positioned on their chest. It does not follow the officers’ head and eyes and what they specifically see or are able to interpret while on duty. The camera cannot represent the officers’ interpretation even though it is used to hold officers more accountable for their actions. Implications of this missing context could directly affect officers in terms of their career, specifically if there are unknown factors within BWC footage used in court circumstances. Officers mentioned that they were concerned that the BWC footage would not directly match their notes and interpretation of the event. They are also worried that it will not be recognized that they interpreted situations differently than what the video will show, and will be humiliated in court and deemed a liar.

What also needs to be taken into consideration while evaluating the context-specific footage of encounters is when the camera of either device was turned on or off. In each case of panoptic and synoptic surveillance devices, the camera only records footage when it is turned on, and cannot provide information on prior events. Hypothetically, a public citizen could have assaulted an officer and the officer may have fought back to subdue the citizen. If a recording device is only turned on when the officer fights back, the representation of the interaction might change due to the missing components of that specific encounter. This example was mentioned as a concern regarding how context of video representation can be skewed by the public and negatively impact officer visibility. Much like with the concept of “F.I.D.O.” with the high likelihood that context may be missing, officers are now reluctant to do their jobs because of the possible scrutiny they could face and questions around whether more extreme actions such as force were or were not appropriately applied. It should however be noted that camera footage also has the capacity to add context to an otherwise ambiguous situation.

This was evident in M.’s experience when his dash camera on the inside of the car captured a suspect hurting himself in the back of police cruiser and claimed the officers inflicted the injuries. This footage provided more context to the situation and provided officers with video evidence of their innocence.
Social Media

Mass media and social networks can impact public opinion, and foster public shamming. This public forum is the avenue through which surveillance footage is communicated to the public and where context is interpreted from videos. The results of this study indicate that the officers interviewed are concerned with how they are represented in the realm of social media and they are fully aware they have no control over this visibility in terms of synoptic surveillance. Social media has several implications for police legitimacy as this is the avenue that can directly challenge their image for the worse. However, social media holds police accountable for their actions when a situation arises where officer behaviour is in question. Though, as mentioned, it would be beneficial if police could release BWC footage in order to both appear more transparent to the public, as well as provide more context and allow citizens to more accurately interpret videos online.

Relationship with Community

BWCs are suggested to improve the relationship between police and their communities, beginning with increased accountability and transparency (Goldsmith 2010; Harris 2010; Ready and Young 2015; Schellenberg 2000; White 2014). The TPS pilot project gained increasing support from the community of Toronto, suggesting BWCs would benefit, and open up lines of communication between the TPS and their community’s due to this vast support (Toronto Police Service 2016). In contrast, the TPS pilot project results indicate that officers generally did not feel that BWCs would improve public trust in the TPS (Toronto Police Service 2016).

These cameras have the ability to affect relationships between police and public citizens. They are intended to improve the relationship due to the heightened accountability, although it could be argued that BWCs are giving more power to the police. Officers have the ability to record what they choose to record. This could result in a power imbalance in this relationship: panoptic versus synoptic surveillance. In conjunction with this suspected power imbalance, police officers often preconceive the public as naïve.
and ignorant of police practice and the extent of the danger they experience on a daily basis (Kopak 2014). According to the officers interviewed in this research, police officers often conceive of this to be true about citizens, and the lack of the public’s ability to relate to police, the law and their policies and procedures. This divide creates a sense of suspicion among police and citizens, and according to Kopak (2014), the introduction of added surveillance (BWCs) could enhance this divide. This power struggle could be especially threatening to victims of crimes. As officers mentioned during some interviews, victims were especially hesitant and closed off when the BWC was present. This could be seen as citizens having issues with trusting the use of this device and potentially police, which could be due to privacy concerns or issues regarding police legitimacy. It is possible that citizens are unwilling to report victimizations or provide police with information during encounters if they do not believe police have the legitimacy to do their jobs fairly.

This potential lack of communication when the camera is on has several implications. With regard to privacy, some officers mentioned that defence council has access to BWC footage because it could be deemed evidence within a trial. This could breach the identity of police informants giving vital information and could result in “snitches getting stitches”, as one officer described it as during an interview. This device and privacy concern could further be detrimental to the relationship police have with their community. In the least, the relationship may be unchanged.

Indeed, officers in this sample found mostly no change in the relationship due to the cameras, however the negative reactions citizens had towards this device could outweigh any positive reactions due to the impact that experiences with police can have on police legitimacy. Warren (2011) found that people who “hear negative stories about police contacts from friends and family are approximately four times as likely to perceive disrespect during their own police encounter” (369). These negative stories impact police legitimacy more severely than any positive experiences due to the impact that behaving in a procedurally unjust manner can have on police legitimacy.
Regardless of whether surveillance holds police to more accountability and allows police to appear more transparent, if citizens are not comfortable with being on camera during encounters with police, this form of surveillance may not have a place in many facets of police work.

**Impact on Daily Routine with Implementation**

This study has revealed that officers are concerned with the impact BWCs have on their daily routine. The TPS and Edmonton Police Service pilot projects had similar issues with the technology and emphasized the need for improved hardware, data storage and management (Toronto Police Service 2016; Edmonton Police Service 2015). The current findings suggest that BWCs lead to an increase in administrative responsibility for officers, and raise concerns for officers regarding how BWCs could affect the availability of officers to respond to calls for service. Similarly, the Phoenix, Arizona BWC study demonstrated increased workload and the amount of time it takes to process criminal cases due to the added video footage (Katz et al. 2016).

A foremost concern of police is protecting the community they serve. While raising the issue of impacts on daily routine, my interview subjects also discussed the limited resources TPS is faced with. This includes a lack of sworn officers which J. calls a “skeleton crew” patrolling the street. Almost all interviewed officers reported that BWCs are taking bodies off the street in order to perform administrative tasks. This device is not only impacting the daily routine of officers, several subjects mentioned that the cost of BWCs is huge and has several implications in terms of fewer front-line officers on the street available for calls of duty due to money spent on BWCs, instead of addressing the TPS moratorium on hiring. Further, the public may still feel there is not enough of a police presence, making the BWCs less valuable for restoring or maintaining trust. This limited number of officers on the street could be detrimental to police visibility and legitimacy. This is because if it is evident to communities that there is not enough of a police presence reporting to calls of duty, this could negatively affect the trust citizens have and faith in police to perform efficiently.
Technology Malfunctions

Technology malfunctions posed a major concern for subjects. While technology malfunctions could limit the functionality of the device, it could also have serious repercussions for officers. Device battery life was central to this discussion on malfunctions. If the battery is drained and is unable to record, or does not record due to faulty technology and a serious incident occurred during this time, this has the potential to look like the officer intentionally turned the camera off. Subjects felt there could be questions regarding the trustworthiness of the officer over the faulty device and how this would affect their career. This increased scrutiny surrounding technology malfunctions could be detrimental to the relationship between citizens and police if this trust is not present. This lack of trust these subjects mentioned could foster animosity between police and citizens and create a further divide between these groups, hindering overall communication. Innocent technological malfunctions could be seen as maleficent in nature, thereby impacting police legitimacy.

Safety of Officers

The TPS pilot found that 1 of 5 officers felt their safety was increased due to the BWCs (Toronto Police Service 2016). However, in the UK report on BWCs in London, the Metropolitan Police Service and the College of Policing, results show no significant difference between officers wearing the BWCs and those not wearing the device with regard to number of assaults. This is similar to the number of arrests made for all violent crime where no differences were seen with the use of BWCs. Overall, assault and injury data found that officers were no less likely to be assaulted if they were equipped with BWCs (Grossmith et al. 2015:26). As previously mentioned in the literature review, results of a meta-analysis of randomised controlled trials determined there was actually an increased likelihood of officers being assaulted when wearing the BWC as opposed to officers not wearing the device (Ariel et al. 2016). These empirical results contradict theoretical assumptions that BWCs would provide a civilizing effect during encounters between police and citizens. While I did not empirically test the likelihood of violence against officers with and without BWCs, my results indicate there is no increased perception of safety for officers
if they are wearing BWCs. According to these results, there seems to be no substantial benefit of wearing BWCs for all encounters with the public in terms of perceptions of officer safety.

**Officer’s Favourability toward Body-Worn Cameras**

The success of technology implementations is increasingly dependent on the willingness of people to use the tools effectively and efficiently. In this research, it was very important to ask officers whether they like to wear BWCs. Suchman (1995) has researched on-officer video cameras and claims:

To effectively achieve the goals of the department that are intended by the use of cameras, the device must be perceived by officers as legitimate. If officers view the cameras as illegitimate, then they will be less likely to comply with departmental authority regarding camera use.

However, if officers view OVCs (on-officer video cameras) as a tool that serves their own interest (e.g., increases safety, reduces complaints), then use of cameras will be seen as legitimate (Suchman 1995, as cited in Young and Ready 2015:246).

In this case, if officers have any negative feelings toward BWCs, this could hinder the effectiveness of this device and the perceived benefits.

The results of this research indicate that there is no overall consensus regarding the favourability toward BWCs; however, in general, the benefits do not outweigh the costs and implications of this technology. In comparison, during the TPS pilot, 32% of officers said that the camera was a positive addition to their job while 27% said it had been a negative addition (Toronto Police Service 2016).

It is suggested that BWCs should only be considered as a tool in conjunction with larger efforts to improve policing practice (Coudert et al. 2015). This being said, BWCs do not appear to be the “silver bullet” to improving public and police relations that they promise to be. It was suggested by my research subjects that a larger police presence, more sworn officers, and the deployment of CEWs for all officers would be more beneficial to the service and their legitimacy, rather than the implementation of a technology that the implications have not been researched in depth.
**Overall Evaluation**

While this research is not attempting to directly test at theory, it does explore where this device is situated within theoretical discussions of surveillance and police legitimacy when police officer perceptions and practical application of this device are taken into account. With regard to surveillance in general (both synoptic and panoptic), BWCs can hold police more accountable for their actions and appear to the public to be acting with transparency. This in theory should impact procedural justice due to more positive behavioural changes that accompany the increased accountability and transparency. This increased positive visibility of police should directly impact police legitimacy and beneficially impact the relationship between police and their communities. While BWCs appear beneficial in theory according to the traditional criminological literature on policing coupled with surveillance theories, in practice, the benefits do not outweigh the costs. In a utopic society, the BWCs are a great surveillance tool, however the financial cost poses a substantial problem as number of officers deployed is directly related to budget money spent on BWCs mean fewer new sworn officer hires. Further, implementing BWCs that have technological issues and continual malfunctions during officers’ shift can be hugely problematic. For this implementation to be successful, every officer will have to be out-fitted with a BWC and the technology must be flawless. If not, the public confidence and legitimacy can be lost if one second of an encounter in question was lost or not represented due to officers not having a camera or malfunctions with the camera, such as battery. If there is a technological malfunction it could look maleficient in nature. Responses from officers suggest that BWCs surprisingly pose several barriers to improved policing. Other barriers which became evident through my interviews are potential for decreased lines of communications this device influences, in conjunction with privacy issues that stem from this invasive device.

This research intended to uncover the attitudes and perceptions of officers interviewed, and most importantly resulted in the humanization of police officers by providing dialogue that is often not represented in policing literature and research. Most importantly, F.I.D.O is a major research contribution due to the practical implications this term expresses and the severe implications it could have on policing.
practice and the relationship police share with their communities. It is also important to mention another main contribution of this study, the paradox of this technology. There is a clear incongruence between BWCs improving police transparency and accountability and fostering procedural justice, while at the same time potentially undermining citizens trust due to the lack of human agency, discretion, empathy, informal communication, and subjectivity police sometimes demonstrate (according to officers interviewed and previous literature). This technology is suggested to be a detriment to the communication between police and their communities, which has severe implications for other aspects of policing practice, such as community and neighbourhood policing styles.

This paradox between the theoretical benefits of this device and the practical implications of this device requires more research from police and academics. It is clear from the perspectives and experiences shared by officers interviewed that this device will not please all parties involved and there will be several critical implications regarding the trust citizens have in police. It is clear from the TPS pilot project which demonstrated huge support from the community that citizens want police to wear BWCs on duty; however, this call for more accountability of policing from citizens is contradictory. This is evident through officer experiences with several citizens who were worried about their privacy and did not want to be filmed by the device. Seemingly, if the TPS released video from the BWCs this would support the narrative of increased accountability and transparency of police services through the use of these cameras and provide a more positive visibility on behalf of the police. However, there are several privacy implications for citizens and officers if video is made public after an incident that is in question. The paradoxical aspect of implementing these devices is a catch-22 for police services, if they do not test or at least try the BWCs they will be scrutinized and when they try the device, they are scrutinized by citizens due to the practical implications of this device (i.e. technology malfunctions, privacy concerns). Regardless of which route is taken, scrutiny and concerns of citizens could be detrimental to policing legitimacy and the relationship and trust between police and their communities, further creating a divide, particularly when a concept like F.I.D.O enters the fold.
In sum, despite BWCs seemingly motivating officers to behave in a more formal or potentially procedurally just manner, when officer hesitation in the line of duty due to fear of scrutiny is coupled with both the inability to appear transparent and accountable (because video footage cannot be released to the public), and privacy concerns for victims and witnesses, it starts to become clear the BWCs may be unable to deliver on their promises as the ‘silver bullet’ to police legitimacy. This conclusion runs counter to what the literature on surveillance and police legitimacy that makes up the Surveillance Accountability Framework would suggest, or in the least raises practical concerns that much of the literature could not have foreseen. Additional concerns include cost, technology malfunctions, and the loss of police personnel on the streets due to time spent at division headquarters processing video footage. The latter-most concern has direct implications for public safety and should not be taken lightly.
CHAPTER SIX

Conclusion

My research led me to discover and question several unaddressed issues and implications in relation to BWCs as a surveillance device. This study has provided an opportunity to explore police officers’ perceptions toward this device and toward citizens’ surveillance devices. This research has also allowed me to explore BWCs through the lens of popular surveillance theories and concepts of police legitimacy as demonstrated through what I have termed the Surveillance Accountability Framework. Again, this research is exploratory in nature and was never intended to test BWCs with surveillance theories, rather to explore where these surveillance tools could be situated in terms of discussion surrounding theories when practical application is taken into account. The Surveillance Accountability Framework is the culmination of the surveillance and policing literature applicable to the implementation of BWCs, and it suggests that BWCs allow officers and police services to re-gain control over their visibility and image by providing a means for panoptic surveillance to counter synoptic surveillance. Video surveillance in general should impact police accountability and thus create a way to become more transparent through BWCs. This should influence officer behaviours and increase procedural justice and positive visibility, overall resulting in police legitimacy.

In contrast to the literature which makes up this framework, my results show that in practice BWCs are not delivering on their promises because BWC footage is not released to the public. This is creating a barrier to accountability and transparency, though almost all officers perceived that this device would hold them more accountable in terms of their actions and protect them from false accusations which could be deemed as negative visibility from citizens. The protection of officers from false accusations was one of the most beneficial outcomes of BWCs according to my research subjects, and all subjects liked and supported this surveillance tools in terms of this protection.
There were several consequences of BWCs in terms of their effect on policing practice. These implications were severe enough to outweigh any possible benefit of these devices in terms of officer’s favourability toward this tool. This device had a significant impact on the daily routine of officers with regard to increased workload and administrative duties, and subjects felt this likely resulted in fewer officers on the street and available to respond to calls of duty. Financial cost was another large consequence of this device mentioned by officers, in which two officers mentioned they would rather see officers outfitted with CEWs and more officers hired. Other consequences are the privacy concerns for citizens and officers regarding the invasiveness of this form of surveillance. However, the most significant consequence of this surveillance device is the unintended behavioural response by officers, which includes hesitation and second-guessing their actions. This behavioural change has also been observed by officers when they are surveilled by citizen’s cellphones. Though there were instances of officers feeling that they were hesitating to act, officers mentioned that if safety was a concern, camera surveillance was the last thing on their mind. Overall while most officers did feel they were more motivated to behave in a procedurally just manner (as mentioned in the results section by changing their behaviour in terms of being more professional in the way they speak and communicate when they are being recorded) because of panoptic and synoptic surveillance, legitimacy may not be impacted because BWC footage is not released to the public for viewing and they are inundated with the negative depictions of synoptic surveillance.

This aspect of synoptic surveillance has not been researched largely in past literature, especially in terms of and in conjunction with BWC research. I believe the influence and power that synoptic surveillance holds over police is largely underestimated and/or ignored in academic research. This form of surveillance can be suggested to have more overall influence and power over police behaviour and their public image according to previous literature and the experiences and perceptions of officers throughout this research. This lack of previous research, especially empirical research, makes it difficult to compare my results.
Policing in practice has a high level of subjectivity during each encounter so it is difficult to evaluate a surveillance device in these dynamic situations with these large discrepancies between officer experiences. This was evident in the results of this research. Several officers provided insight that suggest that the impact BWCs have on encounters and citizen reactions towards the device is very situational. However, there were several instances of BWCs hindering communication between police and citizens during investigations. The long-term effects this device can have on the relationship between police and citizens are unclear.

This research provides a general consensus of officers interviewed that this device would be beneficial if officers were provided with proper technology, policies, and unlimited financial resources made available to police services. However, the implications of such device, especially due to technology malfunctions, privacy concerns, and the strained communication between police and citizens (especially with victims and witness) are crucial detriments of BWCs. This device does not work in practical application as it is suggested to in theory.

Overall evaluation of this research and the findings of these interviews suggest that it will not matter how beneficial BWCs could be, synoptic surveillance will continue to influence and hold police more accountable. This is largely due to issues regarding the TPS not releasing footage and not following through with their promise to be more accountable and transparent. If the TPS would like to improve their relationship with their communities, there needs to be some give and take. If they expect the public to trust them, they need to start trusting in their communities by releasing such footage in order to remain trustworthy and legitimate.

It is also important to mention the implications of the increasingly negative visibility police are suggested to have and the increasing scrutiny officers face regarding their actions. The concept of F.I.D.O. is largely detrimental to the promise of any device that could be suggested to act as a “silver bullet”. If individual officers are scared of being scrutinized and are not wanting to engage with the
communities in fear of repercussions, or being seen as unjust, there will be no positive benefit in any such instances for police legitimacy.

F.I.D.O and the paradoxical aspect between the theoretical benefits of BWCs and the practical implications of this device in terms of the trust between police and their communities are the major contributions this research study was able to provide. These contributions were only able to be captured through these interviews, which provide significant value in terms of humanizing police officers and providing an open dialogue regarding technology and policing practice, and gaining practical policing knowledge through the shared experiences of these officers. This practical policing knowledge, including concepts such as F.I.D.O, is very difficult to uncover and research, but carries with it great benefit to academia and police organizations.

**Study Limitations**

Limitations of this research include the fact that because the research was exploratory in nature and not an experiment, I was unable to determine any causal relationship between BWCs and various outcomes related to policing directly. Further, present results are not representative of all TPS officers who wore BWCs for the pilot, nor are they representative of TPS or Canadian municipal police officers in general. This is because I was compelled to rely on a non-probability snowball sampling technique and an extremely small sample size due to sampling access limitations which are characteristic of police services in general.

Police as a group are difficult to access due to their exclusive nature and their scepticism toward outsiders. However, once outsiders are given access, police research in general is very crucial due to its rare nature. Police perspectives are underrepresented in academic literature and BWCs as a recent technology is largely unresearched by outsiders. BWCs are primarily researched by police organizations themselves, which can be considered to have a conflicting agenda. Despite facing numerous barriers in terms of this research and the difficulty and resistance in gaining participants, 7 officers were interviewed
and provided valuable insight and experiences regarding their perceptions of BWCs and the implications regarding this surveillance device and civilian surveillance tools.

With that said, it is important to mention how my influence as an outsider with no ties to the TPS, could have impacted interviews. Officers could have provided me with more negative opinions and perceptions towards this device because of the confidentiality measures in place. During the TPS pilot project there were 24 officers interviewed (Toronto Police Service 2016), however there was no mention as to whether they were confidential. My research is very important due to my role as an outside researcher and how my results compared to the TPS pilot project that was largely researched by insiders arguably concerned with pleasing the public and protecting this organization’s legitimacy. During the pilot officers could have been more positive or neutral due to the possible career consequences and the mindset of pleasing their supervisors or their employer with their answers. One officer in my study did mention that they did not feel that the TPS cared about their opinions on the device and were just going through the motions when discussing the device with officers. In contrast to the TPS pilot, as an outsider that is a young, female student, with no ties to the TPS or ability to affect their career, I could have been seen as less threatening to the officers interviewed; thereby gaining their trust, and promoting honest answers even if they were not favourable to the TPS. With regard to data analysis, it is also possible that my own bias being favourable towards police could have affected my interpretations of the results in a manner that is more sympathetic to police rather than critical of them. However, I have made a conscious effort to remain neutral and present results as accurately as possible through the use of direct quotations allowing readers to interpret for themselves.

*The Future of Body-Worn Camera Research*

I believe the number one factor against implementation of BWCs is the huge financial cost of this technology and the sustainment of such data this device creates. As suggested by several officers interviewed, these funds could be and should be used towards more uniformed officers before any fancy gadgets with little empirical research suggesting direct benefits. I suggest that the implications described
throughout this thesis should be addressed and researched more thoroughly before any implementations (for example officer hesitation, strain on daily routines, and communication issues with the public). Several U.S. police services are introducing these devices without any research or testing periods. This knee-jerk reaction could have long term effects on the relationship police have with their communities. This relationship building should have arguably been made a priority before BWCs have the potential to monitor or influence these relationships.

This device, as an invasive surveillance tool that arguably gives police more power over citizens, requires future research into the possible consequences of this device. Future research may include a cost-benefit analysis, with a focus on the long-term sustainability of this device and the possible implications it could have on hiring officers. Additional research could include, experimentation on outfitting officers with BWCs at one division as one experimental condition, and hiring more uniformed officers at another as a second experimental condition, with a third condition being a control group. The experiment could assess various outcomes of these conditions, such as complaints against police, use of force incidents, and crime rates. Also, the long-term impact BWCs could have on the relationship between police and citizens and police legitimacy requires significant research. There is an overall necessity for future research of police as a culture and organization which must be evaluated and analysed by outsiders, rather than insiders. More specifically, research into officer’s perceptions which would allow for more understanding of this private group. More knowledge into the secret realm of police could allow for future research into aspects of the job that are not known to or questioned from outside researchers and academics.

Overall police services must determine if these devices are worth these consequences and implications. In addition, if their intended goal and number one priority of the implementation of BWCs is more accountability and transparency (similar to the TPS pilot project) they must release footage and take all required steps to ensure this transparency and accountability is communicated to their communities. If police services do not put in place proper procedures surrounding this device, this could further impact their negative visibility and overall police legitimacy.
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**Benefits?** Overall, this research will contribute to literature and research studies on police officers and their attitudes and perceptions toward synoptic surveillance and the usefulness and implications of police worn body cameras. There will be no directed benefit to the participant however, the findings of this study will contribute to policing policy and practices and will provide an insight for police services on the effect of new technology on police officers and public citizen encounters. I will also be producing a non-academic report as a way to mobilize this research knowledge into practice for police departments. I will provide this report to the Toronto Police Services Board. This report will contribute to their knowledge on the implications and results of this new technology and provide an insight of the Toronto police officer’s attitudes toward this surveillance. Additionally, my research study, specifically my literature review will demonstrate that lack of research studies and knowledge academia has on police officers as a group, authority figures and their relationship with their communities. Lastly, there is no conflict of interests on behalf of the researcher (Stacie Cox) and the institution (Queen’s University).

**Possible Risk?** There is a potential career risk to participates, if in the case that something very critical comes out of the data collection, and a supervisor finds out which officer has divulged this information, there might be possible reprimand. There is also a risk due to indirect identification of participants, if someone identifies an individual officer meeting with the interviewer or due to the small size of the piloting project, the data collected would be drawn from 15-20 of 85 officers from the pilot. However, due to this risk of career reprimand and indirect identification of participants, officers’ name will not be mentioned in the research study, and no names, or identifying markers will be recorded at any time during the data collection. Interviews will be located in a private room in the Toronto Police precinct in order to protect their confidentiality however indirect identification of participants is possible if someone identifies officers entering or exiting the private room. In order to minimize these risks, my presence and purpose in the precinct will not be made accessible to anyone other than participants. If in such case someone sees an officer leaving the room, they will not know the purpose of the meeting or conversation. However, in the case a participant feels uncomfortable having a discussion with the interviewer at their work place, a secondary location will be
suggested (ie. coffee shop). This is a minimal risk due to the confidentiality procedures that are taking place.

**If you should have any questions or concerns?** Any questions or concerns regarding this research, the interview or your participation in this study may be directed to Stacie Cox at stacie.cox@queensu.ca or Victoria Sytsma at victoria.sytsma@queensu.ca. If you have any ethical concerns or complaints, you may contact the Chair of the Queen’s University General Ethics Board at 1-844-535-2988 or chair.GREB@queensu.ca.

I appreciate you giving me your time and consideration. Your perceptions of, and opinions on, the body cameras are valuable to my research. Once again, I would like to remind you that this interview is confidential and there will be no record of your name.

Sincerely,

Stacie Cox
Graduate Researcher
Queen’s University
stacie.cox@queensu.ca
APPENDIX C: Consent Form

Law Enforcement Attitudes of Current Public and Departmental Surveillance Technologies: A Qualitative Cases Study of the Toronto Police Service:

Student Principal Investigator:
Stacie Cox, Sociology, Queen’s University, Master’s Student
Email: stacie.cox@queensu.ca

Faculty Supervisor:
Victoria Sytsma, Professor, Sociology, Queen’s University
Email: victoria.sytsma@queensu.ca

Consent Form

Invitation:
You have been selected and invited to participate in this master’s thesis research study because of your experience in the Toronto Police Service piloting project, wearing the police body-worn cameras. My research objective is to analyze the front-line police officers’ perceptions of, and attitudes towards, police body-worn cameras and their effect on the relationship between officer and public citizens. Your participation is helpful because of your first-hand experience with the device.

Procedure:
As a participant, you will be interviewed and asked a series of questions surrounding body-worn cameras and your experiences of, and attitudes towards them. Interviews will approximately be around 45-60 minutes in length.

Confidentiality:
In this research, participants’ identity will be kept confidential in order to protect them and the Toronto Police Service. The officers will be randomly selected among the piloting project and the researcher conducting the interviews will be the only person with which participants will be in contact with. It is important to protect the officers’ identities from their supervisors in order for the officers not to fear reprimand for answers pertaining to conduct.
during specific experiences they shared during the interview. These interviews will be audio-recorded to protect the visual identification of the participants and no names or identifying markers (other than their voice) will be recorded during the interview. Once the interviews have been transcribed, the audio recording of each interview will be deleted in order to protect participants against voice recognition.

**Voluntary Participation:**

In the case that a participant would like to withdraw from the interview, the audio recording will stop immediately and the interview will end. At this time, the interviewer will ask the participant if the data collected up to that point can be used in the study. If you do not feel comfortable with allowing the data collected to be used, the audio recording will be destroyed immediately. There will be no career or employment consequences if you choose to withdraw from the study. Once the interview is complete, and the audio device has been turned off, the participants will be debriefed and thanked for their time, and are welcomed to ask questions or provide any concerns. By consenting, participants have not waived any rights to legal recourse in the event of research-related harm.

**Benefits:**

Overall, this research will contribute to literature and research studies on police officers and their attitudes and perceptions towards synoptic surveillance and the usefulness and implications of police worn body cameras. There are no direct benefits to participants, however, the findings of this study will contribute to policing policy and practices and will provide an insight for police departments on the effect of new technology on police officers and public citizen encounters. I will also be producing a non-academic report as a way to mobilize this research knowledge into practice for police departments. I will provide this report to the Toronto Police Services Board. This report will contribute to their knowledge on the implications and results of this new technology and provide an insight to the Toronto police officers’ attitudes toward this surveillance. Additionally, my research study, specifically my literature review, will demonstrate that the lack of studies and knowledge that currently exists within the literature on police officers as a group, authority figures, and their relationship with their communities.
Potential Risk:

I would like to mention that there is a potential career risk to participates, if in the case that something very critical comes out of the data collection, and a supervisor finds out which officer has divulged this information, there might be possible reprimand. There is also a risk due to indirect identification of participants, if someone identifies you meeting with the interviewer (myself) at the precinct or at a secondary location. However, these risks have been carefully assessed and precautions put in place to ensure confidentiality.

Contact Information:

If you have any further questions or concerns surrounding this research, or would like to follow up with this research, please contact Stacie Cox using the contact information listed at the top of the consent form and the letter of information. If you wish to contact the supervisor of this project, please contact Victoria Sytsma at victoria.sytsma@queensu.ca.

Consent:

Please check one of the following boxes to indicate your consent.

☐ Yes, I agree to participate in this study. I have read the Letter of Information and this Consent form, all questions regarding this research and study were answered to my satisfaction, and understand that I can withdraw from this study and consent at any time. By consenting, I have not waived any rights to legal recourse in the event of research-related harm.

☐ No, I do not wish to participate in this study.

Date: ____________________________
APPENDIX D: Interview Schedule

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

Semi-Structured Interview Guide

This interview will take approximately 45-60 minutes and will be conducted by Stacie Cox, the principal researcher investigator.

Interview Overview:

Thank you for allowing me to interview you at this time. I am interested in interviewing you because you were involved in the 2015-2016 Toronto Police Service police body-worn camera piloting project. My research objective is to analyze the front-line police officer’s perceptions of, and attitudes towards, police body-worn cameras. This interview will serve as an instrument that will be used to determine the value of the body-worn cameras and gather opinions of front-line officers who are wearing the device.

I would like to begin by stating that your participation in this interview is confidential; your name will not be recorded on the interview schedule or required on the consent forms, and will not be transcribed further.

At any time during this interview you can withdrawal from the study.

If you agree, I would like to audio-record this interview.

Do you have any questions before we proceed?

Interview Questions to Police Officers

Warm up question:

As a part of the piloting project did you previously have experience or knowledge with body-worn cameras?

Section 1: Officer’s thoughts on the device

1. In your experience with the piloting project, do you like to wear the body-worn cameras?
   i. What did you like or dislike about them?
   ii. Do you see this device protecting you, in terms of physical safety as an officer?
2. Do you agree or disagree with Canadian police officers wearing body-worn cameras?
   i. Do you think they are necessary with the advancement of camera technology?
   ii. Do you think this device has an important role in terms of the increase scrutiny of police officers in the media recently?
   ▪ How so?
3. Do you think these body-cameras will provide adequate footage of encounters and provide an accurate representation of the interaction?
4. How do you think these footages will compare in relation to citizens recording the same interactions on their cellphones and uploading them to mass media?
5. Do you think having police recorded footage through the use of body-worn cameras will improve public trust in the police or will it invite increased levels of scrutiny around officer performance?

Section 2: Officers’ opinions on the device’s effect on interactions with citizens

6. Do you find that you are more conscious and aware of your actions if you know you are being recorded by citizen’s cellphones during an encounter?
   i. Yes? how so? In what specific encounters has being recorded altered your behaviour?
7. Do you find that the presence of body-worn cameras, as a recording device alters citizens’ behaviour?
   i. Are they more cautious about how they communicate with you if they know they are being recorded?
8. Have you noticed a change in citizens’ demeanor when they are being filmed by the body-worn camera?
9. Do you find that citizens record your actions with their cellphones more, less, or the same amount during interactions while you are wearing the body cameras as opposed to when you are not wearing the device?

Section 3: Officers’ opinions on their actions while wearing the device

10. Have you noticed that you are more conscious and aware of your actions while wearing the body camera?
    i. Yes- How does this device alter your behaviour? What makes your behaviour different?
    ii. How so?
    iii. In what specific situations?
11. Have you noticed that you are more conscious and aware of your actions with the rise and the increased use of social media by the public?
    i. How so?
12. Which do you think is more likely to have impact on officer self-awareness? Body-worn cameras? Or the rise of social media use by the public?
    i. Why?
13. Have you noticed that this device has improved or harmed the public’s trust in police through these monitored encounters?
14. Do you think this device will have a positive, negative or no effect on the police’s relationship with the community?
    i. How so?
15. Do you think this device will have any impact on police accountability?
Section 4: Concerns

16. Do you have any concerns with the device regarding your daily routine as an officer?
   i. Do you think the device could be improved upon at all?
17. Do you find there to be any privacy concerns with the footage?
   i. For police officers or private citizens?
   ii. How so?
18. Do you see this new technology changing the practice of policing?
   i. If so, how?
19. Where do you see the future of policing heading in terms of technology and practice?

Section 5: Open Discussion

20. Do you have any other reactions or thoughts about this device?
21. Is there anything else you would like to add or discuss?

At this time, I will turn off the audio recorder.

Closing remarks (Debrief):

That concludes our interview; I appreciate you giving me your time to conduct this interview. Your perceptions of and opinions on the body cameras are a valuable asset to my research! Once again, I would like to remind you that this interview is confidential and there will be no record of your name.

Do you have any questions on this research or about the interview? If you have any questions at a later date or you would like to follow up on this research, my contact information is on the letter of information.