

8-1-2022

What You See You Perceive: Public Opinions of Potential Negative Consequences and Support for Officer Body-Worn Cameras

Jordyn Marian Sanders

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalscholarship.unlv.edu/thesesdissertations>



Part of the [Criminology Commons](#), and the [Criminology and Criminal Justice Commons](#)

Repository Citation

Sanders, Jordyn Marian, "What You See You Perceive: Public Opinions of Potential Negative Consequences and Support for Officer Body-Worn Cameras" (2022). *UNLV Theses, Dissertations, Professional Papers, and Capstones*. 4532.

<http://dx.doi.org/10.34917/33690310>

This Thesis is protected by copyright and/or related rights. It has been brought to you by Digital Scholarship@UNLV with permission from the rights-holder(s). You are free to use this Thesis in any way that is permitted by the copyright and related rights legislation that applies to your use. For other uses you need to obtain permission from the rights-holder(s) directly, unless additional rights are indicated by a Creative Commons license in the record and/or on the work itself.

This Thesis has been accepted for inclusion in UNLV Theses, Dissertations, Professional Papers, and Capstones by an authorized administrator of Digital Scholarship@UNLV. For more information, please contact digitalscholarship@unlv.edu.

WHAT YOU SEE YOU PERCEIVE: PUBLIC OPINIONS OF POTENTIAL NEGATIVE
CONSEQUENCES AND SUPPORT FOR OFFICER BODY-WORN CAMERAS

By

Jordyn Marian Sanders

Bachelor of Arts – Criminal Justice
University of Nevada, Las Vegas
2019

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the

Master of Arts –Criminal Justice

Department of Criminal Justice
Greenspun College of Urban Affairs
The Graduate College

University of Nevada, Las Vegas
August 2022

Copyright 2022 by Jordyn Marian Sanders

All Rights Reserved



Thesis Approval

The Graduate College
The University of Nevada, Las Vegas

June 24, 2022

This thesis prepared by

Jordyn Marian Sanders

entitled

What You See You Perceive: Public Opinions of Potential Negative Consequences and Support for Officer Body-Worn Cameras

is approved in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts – Criminal Justice
Department of Criminal Justice

William Sousa, Ph.D.
Examination Committee Chair

Terance Miethe, Ph.D.
Examination Committee Member

Tamara Herold, Ph.D.
Examination Committee Member

Robert Futrell, Ph.D.
Graduate College Faculty Representative

Alyssa Crittenden, Ph.D.
*Vice Provost for Graduate Education &
Dean of the Graduate College*

Abstract

Officer-body worn cameras (BWCs) are used in policing to provide visuals from the perspective of the officer during interactions with the community. BWCs are often promoted for the ability to improve the relationship between the community and police by providing accurate and transparent accounts of the interactions. Millions of dollars have been spent to distribute BWCs to police departments across the United States, with an estimated 80% of departments implementing the devices through various policies and procedures (White & Malm, 2020). Most studies on BWCs have provided empirical evidence showing the potential benefits of the devices in policing (Lum et al., 2019; White & Malm, 2020). Research on the public and officer perceptions of BWCs has mostly examined the influence of the potential benefits of the surveillance technology on the overall levels of support (Jennings, Fridell, & Lynch, 2014; Lum et al., 2019; Sousa, Miethe, & Sakiyama, 2015, 2017; Morin et al., 2017). The purpose of the study is to analyze public survey data to assess the influence that potential negative consequences of BWCs has on public support for the devices in policing. The sample consisted of 599 respondents from the United States during May 2015. Results indicate that while respondents generally support BWC on police, the potential negative consequences of the devices impact the level of support. The findings from the bivariate analysis revealed that respondents were less likely to support BWCs if they believed that the devices violate suspect's privacy and reduce citizen cooperation. Results further indicate that respondents were more likely to support the use of BWCs in policing if they believed that the media should have access to recorded footage. Implications and additional findings are discussed in relation to theories of self-awareness and deterrence as well as existing literature.

Keywords: officer body-worn cameras, perceptions, privacy, support, cooperation, access

Acknowledgements

There are so many individuals that I would like to express my gratitude in support my academic aspirations. I could not be where I am without the support and resources from my family, the University of Nevada, Las Vegas and its Criminal Justice Department, and the Las Vegas community.

First, I would like to thank my committee chair, William Sousa, for his patience, consistent guidance, and feedback throughout this study. Dr. Sousa is the most honest to goodness kindest and professional advisor I could have ever asked for in this project.

Secondly, I cannot express my heartfelt gratitude for Dr. Terance Miethe enough; he was the first professor to push me toward the path to academia by realizing the strength and power in research within the criminology field and studying the monsters that haunt the darkest of nightmares. It is thanks to the contributive patience, feedback, and discussions with Drs. Sousa and Miethe that this study was completed.

I would also like to express my upmost gratitude to my inspiration in the field and committee member, Tamara Herold. If anyone can change the world through passion and time management, it is the inspiring, powerful, and caring soul of a woman that is Dr. Herold.

I would like to thank Professor Morgan, whom I will very soon be comfortable enough to refer to as Darwin. Professor Morgan's class guided my fascination in culture, sociological factors in violent, passionate movements, and love for the field of academia and teaching. I would also like to thank Dr. Melissa Rorie for always being a kind, caring, and passionate professor.

I would like to thank my fellow master's study group, Milia Heen, Christopher Forepaugh, Kamali'ilani Wetherell, Khaing Lynn, Megan Silvia, Tanya Dudinskaya, and Josh Donnelly for their endless support and guidance.

Table of Contents

Abstract.....	iii
Acknowledgements	iv
Table of Contents	vi
List of Tables.....	viii
Section 1: Introduction	1
Problem Statement: Public Perception Research on Officer Body-Worn Cameras.....	3
Current Study.....	3
Research Questions	3
Structure of Thesis.....	4
Section 2: Literature Review	5
Overview of Officer Body-Worn Camera Research	6
Positive Consequences of Officer Body-Worn Cameras	8
Negative Consequences of Officer Body-Worn Cameras.....	11
Concerns for Privacy	11
Concerns for Public Access to BWC Footage.....	12
Concerns for Reduced Cooperation with Police	13
Research on Survey Opinion of Officer Body-Worn Cameras	14
Guiding Theoretical Framework	19
Research Questions	20
Section 3: Methodology and Results.....	21
Research Design & Procedure.....	21
Sample	21
Measures of Variables	22
Dependent Variables	25
Independent Variables	25
Bivariate Analysis	26
Multivariate Analysis	29
Section 4: Discussion	31
Question 1.....	31
Question 2.....	31
Question 3.....	32
Question 4.....	32
Section 5: Conclusion.....	33
Main Findings.....	33
Policy Implications.....	35
Limitations.....	36

Future Directions	36
Concluding Remarks	38
Appendices	39
Appendix A: Tables.....	39
Appendix B: Survey Instrument.....	43
References	52
Curriculum Vitae	60

List of Tables

Table 1: <i>Coding of Variables and Univariate Distributions</i>	23
Table 2: <i>Bivariate Relations Between Demographic Factors, Perceived Negative Consequences, and Public Support for BWCs</i>	28
Table 3: <i>Logistic Regression of Predictors of Perceived Negative Consequences of BWCs and Public Support for BWCs</i>	30

Section 1

Introduction

Officer body-worn cameras (BWCs) are small devices attached to an officer's uniform used to capture and record the visual and audial events of public-to-police interactions from the officer's perspective, which are then transmitted and stored for later use by the associated police department. The deployment and enhancement programs for BWCs in policing gained momentum in the United States after the Department of Justice and the White House funded over \$70 million for police departments to implement BWCs because the technology was advertised for its accountability of police actions, which could diffuse the problems in community-police relations (White & Malm, 2020). After the rapid implementation of BWCs in policing, it is important to examine the intended consequences of the technology and what factors could influence the public's opinions and support for the devices.

There are high percentages of police officers and the public that support the use of BWCs because of the potential benefits of the devices (Sousa, Miethe, Sakiyama, 2015; Morin, 2017; Miethe et al., 2019). These benefits include the ability to provide police transparency, accountability, and evidence gathering in arrest and prosecution of offenses. Empirical evidence shows that BWCs have the potential to reduce use of force and citizen complaints, increase arrest rates and citations, increase legitimacy and views of police effectiveness, provide evidentiary benefits, improve cooperation with police, and provide police training opportunities (White, 2014; Braga et al., 2018; Ariel et al., 2014; Ariel, 2016; Lum et al., 2019). While the research has mostly focused on the potential benefits of BWCs in policing, there are also several administrative concerns with the devices, along with some potential adverse consequences.

Implementing BWCs within a police organization is not without its administrative challenges (Sousa et al., 2016). Important policy and protocol decisions need to be made, such as when the devices should be activated and deactivated by officers, whether officers should announce the presence of BWCs during citizen interactions, and the degree of public access to recorded BWC footage. There are budgetary concerns as well. In addition to the costs of the infrastructure and hardware, the storage of recorded BWC footage is expensive because it requires hours of uploaded footage to be stored in an accessible platform, encrypted, and managed by special personnel (White, 2014). There are also the challenges associated with police department's bureaucratic structure and organization in which units deal primarily with BWC programs (Sousa et al., 2016). Agencies must also consider that BWCs have the potential to cause more aggressive proactive policing strategies, such as an increase in arrest and citation rates (Braga et al., 2018). There is a concern for the safety of officers in the hesitation the presence of BWCs could cause in actions (Sousa et al., 2016). Additionally, one study found that the presence of BWCs increases the likelihood of assaults on officers (Ariel et al., 2017). The administrative challenges of BWCs are important to consider as a potential negative consequence of the devices.

Issues pertaining to privacy, however, are among the most significant concerns for the use of BWCs in policing. BWCs often record videos of citizens in vulnerable or embarrassing situations. Citizens, therefore, may be justifiably worried about public access to videos. One study, for example, indicates that the devices could reduce citizen reporting suspicious activity in certain crime situations (Dudinskaya, 2020). Privacy concerns, particularly as they relate to citizen willingness to cooperate with the police, are potentially the unintended, adverse consequences of BWCs. Nevertheless, outside of Sousa et al. (2015), very few studies have

examined how these negative consequences might influence overall public support for using BWCs in policing.

Problem Statement: Public Perception Research on Officer Body-Worn Cameras

Research on BWCs shows mixed results on whether the devices are effective in offering benefits - or finds that there is no impact or potentially negative effects of the technology (National Institute of Justice, 2022). Perceptions of BWCs by members of the public is important to understand in the effort to improve the relationship between police officers and the community. Most of the research on public perceptions examines evidence supporting the benefits of BWCs in policing (Sousa et al., 2015, 2017; Morin et al., 2017; Lum et al., 2019). There is gap in research on public perceptions in terms of the influence of potential negative consequences of BWCs on support for the devices.

Current Study

Using secondary data from a national sample of U.S. citizens, the current study will examine the influence of respondents' beliefs about potential negative consequences of BWCs on their overall support for BWCs. Issues that will be explored include a) whether respondents believe that BWCs violate personal privacy, b) if respondents believe that citizens will be less likely to cooperate with police who are wearing BWCs, and c) respondents' attitudes about accessibility to BWC footage.

Research Questions

Research Question 1) Do individuals' perceptions that BWCs violate the personal privacy of crime victims, suspects, and the public impact their overall support of the police use of BWCs?

Research Question 2) Do the beliefs about media and public support for having access to BWC footage influence individual's overall support for BWC usage?

Research Question 3) Do public opinions on whether the presence of police BWCs leads to fewer witness, victim, and citizen cooperation influence the support for BWC usage?

Research Question 4) Do respondent's demographic characteristics influence their support for BWCs?

Structure of Thesis

The remainder of this thesis is organized into five sections. The next section will review the relevant literature on police BWCs, implementation of BWCs in the United States, positive and negative consequences of BWCs, and survey opinion research on officer body-worn cameras. Section 2 will conclude with a statement of the research questions for this study. Section 3 will examine the definitions, concepts, and measures that are used in this study. This section will also examine the methodology by describing the sample, design and procedures, measures for the independent and dependent variables, and conclude with a summary of the analysis strategy. Section 4 will describe the results for each of the four research questions. Section 5 will conclude the thesis with a summary of the findings, a comparison of the findings from existing research, potential policy implications, limitations of the study, and recommend directions for future research.

Section 2

Literature Review

Officer body-worn cameras (BWCs) provide accounts of interactions with members of the community from the officer's perspective. BWCs were widely adopted in policing because of potential positive consequences of the devices based on the available research and conventional wisdom. BWCs were said to improve relations between police officers and members of the community because they provide accountability of police actions, produce a civilizing effect on officer and offender behaviors, reduce citizen complaints and unnecessary use of force, improve evidence gathering for potential lawsuits and prosecution, and provide opportunities for training (White, 2014).

BWCs are theorized to affect both officer and citizen behavior through a civilizing effect of deterrence and self-awareness, thus enhancing the public's perceptions of the devices. Despite the widespread implementation of BWCs, research shows mixed evidence on the theorized effectiveness of the devices. There is variation in departmental use, storage, and access to the recordings from BWCs. However, public support for the use of BWCs in policing is influenced by the potential benefits of BWCs (Ariel et al., 2014; Ariel, 2016; Ariel et al., 2018; Braga et al., 2018; Lum et al., 2019; Sousa et al. 2015, 2017). BWCs in policing can assist officers through "increased transparency and accountability, improved police legitimacy, officer support, reductions in use of force and complaints against officers (both citizen and internal), and enhanced quality of evidence" (White & Malm, 2020, p. 8). Because of the potential benefits of BWCs, policies for implementing the technology rolled out faster than any technology reform in policing throughout U.S. history. However, with the quick implementation comes potential problems in the form of community perceptions, willingness of witnesses and

victims to provide testimony to police with BWCs, and privacy issues for those interacting with police. With these important issues comes the need to understand how the perceived consequences and understanding of issues can influence the perceptions of support for officer BWCs. Using data collected by Sousa et al. (2015, 2017), this paper will further delve into the influences of the public's perceptions of potential negative consequences on the overall support for BWCs in policing. Specifically, this study will analyze the influence of respondent demographic characteristics and opinions of potential negative consequences on overall support for BWC. This section will provide a summary of the research on the use of BWCs in policing by providing a general overview of descriptive and empirical studies on the technology, examine findings from research on survey opinions on perceptions of BWCs, and the potential negative consequences of BWCs. This will provide a theoretical framework to help frame the research questions for this study.

Overview of BWC Literature

BWCs were quickly implemented in policing in the United States due to a massive amount of hype by the media and supported through the endorsement of the devices by public officials (Newell, 2020). After protests and demands for police reform associated with the police shooting of Michael Brown in 2014 and the subsequent emergence of the Black Lives Matter (BLM) movement, President Barak Obama appointed the President's Task Force on 21st Century Policing. The task force sought the best methods to improve community-police relations through the identification of best policing practices and enhanced accountability, especially after several incidents of police shootings had citizens questioning the use of deadly force needed during interactions with potential offenders. The task force pledged around \$75 million to police departments across the United States to introduce the use of BWCs after the

potential benefits were said to produce between police and the public (White & Malm, 2020). Several states have passed bills requiring officers to utilize BWCs in the line of duty due to the push from highly publicized and controversial incidents of fatal police shootings (Ariel, 2016). Policies on activation and other requirements for the use of BWCs in policing could influence the effectiveness of the technology to provide accountability and transparency, as well as legitimacy in police.

While there are general guiding policies on how to use BWCs, each municipal, local, and federal police department utilize their own policies in the activation, storage, and rules authorizing an officer to use of BWCs during their shifts. At the macro level, the International Association of Chiefs of Police (IACP) Law Enforcement Policy Center created a frequently updated document for police agencies to use in implementing BWCs, including directives for micro-level model policies, procedures on when and where to record, concept and issues papers, and summaries of these policies/procedures (2019). The IACP model for BWCs are intended to help local police departments to develop their own policy. For example, the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department created a detailed seven-page document outlining the requirements and regulations for BWCs, to include when BWCs are to be activated and deactivated, supervisor responsibilities, video access and review, and investigation procedures (2020). These policies are intended to utilize BWCs to effectively benefit policing strategies and community relations, which also influences support for the use of BWC technology.

BWCs were supported in policing in the United States due to their potential benefits. The Bureau of Justice Statistics released a report in 2018 that stated out of 17,985 police departments in the U.S., 47% of general law enforcement agencies use BWCs and over 80% of large police department utilize the devices (National Institute of Justice, 2022). Police

departments without BWCs often did not have the funding or logistics needed to deploy the technology (White & Malm, 2020). While BWCs were not implemented in the U.S. until 2013, research on the effectiveness of the technology occurred as early as 2008 when the United Kingdom implemented the devices (Goodall, 2007). The guidance of BWCs provided for the Home Office for the Association of Chief Police Officers (ACPO) in England, Wales, and Northern Ireland found that the use of BWCs “will enable the Police Service to make far greater use of video evidence due to its increased availability of the front line, as officers will be able to maintain the use of their hands and peripheral senses while recording an incident” (Goodall, 2007, p. 5). Preliminary guidance on BWCs in the U.S. found similar benefits to implementing the devices in policing. For example, the National Institute of Justice stated that the “functions of the [BWC] are to record evidence of activities and behaviors relevant to a crime, deter violence or negative behavior against an officer, and improve accountability of police officers and reduce the number of complaints against officers” (2012, p.1). The research showing evidence of potential positive consequences of BWCs will be further summarized in the next section.

Positive Consequences of Officer Body-Worn Cameras

There are many potential positive consequences of BWCs in policing. These include the ability to increase transparency and views of citizen’s legitimacy in police, accountability, a civilizing effect of both police officers and citizens, evidentiary benefits for arrest and prosecution, opportunities for police training in developing personal skills and research, expedited guilty pleas in arraignments, improve officer safety, reduce agency liability, reduce the use of excessive force and complaints of police misconduct, and the potential to improve relations between police and the community (Goodall, 2007; White, 2014; White & Malm,

2020; Ariel et al., 2014; Braga et al., 2018; Sousa et al., 2015, 2017). The potential benefits of BWCs led to their quick deployment in the U.S., especially because of the devices' positive influence on community perceptions of police. However, research on the beneficial outcomes of BWCs shows variability in the effectiveness of the devices to achieve their desired aims of improving the quality of evidence, reducing citizen complaints of misconduct, and improving officer safety.

Randomized control trials examining of the influence of BWCs on citizen complaints of misconduct, for example, show mixed results. Complaints of misconduct by citizens is an area of research difficult to study, as it is a rare event that an incident of misconduct is reported as a citizen complaint (Ariel et al., 2017a). However, Braga, Sousa, Coldren, and Rodriguez conducted a randomized control trial of 400 police officers in Las Vegas, Nevada, and found that there was a 16.5% reduction in complaints for officers wearing BWC whereas officers not equipped with the devices had a 2.5% reduction (2018). In Rialto, California, Ariel et al. (2014) found that BWCs had some effects on complaints over a 12-month period, the complaints “dropped from 0.7 complaints per 1,000 contacts to 0.07 per 1,000 contacts” (p. 510), though there was no treatment effect between the control (no BWCs) and experimental group (BWCs) in their analysis of reduced complaints. Hedberg, Katz, and Choate (2017) found that in the treatment group with BWCs, there was a 96% reduction in citizen complaints. Ariel et. al. (2017a) points out that BWCs can either support misconduct claims or refute them, benefitting and protecting both community and officer, and the ‘observer effect’ or civilizing effect of BWCs creates a contagious accountability of behavior conduct. This civilizing effect of BWCs can further be explained in Ariel et al. (2017b) research on the deterring effect of wearing the devices from actions against police protocol. In a metaanalysis of empirical BWCs research,

Lum et. al. (2019) stated that more research needs to be done on consistent effects on citizen behaviors in the presence of BWC, but these authors did find a 16.6% reduction in the complaints of officer misconduct across 22 out of 30 studies, though it was not clear if the treatment effect from BWCs were present in all 22 of the studies. These studies show that BWCs may not be as effective at reducing citizen complaints as intended during the implementation of the devices in policing.

Studies examining the influence that BWCs have on proactive policing strategies and reducing use of force also show some variation of the desired outcome. In Rialto, California, Ariel et al. (2014) found that officers that did not wear BWCs were twice as likely to use force than those wearing the devices. However, when examining the use of discretion in activating BWCs in a multisite randomized control trial of ten experimental sites, Ariel et al. (2016a) found that use of force decreased by 37% for officers that did not utilize discretion in immediate activation of BWCs when interacting with citizens. Ariel et al. (2016b) conducted another multisite randomized control trial to examine use of force reduction and assaults on officers and found that BWCs did not reduce force, but officers wearing BWCs were more likely to be assaulted. In the randomized control trial of police officers in Las Vegas, Nevada, Braga et al. (2018) found that use of force reduced by 11.5% for officers wearing BWCs whereas those not wearing the devices only saw a 1.0% reduction during the period between pre-intervention and intervention. Braga et al. (2018) found that officers wearing BWCs were also more likely to arrest or issue a citation than those not wearing the devices. In the metaanalysis of 16 studies related to use of force, Lum et al. (2019) found that four studies showed no effect of BWCs on reducing use of force. The analysis of the studies on use of force shows no definitive proof of

BWCs reducing use of force in policing strategies. The next section will examine the potential adverse consequences of BWCs.

Negative Consequences of Officer Body-Worn Cameras

Potential negative consequences of BWCs in policing include privacy violations and decreases in cooperation between police and citizens (White, 2014). Negative consequences of BWCs are key factors for the analyses of this thesis: examination of studies examining potential negative consequences will therefore be summarized.

Concerns for Privacy

The issue of privacy is a primary criticism and concern in the use of BWCs, especially as it relates to the effect of privacy for officers and citizens (White, 2014; Bud, 2016). As the number of officers with BWCs and the ability to surveil the public increases, there is less privacy for citizens. Coudert et al. (2015) argue that the balance between privacy and protection is a thin line, and the constant surveillance is justified only in specific circumstances that pose a greater risk for police officers or citizens. This view shows a desire for officer discretion at recording, but for there to be a deterrent effect for officers and citizens, the BWC should be recording constantly (Ariel et al., 2016b). However, if privacy is an issue, the recording should be minimal, showing the need to balance discretion, privacy, and policy implications for the recording and storage of BWC footage. It is important to set up the balance between the privacy implications and reasons to use BWCs. Thomsen (2020) argues that “the good that using BWCs brings outweighs the bad” (p. 117), showing the consistent view most of the public perceives when it relates to privacy issues with BWCs. Sousa et al. (2015) found that most survey respondents believed that there were more benefits than negative consequences. Alan Westin points out that the “American law set up a brilliant framework for balancing the interests of

privacy, disclosure, and surveillance in the pre-technology era of 1790-1880” (1967, p. 329). A concern of BWCs in relation to potential violations of privacy is the possibility that video footage could be considered part of the freedom of information requests, thereby allowing public access to BWC recordings when requested.

Concerns for Public Access to BWC Footage

A concern that officers face in the implementation of BWCs are in relation to citizen and police privacy and the public’s right to access the footage provided by surveillance technology. There are rights afforded by the Privacy Act of 1974, which prevents the government or any actors within from the collection, maintenance, use, and disclosure of one’s personal information in an unwarranted record collection system (The United States Department of Justice, 2020). BWC footage may be considered public information and therefore a matter of public record. As such, it may need to be released when requested. Most police department have guiding policies on releasing BWC footage when requested, as well as activation and deactivation procedures for officer consideration.

Of course, depending on agency policies, officers may have some discretion to activate the camera when interacting with individuals. Most policies require officers to activate their cameras immediately when in contact with citizens and during the performance of their duties, although they may often utilize discretion in situations related to citizen privacy rights (particularly for protected classes, such as juveniles, medical patients, or crime victims) or when no crime has been committed (IACP, 2014). The IACP also suggests that the release of BWC footage should consider the jurisdiction’s laws related to the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA), which still requires individuals to request recordings with the associated police department, who then considers approving the requests with appropriate discretion. The FOIA is

the public's right to have full or partial disclosure of information or documents controlled by the government to be released when requested (Westin, 1967).

With the broad exemption that the disclosure of the footage would provide more harm than good, BWC footage can be publicly available upon request. There are policies for local police departments to release BWC footage, but the retention and storage of the recordings becomes another issue. For example, Thomas Bud (2016) finds that the storage collection of BWC footage in policies that do not have an expiration retention date poses potential privacy violations. Additionally, the issue arises in terms of who can access the footage of the interactions between different individuals and officers. Local jurisdictions have variations in policies related to the freedom of information requests. For example, Spokane, Washington allows any member of the public to access the footage provided by officer BWC, which creates additional issues related to the privacy of crime victims, witnesses, and suspects (Newell, 2021). There is also the issue of potential risk in the accessibility of recorded footage when it comes to reduced community cooperation with BWCs.

Concerns for Reduced Cooperation with Police

Another potential negative consequence and concern in the use of BWCs in policing is a reduction in reporting, compliance, and willingness to cooperate with police BWCs. A study conducted by Tanya Dudinskaya (2020) examined the likelihood of respondents' willingness to report or comply with police in certain crime scenarios in the presence of BWCs. The results of the reporting in the presence of BWCs found that more people would report if the crime was violent versus nonviolent (Dudinskaya, 2020). Another study conducted by Crow et al. (2017) on community perceptions of BWCs in two communities in Florida found interesting results related to what can influence the support and opposition toward surveillance technology. Crow

et al. (2017) found that positive perceptions of police performance related to a greater support for BWCs, whereas negative interactions led to perceptions related to the consequences of BWCs, such as privacy violations. Perceptions of procedural fairness was positively correlated to perceptions of police performance, and thus support for BWCs (Ariel, 2016). Views of procedural fairness can lead to an increase in citizen trust and viewing police as more legitimate, which therefore would not completely deter citizen cooperation with police.

Research on Survey Opinions of Officer Body-Worn Cameras

Research on the opinions of citizens on surveillance technology is important to understand, especially the factors that influence individuals' perceptions of how and why the technology is implemented. Surveillance technology has been implemented in police strategies in the forms of installed cameras in police vehicles, cameras attached to drones, traffic sensors, utility pole-mounted videos, CCTV, and body-worn cameras (Goodall, 2007). This section will analyze the current state of research on the perceptions of BWCs, supported with other forms of police surveillance technology.

Surveillance technology is a popular tool in policing, aside from just officer worn cameras. Drones are one such example. Heen et al. (2018) found that 77% of respondents favored the use of aerial drones in most proactive policing situations. The most support came from the use of drones in search and rescue situations (92.7%), as well as the use of surveillance for evidence gathering (74.1%). These studies show that while drones have the potential for privacy concerns, people are generally more likely to feel protected and have greater trust in police accountability when the devices are used.

Most survey-based research finds that the public and police greatly support the use of BWCs. Sousa et al.'s (2015, 2017) nationally conducted survey was one of the first studies that

examined the influence that public perceptions of beneficial consequences of BWCs have on the public's support for the devices. Sousa et al. (2017) found support highly favorable to police BWCs in relation to their perceived benefit of increased trust and improving police legitimacy, as well as support based on the reduction of use of force and increased transparency. Sousa et al. (2017) also found that demographic characteristics had no significant effect on the support for BWCs. This study highlights that the perceptions of advantages of BWCs have a significant effect on the support for the use of surveillance technology in policing. Other studies have also examined the support for the use of surveillance technology by the public.

Agreement for the use of BWCs by the public and police was further examined by the Pew Research Center in 2016. A national survey was distributed to examine the differences of agreement between officer and the public's perceptions of policing issues, including the support of BWCs, and found that while there were some differences in views, there was overall support for the use of BWCs in policing by both citizens and police (Morin et al., 2017). The public did see more benefits from BWCs than the officers. For example, out of the 4,538 citizens that were surveyed, 70% found that policing is more dangerous now because of the recent deaths of Blacks during incidents with police, and out of the 7,917 officers surveyed, 86% agreed that policing is harder (Morin et al., 2017). The results of the question pertaining to the support for BWCs found that 93% of the public favor the use of the technology in policing, while only 66% of officers favored BWCs. Additionally, the results found that 59% of the public thought that citizens would be more likely to cooperate with police in the presence of BWCs, while only 33% of officers believed that the technology would influence cooperation, 56% of officers believed there would be no difference. The question on officer behavior in the presence of BWCs found that 66% of the public believed officers would be more likely to act appropriately,

while the results from the officer survey found that only 50% of respondents believed the BWC would be more likely to make officers act more appropriately (Morin et al., 2017). These results show that while there is a broad support for BWCs, there are some variations in the way the cameras are perceived to deter any potential negative consequences of BWCs.

Another national study of public attitudes about body-worn cameras in police work by Miethe et al. (2019) showed 83% of respondents supported BWCs usage in police work. There were certain areas of police work where respondents had higher support for the strategic implementation of BWCs, such as a total of 90% support in utilizing BWCs in crime scene investigations and 90% in crowd monitoring. The findings from Miethe et al.'s study also show that these perceptions were influenced by "beliefs about the consequences of their BWC usage and individual's level of personal involvement in social institutions" (2019, p. 278). From the overall review of literature on public perception research on BWCs, there appear to be many factors that can lead to variation in support.

Views of BWCs from individuals detained by officers can contribute to the research on perceptions of BWCs in policing. In a study examining police detainees in Australia and their perceptions of BWCs, Taylor et al. (2019) found that detainees' generally support BWCs, but it was dependent on the procedural requirements in which BWCs are operated. The researchers first asked respondents about awareness of the presence of BWCs and found that only 12% of respondents were aware that the arresting officer had a camera with more than half stating they did not know if BWCs were used when they were apprehended (Taylor et al., 2019). Over 80% of the detainees supported the use of BWCs, with 32% of respondents' support based on the benefits of evidence gathering, 23% on the accountability of officer conduct, and 25% on protection BWCs provide (Taylor et al., 2019). The detainees did report that the benefits of

BWCs, such as protection and fairness in the treatment of arrestees, outweighed the perceived costs (Taylor et al., 2019). The perceived consequences that the detainees identified in police implementation of BWCs include issues of privacy, fairness, consent, evidence from BWC used against an offender or others, or by providing additional protection against police misconduct. Interestingly, Taylor et al. (2019) found that BWCs tended to increase perceptions of legitimacy by police detainees. Overall, most research done on the public perception of BWCs finds general support for the use of the cameras in policing. However, important for the purposes of this study, studies on perceptions indicate that there are other factors that may influence BWC support for the technology overall (Sousa et al., 2015).

Evidence also shows some variation in compliance and cooperation with police BWCs because of potential privacy issues. In a survey on citizen cooperation with BWCs, Dudinskaya (2020) found that 51% of respondents believed that recordings in public places in the presence of BWCs violated privacy, while also finding that 34% of respondents found BWCs to be a violation of witness privacy in the recordings (37% disagree, 29% unsure), and only 36% of respondents believing there to be a violation of victim privacy (38% disagree, 26% unsure). In Taylor et al.'s study on detainees' perspective on BWCs, the respondents that did not support BWCs (12%) believed the recording of BWCs was a violation of privacy (21%) or consent (19%). The moral implications of BWC in the form of privacy surveillance within Taylor et al.'s study included violating the value of privacy for individuals and society, feelings of discrimination and stigmatization by police and/or individuals interacting with police or cause a chilling effect for compliance with police (Bud, 2016). Some argue that these moral implications related to privacy are outweighed by the reason to use BWCs, especially in the opinions on the treatment of citizens.

In a study on the measurement of citizens' perceptions of police behavior during routine stops, Carmichael et al. (2020) found that perceptions of unequal treatment and legal cynicism impact the way that those interacting with police comply with the demands by the associated officer. Carmichael et al.'s study also examined the impact that the sociodemographic characteristics have on the perceived misconduct, and found that young, Black, poor, and those living in urban residences were significantly more likely to believe they were treated unfairly, that police acted outside of acceptable police conduct, and that the stop was illegitimate.

Other evidence from BWC research shows that the devices could support public views of legitimacy and policing procedures. In examining public perceptions during interactions with officers during traffic stops, Saulnier et al. found that individuals believed that they were treated more fairly by officers that wore BWCs than officers that did not wear the devices (2020). Wright and Headley (2020) found that while citizens overwhelmingly support BWCs in policing, the trust in police is not improved in the presence of BWCs. The activation and notification of citizens that the officers record through BWCs has a significant effect on the support and benefits of the technology. Sousa et al.'s (2015) study found that 72% of respondents agreed that police should always have the BWCs on when interacting with citizens, with 64% agreeing that citizens should be notified of the recording. Sousa et al. (2015) found that only 26% of their sample agreed police should comply when victim and witnesses requested to turn off BWCs, and only 16% when asked about requests of all citizens to turn off BWCs. The IACP (2014) BWC policy guidance for requests of deactivation states that the individual police agency should consider requests to turn off BWCs for victim and witnesses only "where the dignity of an individual may be comprised" (p. 3). There is some variability in the way different policies state accessibility to recorded BWC footage, which could impact the

public's perceptions that the device on police is effective in deterring socially undesirable behavior through a heightened sense of awareness.

Guiding Theoretical Framework

The theoretical framework for this thesis considers BWC studies that discuss theories of objective self-awareness and deterrence (Ariel, et al., 2018; Ariel, 2016; Braga et al., 2018).

Ariel et al.'s (2018) theory on the paradoxical effects from the self-awareness of being observed found that BWCs cause an immediate difference in police behavior by stripping officers' ability to utilize discretion under extreme interactions with citizens. Because of the self-awareness modification to attitudes and behavior, there is a deterrent effect on excessive force during split-second decision making, causing a civilizing effect on officers (White, 2014; Ariel et al., 2018).

The theories of self-awareness and deterrence influence public opinion on support for BWCs and may also affect views of support when views of negative consequences are considered.

BWCs serve as devices that act as a mechanism to reduce police misconduct and criminal behavior through deterring abnormal or socially undesirable behavior. The use of BWCs have been shown to reduce use of force by minimizing the use of police discretion in interactions with citizens (Ariel et al., 2017). The theoretical tenants evident in the public perception of BWCs is the deterrent effect on adverse officer and offender conduct, which acts as an external factor leading to the awareness of noncompliant or undesirable behavior as a direct effect. As such, deterrence can be seen as a main factor in the potential benefits of BWCs as reducing police use of force and citizen complaints (Ariel et al., 2014; Braga et al., 2018; Lum et al., 2019). These perceptions of BWCs as a mechanism for socially desirable behavior is heavily supported by public officials and media outlets, leading to public support in the requirement of the devices. When a deterrent effect is not directly observed, the phenomena of

self-awareness could also explain the modification of police behavior and public perceptions of officer conduct. Because citizens may become self-aware of behavior due to being recorded by BWCs, this could prevent them from cooperating with police because they do not want to be recorded during interactions with police that may become accessible to the public.

Research Questions

To address the limited evidence on the influence of the public's perceptions of potential negative consequences of BWCs on the overall support, this study will use data collected by Sousa et al. (2015, 2017) in a secondary data analysis. The research questions for this analysis, as indicated at the end of Section 1, are restated here:

Research Question 1) Do individuals' perceptions that BWCs violate the personal privacy of crime victims, suspects, and the public impact their overall support of the police use of BWCs?

Research Question 2) Do the beliefs about media and public support for having access to BWC footage influence individual's overall support for BWC usage?

Research Question 3) Do public opinions on whether the presence of police BWCs leads to fewer witness, victim, and citizen cooperation influence the support for BWC usage?

Research Question 4) Do respondents' demographic characteristics influence their support for BWCs?

Section 3

Methodology and Results

The current study will examine the public's perceptions of BWCs by utilizing data collected by Sousa et al. in their national online survey collected in 2015. This section will discuss the methods used in this study, including the methods used in the original data collection, the sample characteristics, the variables used in the current study, and the measures of those variables. The results from the univariate, bivariate, and multivariate analyses are then provided.

Research Design and Procedure

The original study by Sousa et al. (2015, 2017) utilized a national online survey distributed through a sampling platform created by Amazon's Mechanical Turk. The choice of Mechanical Turk, based on previous research, indicated that this sampling platform provided sample estimates that were within 10% of their population values. Previous research suggested that these estimates were better than other sampling methods provided by other online platforms (Heen et al., 2014). The data collected by Sousa et al. (2015) will be coded, similar to the original study. Table 1 shows the coding used for this study and the survey questions used to represent the potential negative consequences of BWCs.

Sample

The survey was administered to only U.S. residents over a 10-day period during May of 2015. A total sample of 635 respondents was included in the original study, but the final sample was reduced to 599 respondents due to missing data. The final sample had the following demographic profile: mostly college-educated (87%), male (54%), White (78%), 30 years or

older (63%), earned an annual household income of less than \$50,000 (57%), and lived in a city populated with less than 1 million residents (82%).

Measures of Variables

The current study examines the influences of individuals' perceptions of the negative consequences of BWC usage, as well as respondents' demographic characteristics on public support for this technology in policing. The specific measures and distributions of the dependent and independent variables are presented in Table 1 and summarized below.

Table 1*Coding of Variables and Univariate Distributions*

Variable	Coding	% (n)
Dependent Variable		
Support BWC on police	1= Support 0= Oppose/unsure	85.1 (524) 14.9 (92)
Independent Variables		
Agree BWC Violate Privacy of Victims	1= Agree/strongly agree 0= Strongly disagree/disagree/unsure	20.7 (127) 79.3 (487)
Agree BWC Violate Privacy of Suspects	1= Agree/strongly agree 0= Strongly disagree/disagree/unsure	13.0 (80) 87.0 (534)
Violate privacy of people in viewing range	1= Agree/strongly agree 0= Strongly disagree/disagree/unsure	26.2 (162) 73.8 (457)
Agree that Media Should Have Access to any BWC Recording	1= Agree/strongly agree 0= Strongly disagree/disagree/unsure	31.2 (193) 68.8 (426)
Agree that Any Member of Public Should Have Access to any BWC Recording	1= Agree/strongly agree 0= Strongly disagree/disagree/unsure	21.7 (133) 78.3 (480)
Witnesses will worry about cooperating with police	1= Fewer witnesses will worry 0= More witnesses will worry/no impact	41.3 (255) 58.7 (362)
Victims will worry about cooperating with police	1= Fewer victims will worry 0= More victims will worry/no impact	37.8 (233) 62.2 (384)
Citizens will worry about cooperating with police	1= Fewer citizens will worry 0= More citizens will worry/no impact	34.7 (214) 65.3 (403)

Variable	Coding	% (n)
Gender (Male)	1= Male	54.3 (333)
	0= Female	45.7 (280)
Age (<30 years)	1= Under 30 Years Old	36.9 (226)
	0= 30 or Older	63.1 (386)
Race/Ethnicity 1	1= White	78.1 (477)
Race/Ethnicity 2	1= Black	6.9 (42)
Race/Ethnicity 3	1= Hispanic	5.6 (34)
Race/Ethnicity 4 (Reference Category)	0= Other Race/Ethnicity	9.5 (58)
Education (College Graduate)	0= High School Graduate or Less	13.0 (79)
	1= Some College/College Graduate	87.0 (529)
City Resident >1 million	0= City/Town < 1 Million Population	82.3 (502)
	1= Large City > 1 Million Population	17.7 (108)
Income > \$50,000	0= <\$50,000 Annual Income	57.1 (350)
	1= > \$50,000 Annual Income	42.9 (263)
Democratic Party Orientation	1= Democrat	44.2 (269)
Republican Party Orientation	1= Republican	18.4 (112)
Independent (Reference Category)	0= Independent	37.4 (228)

Dependent Variables. The dependent variable in this analysis involves the level of public support for BWC use. The specific wording of this survey item was “in general, do you support or oppose requiring police officers to wear body cameras”. As shown in Table 1, 85% of survey respondents indicated that they supported this requirement of police wearing body cameras.

Independent Variables. The independent variables in this study involve multiple measures of (1) public perceptions of the negative consequences of BWC usage and (2) individual’s demographic characteristics. The specific coding of these variables and their univariate distributions are shown in Table 1.

The eight measures of public perceptions of the negative consequences of BWC usage include respondents’ beliefs that (1) BWCs violate privacy of victims, (2) BWCs violate the privacy of witnesses, (3), BWCs violate the privacy of suspects, (4), BWCs should be accessible to the media, (5), BWCs should be accessible to all members of the public, (6), BWCs will reduce victim cooperation with police, (7), BWCs will reduce witness cooperation with police, and (8), BWCs will reduce citizen cooperation with police. For measures of privacy in the univariate trends, less than one-fourth of respondents agreed that BWCs were a violation of the privacy of victims (21%), others in the viewing area (22%), and suspects (13%). The measures of respondent agreement that the media should have access to any BWCs footage was higher (31%) than those that agreed that any member of the public should have access (22%). The third set of measures yielded opinions that respondents thought that fewer witness (41%), victims (38%), and citizens (35%) would cooperate with police.

The respondent’s demographic characteristics include measures of their gender, age, race/ethnicity, education, urban residency, household income, and political party orientations.

Compared to their distribution in the U.S. population, the sample is slightly over representative of males (54%), White (78%), older (63%), had some college education (87%), Democrat (44%), and lived in a rural city with less than a million people (82%). The demographic factors are represented within table 2.

Bivariate Analysis. A bivariate analysis was conducted to examine the relationship between the independent variables (i.e., respondent's attitudes about potential negative consequences of BWCs and their demographic characteristics) and the dependent variable (i.e., overall support for BWCs.). These bivariate results are summarized in Table 2.

As shown in Table 2, individuals who believed that BWCs violate the privacy of the suspect, victim, or other people within viewing range were significantly ($p < 0.5$) less likely to support BWC usage than people with less concern about these privacy issues. Respondents who do not believe that BWCs violate the privacy of crime suspects are far more likely to support the use of the devices (88% support BWCs) than those who believe the technology violates suspects' privacy (64% support BWCs). This same pattern of higher privacy concerns associated with less support for BWC usage was also found for the privacy of victims and others in the viewing area.

Among variables measuring the accessibility to BWC footage by media and the public, a significant relationship was found between media accessibility and support. Respondents who support giving media access to BWC footage were more supportive of BWC usage (90%) than individuals who opposed media access to the recording (83%). There was no significant bivariate relationship between public access to BWC footage and support for this technology.

There was a significant bivariate relationship between respondent's perceptions of BWCs having a chilling effect on cooperation with police and BWC support. For example, those that

believed fewer witnesses, victims, and citizens would cooperate with police were less likely to support BWCs than those that believed otherwise.

Among bivariate measures of demographic characteristics, only respondent's political affiliation influenced the level of BWC support. Self-identified Democrats were more supportive of the use of BWC technology than any other political party.

Table 2

Bivariate Relations Between Demographic Factors, Perceived Negative Consequences, and Public Support for BWCs

Potential Negative Consequences	Support BWC Percent	Demographic Characteristics	Support BWC Percent
Agree Violate Privacy of Suspect	64*	Male	85
Disagree Violate Privacy of Suspect	88	Female	85
Agree Violate Privacy of Victims	71*	<30 years	85
Disagree Violate Privacy of Victims	89	>30 years	85
Agree Violate Privacy of People in Viewing Range	70*	White	84
Disagree Violate Privacy of People in Viewing Range	89	Black	90
		Hispanic	91
		Other	90
Agree Media Access to Any BWC recording	90*	College Graduate	85
Disagree Media Access to Any BWC recording	83	High School Graduate or Less	86
Agree Public Access to Any BWC Recording	88	Urban	86
Disagree Public Access to any BWC recording	84	Rural	85
Reduces Witness Cooperation	80*	Income < \$50,000	83
No increase or Impact on Witness Cooperation	89	Income > \$50,000	87
Reduce Victim Cooperation	78*	Democrat	89*
No increase or Impact on Victim Cooperation	89	Republican	82
		Independent	82
Reduce Citizen Cooperation	75*		
No Increase or Impact on Citizen Cooperation	90		

* $P < 0.05$.

Multivariate Analysis.

To further examine the influence of respondents' demographics and potential negative consequences, a multivariate analysis was performed. A logistic regression analysis was conducted to evaluate the net impact of individual's views about the potential negative consequences and demographic attributes on their support for BWCs. These results are shown in Table 3.

As shown in Table 3, several measures of the adverse consequences of BWC usage had significant net effects on public attitudes about this technology. After controlling for the demographic variables in this analysis, people who view BWCs as a violation of suspect's privacy were significantly less supportive of BWCs than those that did not. Similarly, among measures of accessibility to BWC footage, those that supported media access were also significantly more likely to support BWC usage than people that did not believe that the media should have access to the BWC footage. For the question about cooperation when BWCs were used, those that believed that fewer citizens would cooperate were far less likely to support BWCs than people who did not believe in this chilling effect of this technology. The other measures of negative consequences and most of the demographic characteristics did not have a significant net effect on public support for BWC usage.

Table 3

Logistic Regression Analysis of Predictors of Perceived Negative Consequences and Public Support for BWCs

Predictor Variable	Support for BWCs Odds ratio
Violate Privacy of Victims	1.00
Violate Privacy of Suspects	0.41*
Violate Privacy of Any Person in Viewing Range	0.56
Media Access to BWC Recording	2.73*
Public Access to Any BWC Recording	0.81
Witnesses reduce cooperation with BWCs	1.38
Victims reduce cooperation with BWCs	0.78
Citizens reduce cooperation with BWCs	0.43*
Male	0.94
<30 years	1.05
White	0.75
Black	1.61
Hispanic	1.37
College Graduate	0.88
Democrat	1.69
Republican	1.08
City Resident <1 million	1.15
Income > \$50,000	1.47
<i>N</i>	599
Nagelkerke <i>R</i> ²	0.17

* *P*<0.05.

Section 4

Discussion

This section will provide a summary of the univariate, bivariate, and multivariate analysis for each of the four questions provided in sections 1 and 2. The findings from the bivariate and multivariate analyses showed that some negative consequences of BWCs do have an influence on overall support for the devices. This section will discuss the significant results from the analyses, which are presented below according to each research question.

Research Question 1) Do individuals' perceptions that BWCs violate the personal privacy of crime victims, suspects, and the public impact their overall support of the police use of BWCs?

The bivariate analysis revealed that survey respondents who believe that BWCs violate the privacy of crime suspects, victims, and the public were all significantly less likely to support the use of the technology. However, the multivariate analysis indicated that once all variables were controlled for, the model suggests that only respondents that agreed that BWCs violate of suspects' privacy were significantly less likely to support the use of the technology.

Research Question 2) Do the beliefs about media and public support for having access to BWC footage influence individual's overall support for BWC usage?

The findings about the relationship between respondents' views of accessibility of BWC footage and BWC support varied across the particular source of this accessibility. For both the bivariate and multivariate analyses, respondents who believed in media accessibility were more support of BWCs than who had less favorable views about media accessibility. There was no significant relationship between views that the public should have access to BWC footage on levels of support.

Research Question 3) Do public opinions on whether the presence of police BWCs leads to fewer witness, victim, and citizen cooperation influence the support for BWC usage?

The results of the bivariate analysis indicated that beliefs about the chilling effect for citizen, witness, and victim cooperation with police wearing BWCs significantly influenced support for the use of the devices. Respondents who believed that fewer witnesses would cooperate with police with BWCs were less likely to support the devices. Additionally, those that believed police BWCs would result in fewer witness and victim cooperation were significantly less likely to support the use of BWCs in policing. These findings are also reflected in the multivariate analysis.

The multivariate analysis showed that support for the use of BWCs in policing was significantly lower when respondents believed that there was a reduction in cooperation for those individuals interacting with police. Those that did not believe there would be a chilling effect when cooperating with police were significantly less likely to support the use of BWCs in policing.

Research Question 4) Do respondents' demographic characteristics influence their support for BWCs?

Individual's demographic characteristics were generally not significantly related to support for BWCs. The exception is that support for BWC's were significantly higher among Democrats than people with other political identities.

Section 5

Conclusion

This study utilized data collected by Sousa et al. (2015, 2017) which examined the relations between respondents' demographic factors and views of potential benefits of BWCs on the public support for the use of BWCs in policing. While Sousa et al. were able to find significant relationships between views of potential benefits on overall support for BWCs in policing, they did not examine how the views of negative consequences might influence support. To address this gap in knowledge, the purposes of this study was to examine the influence of respondent demographics and views on potential adverse consequences on overall support for BWCs. To examine the relationship between demographic characteristics and negative consequences of support, this study utilized univariate, bivariate, and multivariate analyses. This section will summarize the main findings, compare the current findings to the current literature, discuss the findings in relation to the demographic characteristics and negative consequences on support, and discuss policy implications, limitations, and directions for future research.

Main findings

This study indicated that there was some influence of potential negative consequences of BWCs on overall support for BWCs, although demographic factors did not explain much variation in support. These findings will be summarized below based on the method of analysis.

The univariate analysis shows the frequency of respondents' views on the potential negative consequences of BWCs in U.S. policing. The distributions show that the public generally does not view BWCs as a violation of victim's privacy (79%), suspects' privacy

(13%), nor the privacy of people in viewing range of BWCs (78%). In terms of access to BWC recordings, most respondents did not believe that the media should have access to footage (69%) while an even higher percentage did not think that any member of the public should have access (78%). Although a minority, a substantial percentage of respondents thought that fewer witnesses (41%), victims (38%), and citizens (35%) would cooperate with police that had BWCs.

The bivariate analysis revealed several group differences between demographic factors, potential negative consequences, and support for BWCs. The level of public support was influenced by nearly all of the eight measures of negative consequences used in this study. In particular, those that agreed that BWCs violate the privacy of suspects, victims, and the public did support the use of the technology in general, though less so than those who believed that BWCs did not violate privacy. The agreement on the accessibility of BWC footage also showed some variability. Only those that agreed the media should have access to the BWC footage were significantly more likely to support the use of BWCs than those that did not agree on accessibility by the media. There was not a significant relationship between support and views on public accessibility.

The multivariate analysis revealed that the predictors for BWC support varied across measures. For example, demographic characteristics generally did not explain much variation in support for BWCs, with only a 3.6% variation in BWCs support was explained by demographic factors. However, the level of BWC support was influenced by several measures of the negative consequences of BWC. In particular, significantly less public support for BWC usage was found when respondents (1) believe that BWCs violated the privacy of suspects, (2) do not support media access to BWC footage, and (3) believe that BWCs reduce citizen's

cooperation with the police. Support for BWCs was not significantly influenced by the other measures of negative consequences.

Policy Implications

There are many implications of research on the public's perception of the potential negative consequences of BWCs in the United States. Awareness of potential adverse consequences can help introduce policies to avoid harm and evidence-based research showing public perceptions of these negative consequences can help guide legislative decisions in the implementation of BWCs. Policing agencies should consider public views of adverse consequences of BWCs to guide policy decisions for the use of the surveillance technology in policing.

Agencies that deploy BWCs must consider requirements on accessibility of the footage, when to use the recordings for evidentiary purposes, and consider the privacy of officers and other within the camera's frame. Another policy implication related to the privacy rights of individuals includes the interactions between officers and citizens, such as how statements are recorded. Most guiding policy documents recommend that officers utilize discretion in activation for BWCs, but activation of BWCs for individuals with privacy exceptions may not be known by officers, leading to ethical issues of the recorded footage. BWCs also record intimate interactions of a person at their worst. This study could help guide policies and training on the activation of BWCs in consideration of individual privacies.

These findings could encourage policing agencies to consider potential adverse consequences of BWCs in policing. Ways criminal justice agencies can address the issues involved in surveillance technology is to understand how the public perceives adverse

consequences and policies, training, communication, and positive interactions between the community and police.

Limitations

The limitations of this study pertain to the data collection and sample size. The analyses were limited to the data collected during the original study, and so additional survey items that may be relevant to the research questions were not possible (i.e., respondent personal interaction with officers, prior victimization experiences). The survey was also distributed in 2015, a time when BWCs were not as widely known and present, and it is difficult to know if public support for the devices would change after the pandemic, the Black Lives Matter movement, the protests, and media's sensationalism of police lethal use of force. Additionally, the public may not be aware of the potential costs of exposure due to the accessibility of BWC footage.

Another potential limitation of this study is in the distribution and generalizability of findings to the national population based on the sample. This study was conducted via an electronically distributed survey, and as such, respondents were unable to get easy and timely clarification on questions. There were subjective, dichotomous cutoffs within the demographic-related survey questions. A final concern in the study's sample representativeness of the U.S. population, as the survey was distributed online, and thus limited to those that had internet.

Future Directions

This study presents some directions for future research involved with BWCs and public opinion of the technology. It is important to continue research on the effectiveness of BWCs in policing. One such way to continue research on the effectiveness of BWCs is to examine the public's opinions on the technology.

A mixed methods study on the public's perceptions of BWCs would vastly help

researchers understand the theorized effectiveness of the technology in policing. The theoretical framework for this study included the BWCs effectiveness in deterring socially undesirable behavior through self-awareness of being watched. Researchers could explicitly examine if BWCs are effective in enhancing or deterring good behavior. For example, researchers could interview officers and members of the public to gauge reactions to recorded BWC footage and its effectiveness in deterrence through self-awareness. Additionally, the influence of respondents' previous treatment as a victim and opinions on negative consequences may be a potential avenue of future research.

Future research may also consider the benefits and costs analysis in the use of BWCs in policing. For example, researchers could consider the necessity of BWCs in certain policing situations, and if those scenarios influence overall support for the use of the technology, through surveys to officers, members of the public, and those that have interacted with police. Researchers could examine the different policies across police agencies to create survey questions to find if some policies are more effective than others. Research could also examine the influence of protest participation on support for the use of surveillance technology in policing. Additionally, researchers could have respondents watch videos of interactions from the BWC perspective versus other surveillance technology to gather the effectiveness and need for the devices as well as support for the technology before and after viewing the interaction. The relationship between respondent characteristics and support for the use of BWCs can help policies related to the use of the devices during interactions with the community. This study was unable to find a significant relationship between opinions of BWCs and demographic factors, but future research could allow respondents to have the ability to answer more demographic related questions to examine a significant relationship.

Concluding Remarks

This study's analysis on factors influential on overall public support for using BWCs in policing showed that perceptions of negative consequences are an important consideration. This study showed that the public is somewhat skeptical of BWCs in terms of privacy of suspects and opinions on cooperation. When compared to previous research on the public's perceptions, this study proves that adverse consequences of privacy and cooperation can influence one's support for BWCs in policing. The influence of negative consequences on overall support for the use of police surveillance technology is an important consideration in the deployment of the devices, and insight on the public's perceptions of consequences can help policing authorities identify and form policies that improve accountability while also protecting privacy of individuals.

Appendix A

Tables

Table 1

Coding of Variables and Univariate Distributions

Variable	Coding	% (n)
Dependent Variable		
Support BWC on police	1= Support 0= Oppose/unsure	85.1 (524) 14.9 (92)
Independent Variables		
Agree BWC Violate Privacy of Victims	1= Agree/strongly agree 0= Strongly disagree/disagree/unsure	20.7 (127) 79.3 (487)
Agree BWC Violate Privacy of Suspects	1= Agree/strongly agree 0= Strongly disagree/disagree/unsure	13.0 (80) 87.0 (534)
Violate privacy of people in viewing range	1= Agree/strongly agree 0= Strongly disagree/disagree/unsure	26.2 (162) 73.8 (457)
Agree that Media Should Have Access to any BWC Recording	1= Agree/strongly agree 0= Strongly disagree/disagree/unsure	31.2 (193) 68.8 (426)
Agree that Any Member of Public Should Have Access to any BWC Recording	1= Agree/strongly agree 0= Strongly disagree/disagree/unsure	21.7 (133) 78.3 (480)
Witnesses will worry about cooperating with police	1= Fewer witnesses will worry 0= More witnesses will worry/no impact	41.3 (255) 58.7 (362)
Victims will worry about cooperating with police	1= Fewer victims will worry 0= More victims will worry/no impact	37.8 (233) 62.2 (384)

Variable	Coding	% (n)
Citizens will worry about cooperating with police	1= Fewer citizens will worry 0= More citizens will worry/no impact	34.7 (214) 65.3 (403)
Gender (Male)	1= Male 0= Female	54.3 (333) 45.7 (280)
Age (<30 years)	1= Under 30 Years Old 0= 30 or Older	36.9 (226) 63.1 (386)
Race/Ethnicity 1	1= White	78.1 (477)
Race/Ethnicity 2	1= Black	6.9 (42)
Race/Ethnicity 3	1= Hispanic	5.6 (34)
Race/Ethnicity 4 (Reference Category)	0= Other Race/Ethnicity	9.5 (58)
Education (College Graduate)	0= High School Graduate or Less 1= Some College/College Graduate	13.0 (79) 87.0 (529)
City Resident >1 million	0= City/Town < 1 Million Population 1= Large City > 1 Million Population	82.3 (502) 17.7 (108)
Income > \$50,000	0= <\$50,000 Annual Income 1= > \$50,000 Annual Income	57.1 (350) 42.9 (263)
Democratic Party Orientation	1= Democrat	44.2 (269)
Republican Party Orientation	1= Republican	18.4 (112)
Independent (Reference Category)	0= Independent	37.4 (228)

Table 2

Bivariate Relations Between Demographic Factors, Perceived Negative Consequences, and Public Support for BWCs

Potential Negative Consequences	Support BWC Percent	Demographic Characteristics	Support BWC Percent
Agree Violate Privacy of Suspect	64*	Male	85
Disagree Violate Privacy of Suspect	88	Female	85
Agree Violate Privacy of Victims	71*	<30 years	85
Disagree Violate Privacy of Victims	89	>30 years	85
Agree Violate Privacy of People in Viewing Range	70*	White	84
Disagree Violate Privacy of People in Viewing Range	89	Black	90
		Hispanic	91
		Other	90
Agree Media Access to Any BWC recording	90*	College Graduate	85
Disagree Media Access to Any BWC recording	83	High School Graduate or Less	86
Agree Public Access to Any BWC Recording	88	Urban	86
Disagree Public Access to any BWC recording	84	Rural	85
Reduces Witness Cooperation	80*	Income < \$50,000	83
No increase or Impact on Witness Cooperation	89	Income > \$50,000	87
Reduce Victim Cooperation	78*	Democrat	89*
No increase or Impact on Victim Cooperation	89	Republican	82
		Independent	82
Reduce Citizen Cooperation	75*		
No Increase or Impact on Citizen Cooperation	90		

* $P < 0.05$.

Table 3

Logistic Regression Analysis of Predictors of Perceived Negative Consequences of BWCs and Public Support for BWCs

Predictor Variable	Support for BWCs
	Odds ratio
Violate Privacy of Victims	1.00
Violate Privacy of Suspects	0.41*
Violate Privacy of Any Person in Viewing Range	0.56
Media Access to BWC Recording	2.73*
Public Access to Any BWC Recording	0.81
Witnesses reduce cooperation with BWCs	1.38
Victims reduce cooperation with BWCs	0.78
Citizens reduce cooperation with BWCs	0.43*
Male	0.94
<30 years	1.05
White	0.75
Black	1.61
Hispanic	1.37
College Graduate	0.88
Democrat	1.69
Republican	1.08
City Resident <1 million	1.15
Income > \$50,000	1.47
<i>N</i>	599
Nagelkerke R^2	0.17

* $P < 0.05$.

Appendix B Survey Instrument

Survey Topics for Public Attitudes of Body Cameras and Policing:

Introduction to Survey:

The body worn camera is a small video / audio recording device worn on police officers' uniforms, usually on the chest area or collar. When activated, the body camera provides a visual record of officers' activities and their interactions with citizens. Many police departments are now considering the wider use of body cameras. However, we know little about the nature of public support for this technology and people's views about how body cameras may influence citizens' communications with officers or cooperation with police investigations. Studying public attitudes about police and body cameras is important to more fully understand the potential strengths and weaknesses of this technology in police work.

The following survey is designed to ask your opinion about police use of body worn cameras. There are no right or wrong answers to these questions. We are only interested in your general feelings about this technology and its use in police work.

1. First, prior to reading the introduction to this survey, had you heard about police wearing body cameras in their daily interactions with citizens and crime suspects?

- No
- Yes

2. Are any police officers in your town currently wearing body cameras?

- No
- Yes
- Don't know

3. How much do you agree or disagree with the following statements about *the possible impact of body worn cameras on police-citizen interactions?*

Strongly Disagree
 Disagree
 Unsure
 Agree
 Strongly Agree

a. Police will behave more respectfully toward crime suspects.					
b. Police will behave more respectfully toward crime victims.					
c. Police will behave more respectfully toward citizens in general.					
d. Citizens will behave more respectfully toward police.					
e. Citizens will reduce false complaints of police misconduct.					
f. Citizens will have greater trust in police.					
g. Racial tension between police and citizens from minority communities will decline.					

4. How much do you agree or disagree that police body cameras...

Strongly Disagree
Disagree
Unsure
Agree
Strongly Agree

a. Reduce use of excessive force by police					
b. Reduce other types of police misconduct (e.g., abuse of power, discourtesy, offensive language)					
c. Improve police transparency by providing a visual record of police-citizen interactions					
d. Improve police relationships with citizens					
e. Improve evidence gathering in criminal incidents					

5. How much do you agree or disagree that police body cameras...

Strongly Disagree
Disagree
Unsure
Agree
Strongly Agree

a. Violate the personal privacy of crime <i>suspects</i> being questioned by the police.					
b. Violate the personal privacy of crime <i>victims</i> being questioned by the police.					
c. Violate the personal privacy of <i>any person</i> within the viewing range of the camera.					
d. Provide an accurate account of the chain of events that occur in police-citizen interactions.					

6. How much do you agree or disagree with these statements about different policies concerning the use of body worn cameras:

Strongly Disagree
Disagree
Unsure
Agree
Strongly Agree

a. Police should notify citizens whenever a camera is recording.					
b. Police should comply with victim/witness requests to turn off body cameras.					
c. Police should comply with the requests of all citizens to turn off body cameras.					
d. Police should always have the camera on when interacting with a citizen					
e. People recorded on body cameras should have access to their video recording					
f. The media should have access to any body-camera recording.					
g. Any member of the public should have access to any video camera recording.					

7. How much do you agree or disagree with the following statements about body cameras and crime victims, witnesses, and citizens...

Strongly Disagree
Disagree
Unsure
Agree
Strongly Agree

a. Crime victims will worry about cooperating with police due to concerns over body cameras recording their statements					
b. Witnesses will worry about cooperating with police due to concerns over body cameras recording their statements					
c. Citizens will worry about approaching officers to discuss suspicious activities in their neighborhoods due to concerns over body cameras recording their statements					

8. What do you think are the top three major benefits of requiring body cameras for police officers? (check only 3 of the following)

- Greater transparency through the video recording of police-citizen interactions.
- Reducing in the frequency of excessive use of force by police.
- Reducing other forms of police misconduct.
- Reducing false complaints of police misconduct.
- Improving evidence gathering in criminal incidents.
- Improving civility and respect of police toward citizens.
- Improving civility and respect of citizens toward police.

9. What do you think the three most serious negative consequences of requiring body cameras for police officers? (check only 3 of the following)

- Violations of the personal privacy rights of criminal suspects.
- Violations of the personal privacy rights of crime victims who are being questioned by the police.
- Violations of the personal privacy rights of citizens who are in the viewing range of the body camera.
- Fewer crime victims cooperating with police due to the fear of body cameras recording their statements.
- Fewer crime witnesses cooperating with police due to the fear of body cameras recording their statements.
- Fewer citizens willing to approach officers to discuss suspicious activities because of fear of body cameras recording their statements.

10. In general, how would you rate the potential benefits and potential negative consequence of using body cameras in police work?

- More benefits than negative consequences.
- More negative consequences than benefits.
- Equal benefits and negative consequences.

11. How necessary are body cameras in the following areas of police work?

Not Necessary
Somewhat necessary
Very necessary
Don't know

a. Traffic stops of drivers on streets / highways				
b. Stopping people in public places				
c. Responding to calls for service at a person's home				
d. Routine surveillance of known crime areas				
e. Monitoring crowds and demonstrations				
f. Transporting arrested persons to secure locations				
g. High risk operations (drug raids, hostage situations, SWAT operations, etc.)?				
h. Assisting with medical emergencies				

12. In general, do you SUPPORT or OPPOSE requiring police officers to wear body cameras?

- Support
- Oppose
- Unsure

13. Please indicate how much you would support the use of body worn cameras by the following public safety officials:

No Support
Some Support
Strongly Support
Not Sure

a. Local and state police officers				
b. Federal uniformed police (such as Border Patrol and Park Rangers)				
c. Transportation Security Administration officers (TSA) (airport security)				
d. Correctional officers				
e. School security officers				
f. Private security guards (such as at malls or local businesses)				
g. Firefighters				
h. Emergency medical technicians (EMTs)				
i. Neighborhood watch volunteers				

14. Please indicate how much you agree or disagree with the following statement:

I have confidence in my local police department

- Strongly Agree
- Agree
- Neutral
- Disagree
- Strongly Disagree

Finally, a few questions about you:

15. Have you or any member of your immediate family ever worked for a law enforcement agency?

- No
- Yes

16. Gender

- Female
- Male

17. Age Group:

- 19 or under
- 20-29
- 30-39
- 40-49
- 50-59
- 60-69
- 70 or older

18. How would you best describe yourself?

- American Indian or Alaskan Native
- Asian
- Black or African American
- Hispanic
- Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander
- White or Caucasian
- Other (please specify) _____

19. Highest Level of Education Completed:

- Less than high school
- High school graduate or the equivalent (e.g., GED)
- Some college
- College graduate
- Post-graduate degree

20. Primary Employment / Activity Status:

- Full time employed (30 or more hours)
- Part time employed (less than 30 hours)
- Unemployed
- Retired
- Student
- Volunteer
- Other (please specify) _____

21. Live in an Urban or Rural Area?

- Large Urban area (greater than 1 million population)
- Medium Size Urban area (50,000 to 1 million population)
- Smaller Urban area (2,500 to 50,000 population)
- Rural area (less than 2,500 population)

22. Place of Residency:

- State: _____
- Country: _____

23. Political Party Orientation – leaning toward Democrat, Republican, or Independent?

- Democrat
- Republican
- Independent

24. Would you prefer a government that puts greater emphasis on public safety or individual rights?

- Public Safety
- Individual Rights

25. Annual Household Income:

- Less than \$25,000
- \$25,000 to \$50,000
- \$50,000 to \$75,000
- \$75,000 to \$100,000
- \$100,000 or more

References

- Ariel, B., Farrar, W., & Sutherland, A. (2014). The effect of police-worn cameras on use of force and citizens' complaints against the police: A randomized control trial. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology, 31*, 509-535. DOI: 10.1007/s10940-014-9236-3.
- Ariel, B. (2016). Increasing cooperation with the police using body-worn cameras. *Police Quarterly, 19*(3), 326-362. DOI:10.1177/1098611116653723
- Ariel, B., Sutherland, A., Henstock, D., Young, J., Drover, P., Sykes, J., Megicks, S., & Henderson, R. (2016a). Report: Increases in police use of force in the presence of body-worn cameras are driven by officer discretion: A protocol-based subgroup analysis of ten randomized experiments. *Journal of Experimental Criminology, 12*, 453-463. DOI: 10.1007/s11292-016-9261-3.
- Ariel, B., Sutherland, A., Henstock, D., Young, J., Drover, P., Sykes, J., Megicks, S., & Henderson, R. (2016b). Wearing body worn cameras increases assaults against and does not reduce police use of force: Results from a global multi-site experiment. *European Journal of Criminology, 13*(6), 744-755. DOI: 10.1177/147737081663734.
- Ariel, B., Sutherland, A., Henstock, D., Young, J., Drover, P., Sykes, J., Megicks, S., & Henderson, R. (2017a). "Contagious accountability": A global multisite randomized controlled trial on the effect of police-worn body cameras on citizens' complaints against police. *Criminal Justice and Behavior, 44*(2), 293-316. DOI: 10.1177/009385481666218.
- Ariel, B., Sutherland, A., Henstock, D., Young, J., & Sosinski, G. (2017b). The deterrence spectrum: Explaining why police body worn cameras 'work' or 'backfire' in aggressive police-public encounters. *Policing, 12*(1) 1-21. DOI: 10.1093/police/paw051.

- Ariel, B., Sutherland, A., Henstock, D., Young, J., Drover, P., Sykes, J., Megicks, S., & Henderson, R. (2018). Paradoxical effects of self-awareness of being observed: Testing the effect of police body-worn cameras on assaults and aggression against officers. *Journal of Experimental Criminology, 14*, 19-47. DOI: 10.1007/s11292-017-9311-5.
- Baker, M. & Bacharach, V. (2017). Police officer-civilian confrontations caught on camera: The influence of contextual frames on judgements of excessive force. *American Journal of Criminal Justice, 42*, 683-697. DOI: 10.1007/s12103-017-9387-5.
- Braga, A., Sousa, W., Coldren, J., & Rodriguez, D. (2018). The effects of body-worn cameras on police activity and police-citizen encounters: A randomized control trial. *The Journal of Criminal Law & Criminology, 108*(3), 511-538.
- Bud, T. K. (2016). The rise and risks of police body-worn cameras in Canada. *Surveillance and Society, 14*(1), 117-121. <http://ojs.library.queensu.ca/index.php/surveillance-and-society/index>
- Carmichael, J., David, J. D., Helou, A. M., & Pereira, C. (2020). Determinants of citizens' perceptions of police behavior during traffic and pedestrian stops. *Criminal Justice Review, 46*(1), 99-118. DOI: 10.1177/0734016820952523.
- Casey, T. (2019). The value of deviance: Understanding contextual privacy. *Loyola University Chicago Law Journal, 51*, 65-105.
- Coudert, F., Butin, D., & Le Metayer, D. (2015). Body-worn cameras for police accountability: Opportunities and risks. *Computer Law & Security Review, 31*(6), 749-762. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.clsr.2015.09.002>.
- Crow, M. S., Snyder, J. A., Crichlow, V. J., & Smykla, J. O. (2017). Community perceptions of police body-worn cameras: The impact of views of fairness, fear, performance, and

privacy. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 44(4), 589-610. DOI:
10.1177/0093854816688037.

Dudinskaya, T. (2020). Examining crime reporting behaviors in the presence of body-worn cameras. *ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global*. (2435226244).
<http://ezproxy.library.unlv.edu/login?url=https://www.proquest.com/dissertations-theses/examining-crime-reporting-behaviors-presence-body/docview/2435226244/se-2?accountid=3611>.

Duval, S., & Wicklund, R. (1972). *A theory of objective self-awareness*. New York: Academic Press.

Fan, M. D. (2017). Justice visualized: Courts and the body camera revolution. *UC Davis Law Review*, 50(3), 897-959.

Freund, K. (2019). When cameras are rolling: Privacy implications of body-mounted cameras on police. *Columbia Journal of Law and Social Problems*, 49(1), 91-133.
<https://www.proquest.com/scholarly-journals/when-cameras-are-rolling-privacy-implications/docview/2056798485/se-2?accountid=3611>

Gaub, J., & White, M. (2020). Open to interpretation: Confronting the challenges of understanding the current state of body-worn camera research. *American Journal of Criminal Justice*, 45, 899-913. DOI: 10.1007/s12103-020-09518-4.

Goodall, M. (2007). *Guidance for the police use of body-worn video devices: Police and crime standards directorate*. United Kingdom's Home Office for the Association of Chiefs of Police. <https://library.college.police.uk/docs/homeoffice/guidance-body-worn-devices.pdf>

- Hedberg, E.C., Katz, C. M., & Choate, D. (2017) Body-Worn Cameras and Citizen Interactions with Police Officers: Estimating Plausible Effects Given Varying Compliance Levels, *Justice Quarterly*, 34(4), 627-651, DOI: 10.1080/07418825.2016.1198825
- Heen, M. S., Lieberman, J. D., & Miethe, T. D. (2014). A comparison of different online sampling approaches for generating national samples. *Center for Crime and Justice Policy*. e_files/27/ComparisonDifferentOnlineSampling.pdf
- Heen, M., Lieberman, J. D., & Miethe, T. D. (2018). The thin blue line meets the big blue sky: Perceptions of police legitimacy and public attitudes toward aerial drones. *Criminal Justice Studies*, 31(1), 18-37. DOI: 10.1080/1478601X.2017.1404463
- Huff, J. (2020). Examining variation in police discretion: The impact of context and body-worn cameras on officer behavior. *ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global*. (2408527431). <http://ezproxy.library.unlv.edu/login?url=https://www.proquest.com/dissertations-theses/examining-variation-police-discretion-impact/docview/2408527431/se-2?accountid=3611>.
- International Association of Chiefs of Police. (2014). Model Policy on BWC. <https://www.theiacp.org/sites/default/files/all/b/BodyWornCamerasPolicy.pdf>.
- Jennings, W., Lynch, M., & Fridell, L. (2015). Evaluating the impact of police officer body-worn cameras (BWCs) on response-to-resistance and serious external complaints: Evidence from the Orlando Police Department (OPD) experience utilizing a randomized controlled experiment. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 43, 480-486. DOI: 10.1016/j.jcrimjus.2015.10.003

- Jennings, W., Fridell, L., & Lynch, M. (2014). Cops and cameras: Officer perceptions of the use of body-worn cameras in law enforcement. *Journal of Criminal Justice, 42*, 549-556.
DOI: 10.1016/j.crimjus.2014.09.008
- Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department. (2020). *Policies for Body-Worn Cameras: LVMPD 5-210.01 Body-Worn Cameras rev. 6-20*. Retrieved from [https://www.lvmpd.com/en-us/InternalOversightConstitutionalPolicing/Documents/LVMPD%205-210.01%20Body%20Worn%20Cameras%20rev.%206-20%20\(1\).pdf](https://www.lvmpd.com/en-us/InternalOversightConstitutionalPolicing/Documents/LVMPD%205-210.01%20Body%20Worn%20Cameras%20rev.%206-20%20(1).pdf)
- Lawrence, D., McClure, D., Malm, A., Lynch, M., & Vigne, N. (2019). Activation of body-worn cameras: Variations by officer, over time, and by policing activity. *Criminal Justice Review, 44*(3), 339-355. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0734016819846228>
- Lum, C., Stoltz, M., Koper, C. S., & Scherer, J. A. (2019). Research on body-worn cameras: What we know, what we need to know. *Criminology and Public Policy, 1*-26. DOI: 10.1111/1745-9133.12412
- Maury, K. J. (2016). Police body-worn camera policy: Balancing the tension between privacy and public access in state laws. *Notre Dame Law Review, 92*(1), 479-512.
- Miethe, M., Lieberman, J., Heen, M., & Sousa, W. (2019). Public attitudes about body-worn cameras in police work: A national study of the sources of the contextual variability. *Criminal Justice Review, 44*(3), 263-283. DOI: 10.1177/0734016819846241
- Mitchell, S. (2019). Evaluating impacts and defining public perceptions of police BWCs. ProQuest One Academic. (2225449105).
<http://ezproxy.library.unlv.edu/login?url=https://www.proquest.com/dissertations-theses/evaluating-impacts-defining-public-perceptions/docview/2225449105/se-2?accountid=3611>

- Molnar, A., & Warren, I. (2020). Governing liberty through accountability: Surveillance reporting as technologies of governmentality. *Critical Criminology*, 28, 13-26. DOI: 10.1007/s10612-020-09490-9.
- Morin, R., Parker, K., Stepler, R., & Mercer, A. (2017). Police views public views. Pew Research Center. <https://www.pewresearch.org/social-trends/2017/01/11/police-views-public-views/>
- National Institute of Justice. (2012). *A primer on body-worn cameras for law enforcement*. United States Department of Justice. <https://nij.ojp.gov/library/publications/primer-body-worn-cameras-law-enforcement>
- National Institute of Justice. (2022, January 7). *Research on body-worn cameras and law enforcement*. United States Department of Justice. <https://nij.ojp.gov/topics/articles/research-body-worn-cameras-and-law-enforcement#citation--0>
- Newell, B. (2021). *Police Visibility: Privacy, Surveillance, and the False Promise of Body-Worn Cameras*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Saulnier, A., Lahay, R., McCarty, W., & Sanders, C. (2020). The RIDE study: Effects of body-worn cameras on public perceptions of police interactions. *Criminology & Public Policy*, 19(3), 833-854. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1745-9133.12511>
- Sousa, W. H., Miethe T. D., & Sakiyama, M. (2015). Body worn cameras on police: Results from a national survey of public attitudes. *Center for Crime and Justice Policy*. https://www.unlv.edu/sites/default/files/page_files/27/BodyWornCameras.pdf
- Sousa, W. H., Coldren, J. R., Rodriguez, D., & Braga, A. (2016). Research on body worn cameras: Meeting the challenges of police operations, program implementation, and

- randomized controlled trial designs. *Police Quarterly*, 19(3), 363-384. DOI: 10.1177/1098611116658595.
- Sousa, W. H., Miethe T. D., & Sakiyama, M. (2017). Inconsistencies in public opinion of body-worn cameras on police: Transparency, trust, and improved police-citizen relationships. *Policing*, 12(1), 100-108. DOI:10.1093/police/pax015
- Tankebe, J. (2013). Viewing things different: The dimensions of public perceptions of police legitimacy. *Criminology*, 51(1), 103-135. DOI: 10.1111/j.1745-9125.2012.00291.x
- Taylor, E., Lee, M., Willis, M., & Gannoni, A. (2017). Police detainee perspectives on police body-worn cameras. *Australian Institute of Criminology: Trends and Issues in crime and criminal justice*, No. 537, 1-14.
- The United States Department of Justice. (2020) *Overview of the Privacy Act of 1974*. Office of Privacy and Civil Liberties. <https://www.justice.gov/opcl/overview-privacy-act-1974-2020-edition>.
- Thomsen, F. (2020). The ethics of police body-worn cameras. *Moral Philosophy and politics*, 7(1), 97-121. <https://doi.org/10.1515/mopp-2019-0027>.
- Trinkner, R., Kerrison, E., & Goff, P. (2019). The force of fear: Police stereotype threat, self-legitimacy, and support for excessive force. *Law and Human Behavior*, 43(5), 421-435. DOI: 10.1037/lhb0000339
- Turner, B., Caruso, E., Dilich, M., & Roese, N. (2019). Body camera footage leads to lower judgements of intent than dash camera footage. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, 116(4), 1201-1206. <https://www.pnas.org/content/116/4/1201>.

- Wasserman, H. M. (2017). Recording of and by police: The good, the bad, and the ugly. *Journal of Gender, Race, and Justice*, 20(3), 543-562.
- Westin, A. (1967). *Privacy and Freedom*. Atheneum New York.
- White, M. D. (2014). *Police officer body-worn cameras: Assessing the evidence*. U.S. Department of Justice Office of Community Oriented Policing Services.
https://bja.ojp.gov/sites/g/files/xyckuh186/files/bwc/pdfs/diagnosticcenter_policeofficerbody-worncameras.pdf
- White, M. D., & Malm, A. (2020). *Cops, Camera, and Crisis: The Potential and Perils of Police Body-Worn Cameras*. New York University Press.
- Wright, J. & Brown, H. (2020). What matters more? Police or the community for body worn camera policy. *Police Administration Quarterly*, 44(3), 462-482.
<https://doi.org/10.37808/paq.44.3.5>
- Wright, J. & Headley, A. (2021). Can technology work for policing? Citizen perceptions of police-body worn cameras. *American Review of Public Administration*, 51(1), 17-27.
DOI: 10.1177/0275074020945632.

Curriculum Vitae

JORDYN SANDERS

Department of Criminal Justice | University of Nevada, Las Vegas
Jordynsanders94@gmail.com

Education

College of Southern Nevada Associate of Arts Honors: President and Dean's List	2016-2017
University of Nevada, Las Vegas Bachelor of Arts	2018-2019
University of Nevada, Las Vegas Master of Arts	2020-2022

Awards

INBRE Workshop	Summer 2017
President's List	Spring 2017 – Fall 2017
Dean's List	Spring 2016 – Fall 2016
Employee of the Month	March 2018 & April 2019

Teaching & Advising

College of Southern Nevada Writing Assistant & Tutor Mentor Tutored students in multiple subjects to improve writing structure, organization, format, and arguments in writing. Assisted specialists in observing tutoring sessions, developed tutoring plans, organized schedules, and assisted students in study skills and other subjects.	2017-Current
University of Nevada, Las Vegas Graduate Assistant for Professor Darwin Morgan Worked with course founders and other graduate assistants in a team-capacity to create a more engaging and student-driven introductory course for criminal justice for UNLV's Online General Education Program. Helped with the Urban Adventure classes as a teaching assistant and support member to help students get a true, hands-on experience with crime scene using critical thinking, leadership, collaboration, empathy, and effective communication skills.	2021-Current
University of Nevada, Las Vegas Graduate Assistant for Academic Success Coaching Guided first year and students with disabilities navigate the college experience by teaching soft skills development such as	2020-2021

time management methods, avoiding procrastination, effective communication, and other important skills in a one-on-one meeting.

RESEARCH INTERESTS

Critical and environmental criminology, policing, victimization, incarceration trends, and recidivism.

RESEARCH EXPERIENCE

Volunteer Research Assistant, Meta-Analysis on White-Collar crime with Dr. Melissa Rorie 2020

Undergraduate Research Assistant, Tourism Safety and Crowd Science, Impact of surveillance and facial recognition in casino in Las Vegas, NV. 2018-2019

PRESENTATIONS

Sanders, J. (2022, February). Public Perception of Witness and Citizen Willingness to Testify with Privacy Issues in the Presence of Police Body-Worn Cameras. Poster presentation at the Western Society of Criminology 48th Annual Conference, Honolulu, HI.

Sanders, J. (2022, March). Public Perception of Victim Willingness to Testify with Privacy Issues in the Presence of Police Body-Worn Cameras. Panel chair for Police and the Body-Worn Camera, paper presentation at the Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences 59th annual conference, Las Vegas, NV.

Professional experience

University of Nevada, Las Vegas
Graduate Assistant August 2021-Current

Worked to create a more engaging and student-driven introductory course for criminal justice for the University of Nevada, Las Vegas's Online General Education Program. Helped with the Urban Adventure classes as a teaching assistant and support member to help students get a true, hands-on experience with crime scene by using critical thinking, leadership, collaboration, empathy, and effective communication skills.

College of Southern Nevada
Tutor Mentor and Writing Assistant August 2017 – Current

Prepare handouts, informal quizzes, and other learning aids for students, maintain a professional attitude always. Monitor student progress and needs through proactive communication. Participate in development sessions regularly to improve tutoring practices and techniques.

University of Nevada, Las Vegas
 Volunteer Meta-Analysis Researcher for Dr. Melissa Rorie February 2021 – June 2021
 Assisted in white-collar crime research. Assigned different databases with key terms and gathered numerical data into spreadsheet with other volunteering graduate students.

University of Nevada, Las Vegas
 Academic Success Coach (DRC Lead) August 2020 – May 2021
 Prepare presentations, work closely with students, worked closely and assisted students with disabilities, and created forms and learning aids for students, maintain a professional attitude, help students with soft skills and navigating the college experience.

Clark County District Attorney’s Office
 Intern/Legal Clerical Assistant/Process Server August 2018 – March 2020
 Worked closely with District Attorney clerks in the SVU and DV unit. Helped file bench warrants, prepare calendars, and prep files.

University of Nevada, Las Vegas
 Research Assistant for Dr. Tamara Herold January 2019- May 2019
 Assisted with researchers in the tourism safety and crowd science by analyzing data, embarking on tours of various casinos to collect data with Dr. Tamara Herold.

24 Hour Fitness
 Kid’s Club Attendant March 2015- April 2018
 Observed and interacted with children ages 6 months to 12 years. Helped students with homework and cognitive development

Volunteer experience

Friends of Red Rock
 Visitor Center Educator 2018-Current

Lake Mead
 Conservation Education 2018-Current

Three-Square
 Volunteer and Call Center 2016-Current

The Mob Museum Tour guide and information provider	2017-2019
Community Youth Court Advocate in the Trial by Peers Program	2019
Hope for Prisoners Mentor to ex-convicted individuals looking for rehabilitation into the community	2018

LANGUAGES

English– native language
 American Sign Language– basic concepts
 Spanish- speak, read, and write with basic competence

MEMBERSHIPS

Phi Theta Kappa
 Sigma Kappa
 Alpha Phi Sigma
 Mock Trial Team
 Phi Alpha Delta: Secretary 2018
 History of International Law and Foundation: Vice President 2018
 Criminal Justice Club: Vice President 2018
 Western Society of Criminology
 Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences
 American Society of Criminology- Critical Criminology and Social Justice and Policing
 Division