The Police on Camera: A Case Study of Police Perceptions of and Responses to Cameras and Photographers in Edmonton Alberta

by

Ajay Sandhu

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Department of Sociology

University of Alberta

© Ajay Sandhu, 2016

Abstract

This project contributes to our understanding of police visibility through a case study of Albertan police officers' perceptions of, and responses to, the growing network of cameras targeting law enforcement agents. Contrary to what many readers might expect, my research participants did not uniformly resent or resist cameras. Instead they expressed diverse perspectives about being on camera, which I categorize as the apathetic perspective, strategic perspective, and camera-shy perspective. This dissertation provides insights into the perspectives that my participants aligned themselves with as they experienced higher visibility, how these perspectives influence their behaviour, and the implications of these perspectives for the popular assumptions that raising police visibility can contribute to police accountability, and incite a war against photography.

Preface

This thesis is an original work by Ajay Sandhu. The research project, of which this thesis is a part, received approval from the University of Alberta Research Ethics Board under the title "Policing on Film" (Study identification number: Pro00035241) on January 30, 2013. Sections of this thesis have been used for publications/journal submissions including:

- Policing on Camera by Ajay Sandhu and Kevin Haggerty which is to be published by Theoretical Criminology. I was responsible for the data collection and analysis as well as the manuscript composition and Dr. Kevin Haggerty was responsible for manuscript composition and editing.
- High-Visibility Policing: Policing on Camera and the Crisis of Police Legitimacy by Ajay Sandhu and Kevin Haggerty which has been published by Oxford Handbooks Online. I was responsible for the data collection and analysis as well as the manuscript composition and Dr. Kevin Haggerty was responsible for manuscript composition and editing.
- Camera-Friendly policing, which was accepted for publication by the Surveillance & Society Journal in February 2016.
- Crediting Images: Images which celebrate and applaud police officers, which was submitted to Surveillance & Society Journal in March 2016.

Acknowledgements

Though my name is alone on the front cover of this dissertation, it could not have been completed without the support of several mentors, research participants, and friends. I must start by thanking my academic supervisors whose guidance helped me develop the skills necessary to achieve academic successes. Thank you to Dr. Kevin Haggerty, for his patience and direction as I developed the critical thinking and writing skills to make this contribution to the sociological and criminological fields. Thank you to Dr. Sandra Bucerius, for her guidance as I developed the analytical skills required to write a social scientific research study which I can be proud of. Thank you to Dr. Tope Oriola, for his support over the course of my 4.5 years as a graduate student, including the recent opportunities he has provided as I prepare to enter the job market. Finally, thank you to the Sociology Department at the University of Alberta for the financial support and social networking opportunities it provided me.

Thank you to my research participants who allowed me to observe their police work in order to investigate the politics of police visibility. The police officers were accommodating, even allowing me into their personal lives to varying degrees. Without my participants' openness, I would not have been able to gather the valuable data upon which this dissertation is built.

Thank you to friends and family who supported me through my doctoral degree. Early in my degree I was diagnosed with a medical condition. With the support of friends and family, I was able to maintain a strong work ethic despite this condition, and complete my dissertation in a timely manner.

There are many more to thank, but too little time and space, so I conclude with a simple thank you to everyone who helped me undergo the sometimes stressful and frustrating but ultimately fulfilling doctoral process.

Chapter 1 Policing in an era of ubiquitous surveillance 1
1.1 Introduction 1
1.2 A Brief History of Police Visibility 3
1.3 Dissertation Outline 15

Chapter 2 Common Misperceptions About Police Visibility 17
2.1 Introduction 17
2.2 Common perceptions about who watches the police 17
2.3 Common perceptions about the implications of police visibility 25
2.4 The War Against Photography 32
2.5 Conclusion: My Approach to the Police's High Visibility 34

Chapter 3 Research Method 38
3.1 Introduction 38
3.2 Getting There: Where I Conducted My Case Study 41
3.3 Gathering Data: Participant Observation and Interviews 56
3.4 Being There: How I Interacted with Research Participants 61
3.5 Analysis and Coding 67
3.6 Canteen Culture 69
3.7 Conclusion: My study's limitations 72

Chapter 4 The Apathetic and Strategic Perspectives 75
4.1 Introduction 75
4.2 The Apathetic Perspective 75
4.3 The Strategic Perspective 82
4.4 Discussion: Cameras as Tools for the Police's Image Work 94
4.5 Conclusion: The War of Interpretation 97

Chapter 5 The Camera-Shy Perspective 99
5.1 Introduction 99
5.2 In-field Concerns 99
5.3 Image-Management Concerns 107
5.4 Discussion: Apathetic, Strategic, and Camera-Shy at the Same Time? 120
5.5 Conclusion: Still Apathetic? 123

Chapter 6 Camera-Friendly Policing 124
6.1 Introduction 124
6.2 Popular Perceptions About Police Responses to Cameras and Photographers 124
6.3 Camera-Friendly Policing 129
6.4 Discussion: Camera-friendly Policing a Sign of Progress 136
6.5 Conclusion: Camera-friendly policing and the Apathetic Perspective 138

Chapter 7 Coping, Joking and The Police's Backstage Behaviour 140
7.1 Introduction 140
7.2 Backstage Behaviours 140
7.3 How Sexuality and Gender Impact Backstage Coping and Joking 149
7.4 Discussion: Racial Joking and Stress Relief 151
7.5 Conclusion 156

Chapter 8 Crediting Images 158
8.1 Introduction 158

8.2 Popular Representations of Police and the Production of Knowledge 160
8.3 Crediting Images: COPS for the web 2.0 era 161
8.4 Discussion: Who Watches Crediting Images? 172
8.5 Conclusion: Crediting Images as Promotional Media? 175
Chapter 9 Conclusions 177
9.1 Introduction: A Summary of My Findings 177
9.2 Discussion: Theories About the Variability of Visibility and Surveillance 178
9.3 Conclusion: Speculation about the Future of the Police's High Visibility 183
Works Cited 186

Chapter 1 Policing in an era of ubiquitous surveillance

1.1 Introduction

In today's surveillance society (Lyon 1994; 2001; 2002; 2003), the police are increasingly monitored by a growing network of cameras (Goold, 2003b; Manning, 2003; Huey et al., 2006; Wilson and Serisier, 2010; Goldsmith, 2010; 2013; Greer and McLaughlin, 2010; 2011; 2012; Stuart, 2011; Toch, 2012; Schaefer and Steinmetz, 2014; Farmer et al. 2015; Evans, 2015; Brown, 2015; Brucato, 2015; Sandhu and Haggerty, 2015). Together, smartphone cameras, public and private surveillance cameras (also known as CCTV or closed circuit television cameras), vehicular cameras, and wearable cameras (also known as body cameras or point of view cameras) have made police work more visible than ever, and created new opportunities to scrutinize police behaviour. As a result, the study of policing now requires an analysis of the new and highly visible reality that police officers experience on a day-to-day basis.

Few empirical studies measure how this highly visible reality is *understood* by police officers, or how officers *respond* to photo/videographers (I will rely on the term photographers for simplicity). Despite this lack of research, popular ideas about the effects of the police's growing visibility have been spread by popular media and social activists (see http://www.berkeleycopwatch.org); the police's growing visibility tends to be either enthusiastically celebrated as a method by which to improve police work, as well as transparency and accountability in policing (Goldsmith, 2010; Brucato, 2015), or described as obstructive to police work, and something which police officers are likely to resent and resist (Wilson and Serisier, 2010; Simon, 2012; Wall and Linnemann, 2014; Mac Donald, 2015). The disconnect between the progress of police visibility, debates about if and how visibility affects policing, and the lack of research means that there is a significant need for empirical studies of police visibility.

Additionally, special attention must be given to how police officers, as the subjects experiencing this higher visibility, understand and respond to cameras and photographers. Such research would help determine if/how cameras and photographers affect the police's ability to protect and serve, if visibility can effectively contribute to accountability in policing, and improve our theoretical understanding of the surveillance of one of society's core socio-legal institutions (Manning and Van Maanen, 1978; Manning, 1988; 1997; Ericson and Haggerty, 1997; McLaughlin, 2007; Reiner, 2010).

The following details the findings of my dissertation research, a case study designed to help fill the aforementioned gap in research by providing empirical data on police officers' growing visibility. The primary objective of this research was to gather in-depth data about police officers' perceptions of, and responses to, cameras and photographers so that the effects of surveillance on policing could be critically examined, and to allow for the assessment of popular ideas relating the surveillance of police to improved behaviour, improved transparency, improved accountability, as well as resentment and resistance.

My research took place over 7 months in 2013 in Edmonton, Alberta, Canada. I relied on participant observation and interview data gathering strategies while I worked with 3 police organizations including the Edmonton Police Service (EPS), the Edmonton Transit Service (ETS), and a University Campus's police service (UPS). Each police service has regular contact with cameras and photographers, and therefore, they made ideal participants in a case study of the police's growing visibility. From January until February, I went on 5 ride-alongs with members of the EPS, and from June until December I went on over 40 ride-alongs with members of the ETS and UPS. My study relied on data from approximately 60 police officers whom I observed for 4-12 hours at a time. In aggregate, I spent over 200 hours observing officers while they engaged in patrols, conducted arrests, aided injured citizens, conducted traffic stops, intervened

in brawls, conducted stakeouts, responded to fires, aided medical professionals, wrote reports, and ate breakfast/lunch/dinner. Where possible, I asked them to clarify their perceptions of, experiences with, and responses to, cameras and photographers of all kinds. My research was broadly guided by the following research questions:

1. How do police officers understand and respond to the cameras recording them?
2. How do police officers understand and respond to the operators of these cameras?

My participants expressed diverse perspectives about being on camera, which I categorize as the apathetic perspective, the strategic perspective and the camera-shy perspective. What readers of my dissertation can expect is a discussion of these perspectives and what they reveal about the complex and contradictory nature of the police's high visibility.

My central argument is a critique of popular ideas about police visibility, particularly those which focus on how cameras can improve police accountability, as well as those which focus on the police's alleged war against photography. I assert that both ideas overlook a key element of police visibility: how police take advantage of their high visibility. Accordingly, I encourage future studies of police visibility to account for how police officers utilize cameras to produce imagery which offers a police-centric account of police work, disconfirm complaints, control social interactions, and produce promotional images. My findings will be of interest to legal officials, policy makers, and anyone else who encourages the surveillance of police and embraces technologies such as wearable cameras.

1.2 A Brief History of Police Visibility

An ideal way to contextualize my discussion is to offer a brief history of the police's visibility. In this section, I will quickly summarize the rise of the contemporary police system and the simultaneous growth of police visibility. This section provides some general background

information about my topic of study, and includes a review of some of most controversial police videos that have been recorded in the last 25 years.

In 19th century England, what most social scientists consider the birthplace of the modern police, the politics of law enforcement was a popular topic of debate. The public was not convinced that police officers were worthy of special legal powers, especially as rumours of their drunken, stupid, and excessively violent behaviour spread (McLaughlin, 2007, p. 180; Reiner, 2010, p. 40). The excessive amounts of discretion that police had over their invocation of law, as well as the low visibility conditions (due to a lack of supervision and accountability systems) under which the police conducted their work, meant that officers were able to bend the rules of the law, and employ questionable methods of law enforcement. In response, members of marginalized groups, especially those living in poverty, began to protest police institutions, often characterizing police officers as agents of oppression (Ignatieff, 2004; Reiner, 2010).

Answering these protests, a British Statesman named Sir Robert Peel introduced major police reforms including the Metropolitan Police Act of 1829 which created a modernized Metropolitan Police Force for London (Manning, 1997; Channing, 2015). Affectionately nicknamed "Bobbies" after Robert Peel himself, a new breed of police officer was born. Bobbies were expected to follow innovative professional policies including standardized procedures and new accountability measures. Robert Peel promoted his Bobbies through various techniques of image-management or "image work," a term that Rob C. Mawby uses to refer to "all the activities in which police forces engage and which project meanings of policing" (Mawby, 2002, p. 1). In the 1830s this image work involved connecting Bobbies to notions of British-ness, civility, and goodwill. Successful image work, including the creation of professionalized uniforms, custodian hats, large police crests, and batons, earned Peel's Bobbies a new level of approval from the public (Reiner, 2010, p. 67; Channing, 2015).

This new-found approval was not long lasting. Corruption, racism, excessive violence, and other problems followed the police service through its evolution into the Bobby, and public dissatisfaction followed (Reiner, 2014, p. 95). Despite further progress since the middle of the 19th century (Newburn. 2004), including the development of community based models of policing (Leighton, 1991; Skogan and Hartnett, 1997; Kelling and Moore, 2004; Tilley, 2004), these same problems remain common today, and continue to stain the police's reputation.

Today, the police remain among the most controversial institutions in North America and receive consistent criticism from journalists, scholars and political bodies, as well as demands for increased police accountability (Jones, 2004). North Americans are said to reluctantly tolerate the police, seeing them as a "necessary evil" rather than an institution to take pride in (Reiner, 2010, p. 96). Even the Bobby and other symbolic police officers such as the Canadian Mountie or the New York Police Officer are understood as a symbol of oppression in many communities (Bolton Jr. and Feagin, 2004; Williams and Murphy, 2004).

This "necessary evil" perspective mirrors what Robert Reiner (2010) calls the "revisionist" view of policing. According to this view, the police are not organizations dedicated to crime control and protection and service for all, but an institution dedicated to maintaining a particular status quo, often because they are directly and indirectly supportive of unequal power relations which benefit upper classes and elites. Reiner argues that this view of the police is simplistic but useful because it reveals the complex politics which shape contemporary policing, including the systemic inequalities which police organizations reinforce. Similarly, Richard Ericson (2004) argues that the police do indeed protect a particular status quo, their primary task being to put things back in order, so that existing social structures are preserved. However, moving beyond revisionist theories of policing, Ericson proposes that the police also have the power to create their own order using their legal authority to justify actions which shape and

adjust the status quo. This view acknowledges the extensive power that police officers hold, especially in light of their high level of discretion over the interpretation and enforcement of vague laws. Peter Manning (1997) makes a similar claim when he argues that although the police perform "under the law," they also have a great amount of control over how law is invoked, applied, and enforced. The police are therefore not merely actors under the law, but creators of law, able to affect how it is enforced on the street, regardless of what is said in legal books or court rooms. Given their power over law, it is not surprising that the police have such a controversial reputation. The police are regularly criticized for how they invoke law, particularly when it comes to making decisions about enforcing controversial laws, issuing fines, and making arrests. Police must also make controversial choices including the decision to jail members of marginalized communities and/or inflict pain to those who they deem a threat to the wellbeing of others. Furthermore, police must face the nearly impossible task of preventing, controlling and deterring *all* crime (Manning, 1997).

One consequence of the controversy surrounding policing is that police officers attract extensive attention from members of the public, the mainstream media, and political institutions that are interested in observing, scrutinizing, and criticizing police (Manning, 1988; 1997; 2012; Goldsmith, 2010; Haggerty and Sandhu, 2014). In addition, police officers receive extensive attention from those who realize that the police can be entertaining (Doyle, 2003; Reiner, 2010), as the police officer represents an opportunity to see the invocation of law, the controversial, the shameful, the painful, the grotesque, the heroic, the professional, and the brave. As a result, I argue that the police have become one of the most closely monitored institutions in contemporary society, granting police officers what I call a high visibility status (Haggerty and Sandhu, 2014; Sandhu and Haggerty, 2015).

The police's visibility has increased significantly as camera technologies have developed. Patrol officers are now not only finding themselves watched by bystanders, but also recorded by surveillance cameras, vehicular cameras, wearable cameras, citizens with smartphones, as well as the cameramen and women employed by news organizations. There are few people on the planet who have such a closely monitored work experience. In fact, the police are approaching an increasingly comprehensive visibility, a status when an individual officer is not only highly visible, but an increasingly large portion of the entirety of their on-duty experience is recorded in some form or fashion. This has resulted in the creation of a number of controversial videos of police, including images exposing police violence and facilitating criticism of police behaviour. Amongst the most infamous examples is George Holliday's video of the beating of Rodney King. A summary of this incident as well as more recent incidents will provide further contextualizing information about the politics of police visibility, including the growing tendency for citizens to use mobile cameras to record police violence in hopes of holding police accountable for behaviour that is often described as brutal, excessive, and abusive.

Rodney Glen King III

In the early morning hours of March 3rd 1991 George Holliday, the inconspicuous manager of a plumbing company, made a significant political statement about the police and racism in the United States of America. His actions have had a lasting impact on political dialogue and popular culture. Yet a close examination of the events reveal that Holliday's actions were unplanned and occurred almost by accident. They were a result of two happenstances; having recently purchased a Sony brand Handycam and being at the right place at exactly the right time.

A recap[1] of March 3rd 1991 starts miles away from Holliday in a car speeding west in the San Fernando Valley of Los Angeles. Inside the car were Bryan Allen, Freddie Helms, and a 25-year-old Rodney King. The three men had spent the night drinking alcohol and watching a basketball game at a friend's home. After the game, King had proposed going out. Despite having drank his fair share of forty-ounce bottles of Olde English 800, King decided to drive.

At approximately 12:30, two California Highway Patrol officers, a husband and wife team named Tim and Melanie Singer, noticed King's speeding Hyundai. A car chase began, reaching speeds of 188 kilometres-per-hour. The officers made several attempts to pull King over, but King ignored their cruiser's flashing emergency lights. After running a red light and nearly causing an accident, King finally stopped at the intersection of Osborne Street and Foothill Boulevard, which happen to be near an apartment in which George Holliday lay sleeping. Several police cruisers, including cars carrying Sergeant Stacey Koon and Officer Laurence Powell, arrived on scene soon thereafter. A police helicopter arrived on scene as well.

The Singers approached King's vehicle and ordered its occupants to exit and lie face down on the ground. Allen and Helms complied. Rodney King did not. According to the Singers, King exited his car but began mocking the police by waving at the police helicopter and laughing. It took several more commands from the Singers before King finally lay down. As Melanie and Tim Singer approached to arrest King, Officer Koon advanced and decided to take over the arrest. Koon later said he believed King was on drugs and might be dangerous, and that he was best equipped to respond to such a person. The details of what happened next are contested and hazy at best. What is known for sure is that Officer Koon and his team engaged King, and King resisted arrest. In what became a physical interaction, two taser charges were used. Despite this,

---

[1] see Linder, 2001 for a full account of the Rodney King incident and the following legal trials

Rodney King was able to repel police and rose to his feet. Then something crucial happened, something that would make what would have probably been an understudied case of police violence into a world-wide event; the commotion awoke George Holliday.

Holliday, probably curious about the noises, stepped onto his bedroom terrace and, from approximately 90 feet away, pointed his Handycam at King, Officer Koon, and the rest of the police officers. Holliday recorded as the officers struck King with their batons several times, sometimes to the head, until they could finally handcuff him. The video shows one officer stomping on King's shoulder with enough force to cause King's head to smack into the street. The beating was long and brutal, and seemingly far more violent than was necessary. King was severely injured and he would later say, "I felt beat up and like a crushed can. That's what I felt like, like a crushed can all over, and my spirits were down real low." After arresting King, the officers re-entered their vehicles and began making notes about the incident, sometimes in a boastful way. Officer Lawrence Powell wrote, "I haven't beaten anyone this bad in a long time."

The next day Holliday delivering his video footage to KTLA, a local television network. The video was promptly aired and shocked a large portion of the American public, especially those who assumed police violence against black people was no longer a significant social problem. The video appeared on several news stations. It was played over, and over, and over. This prompted Ed Turner, vice president of the CNN news network, to state that the mainstream media had "…used the tape like wallpaper."

Holliday's video sparked angry responses, especially from black communities who saw the incident as exemplary of the abuse that they regularly encountered from police. The video also encouraged political dialogue about police brutality, as well as dialogue about the seeming lack of accountability mechanisms in policing (Lasley, 1994; Sigelman et al. 1997; Linder,

2001). The video seemed to have provided marginalized communities and critics of police practices the evidence needed to support their critiques.

The emotions surrounding the incident and the video came to a head almost a year later when the officers who beat Rodney King were tried and acquitted for their involvement. The defense lawyers strategically used the Holliday video to establish that LAPD officers had used appropriate and proportionate violence in response to King's attempts to resist arrest (Crenshaw and Peller, 1993). These results confused and shocked many American citizens (Stuart, 2011). How could the jury acquit the officers given the brutality of the beating shown on Holliday's video? How could a video which seemed to show police brutality be used to defend officers?

The infamous Los Angeles riots of 1992 followed. Citizens took baseball bats to vehicles, threw glass bottles at police, and massive crowds of protestors formed around the city. The riots were extremely violent, leading to 54 deaths, 2,383 injures, 7,000 fires, and damaging more than 3,100 businesses in just over just 5 days. Smaller riots took place in large cities across the United States and even crossed the border into Canada as the acquittal prompted the Yonge Street Riot of 1992. The disgruntlement of underprivileged black communities, questions of police accountability, and the power of cameras were all on display. During the riots, King appeared on television and famously appealed for peace by uttering, "…can we all get along? Can we get along? Can we stop making it, making it horrible for the older people and the kids?…"

The story of the Rodney King beating took yet another turn when, one year later, officers Koon and Powell were tried in federal courts and sentenced to 30 months in federal correctional camps. King also sued the city of Los Angeles in a federal civil rights case and was awarded 3.8 million dollars plus 1.7 million dollars to cover attorney fees. Though it took years of protests, and though it occurred in a private court and with various contestable details, the Rodney King incident finally led to what many considered the correct legal results. It seemed that the police

officers had finally been punished for abusing their power and Rodney King had been granted what many consider a deserved monetary prize for his suffering.

There are several complex angles to the Rodney King incident. It is often studied by those interested in police brutality (Lasley, 1994), race and racism (Skolnick and Fyfe, 1993), the analysis and presentation of videos in the courtroom (Crenshaw and Peller, 1993; Linder, 2001; Stuart, 2011), and the accountability mechanisms used against officers accused of brutality and excessive violence (Skolnick, 2008). But the part of the Rodney King case that interests me the most, has to do with what it tells us about police visibility. Despite the controversies surrounding the trials, enduring legal battles, and the lifelong difficulties King faced after the incident,[2] the events of March 3rd 1991 are often remembered by those interested in police visibility as the first in which police brutality was exposed by a photographer.[3] Though the complexities of the Rodney King incident are not to be ignored, it does seem that a valuable conversation about race and police violence was inspired because an inconspicuous plumber did something as simple as pushing the record button on his camera. It also seems that officers who used excessive violence were eventually legally punished because their violence was recorded on video. Therefore, the Rodney King case could be remembered as one which displays the power of cameras as tools for exposing police misconduct and as a technology which can be used to hold officers accountable for their actions.

[2] Including ongoing legal battles, drunk driving charges, and drug abuse, each of which contributed in their own way to his death, by accidental drowning, in 2012

[3] The Rodney King incident was, in fact, not the first incident of police being recorded by citizens. Though it is difficult to determine when this type of surveillance began, it is known that events such as the civil rights protests in the United States in the 1960s were sometimes recorded, exposing police brutality. For example, the 1985 Selma to Montgomery marches, including the infamous “Bloody Sunday” incident, were documented by photographers. Perhaps the reason that the Rodney King incident is remembered as an unprecedented case has to do with with its recency, the tremendous amount of attention it received, and the controversial riots that it inspired.

The seemingly progressive goal of improving police accountability is likely one reason that, in the 25 years since the Rodney King incident, the number of cameras pointed at police officers has grown substantially, as has the idea that the police can be scrutinized, criticized and held accountable with cameras (Goldsmith, 2010). Accordingly, recent years have seen a number of controversial incidents involving videos of police which grab the public's attention, and inspire debates about how cameras can be used to improve accountability in policing. Some of the most infamous examples of these incidents include:

- The Robert Dziekanski incident in Vancouver, British Colombia, 2007: A Polish immigrant named Robert Dziekanski was killed in the Vancouver International Airport when several RCMP (Royal Canadian Mounted Police) officers responded to reports of his wild and disorderly behaviour. A bystander's video recording of the incident shows that the RCMP decided to use several taser charges to subdue Dziekanski, and he died soon after. The video went viral on the internet and inspired media debates about the RCMP's actions as well as taser use. Two large scale investigations into the incident were launched, including the Braidwood inquiry (see http://www.braidwoodinquiry.ca), which found that the officers used excessive force, and deliberately attempted to misrepresent the incident. On February 20, 2015, one of the RCMP officers who fired a taser at Robert Dziekanski was found guilty of perjury and, on June 22, 2015, was sentenced to 30 months in prison.
- The Ian Tomlinson incident in London, England, 2009: A newspaper vendor named Ian Tomlinson was struck in the leg area with a baton by a police officer who had been enlisted to control London's G20 protests. Tomlinson, who was not involved in any protests, fell, rose to his feet, and then collapsed moments later and died. The entire scene was recorded and the resulting video inspired debates about police violence as well as the role of citizens in monitoring and recording police officers. Criminal inquiries into the incident were initiated and

eventually led to a charge of manslaughter against the officer who struck Tomlinson. The officer was found not guilty, but he was subsequently dismissed from police service.

- The Sammy Yatim incident in Toronto, Ontario, 2013: Sammy Yatim, an 18-year-old immigrant from Syria, was shot 8 times by a Toronto police officer while travelling in a street car. Reports of the incident suggest that before he was shot, Yatim drew a three-inch knife, and threatened fellow passengers. Passengers in the car claimed that Yatim was aggressive towards many of the women on board and at one point, removed his penis and held it in one hand while the other held the knife. Videos of the incident received national attention and members of the public criticized the officers' decision to use deadly force. The officer who shot Yatim was charged with second degree murder and manslaughter, and Sammy Yatim's family launched an 8-million-dollar law suit against Toronto Police Service in July 2013. On January 25, 2016, the officer was found guilty of attempted murder.
- The Kajieme Powell incident in St Louis, Missouri, 2014: A 25-year-old black man named Kajieme Powell, who may have suffered from a medical illness, approached police officers with a knife drawn and yelled "shoot me, kill me now!" Officers commanded him to put down his weapon. Powell continued to approach, and the officers shot him dead. A smartphone recording of the incident inspired controversy when viewers suggested that officers may have used deadly force without considering other options. The public remains divided on the case, often along racial lines.
- The Eric Garner incident in Staten Island, New York, 2014: A black man named Eric Garner was accused of selling loosies (cigarettes) by police. After a short but peaceful interaction, police officers wrestled Garner to the ground and applied an illegal chokehold. Garner repeated "I can't breathe," but the officers did not release their hold. Garner died soon after. The incident was recorded by a friend of Garner's and inspired public and online debates in New York.

When the officers involved in the incident were not indicted, public demonstrations followed in the form of public protests. Several participants marched while holding signs that said "we can't breathe" and "black lives matter." The Justice Department announced a private investigation soon thereafter. The Black Lives Matter protests continue today and are now considered part of a politically active social movement dedicated to challenging structural racism and police misconduct. On July 13th 2015, New York City paid the Garner family 5.9 million US dollars as part of an out of court settlement.

- The Walter Scott Incident, North Charleston, South Carolina, 2015: Walter Scott, a black man, aged 50, ran away from a white policeman named Michael T. Slager when he is shot 8 times from behind. Slager later explained that Scott had stolen his stun gun, that he had reason to fear for his life, and that his use of deadly force was, therefore, justified. Unbeknownst to Slager, the shooting was recorded and the resulting video contradicted Slager's description of the incident. After it was released, the video sparked discussions of police accountability, violence against black men, and police efforts to misrepresent their violence to avoid scrutiny. Slager was indicted on a charge of murder by a grand jury and trial is expected to begin in October 2016.

Each case exemplifies the high visibility reality that police officers now contend with, and a close examination of these cases sheds light on the complexities of this high visibility; not all police officers are held accountable for what seem to be abuses of power and acts of unnecessarily violence, many officers are held accountable for misrepresenting their police work, videos of police violence regularly "go viral," inspiring extensive media coverage and public reaction in the form of protests. The varied consequences of recording police work raises questions like the following:

- Are excessively violent police officers who are caught on camera subsequently subject to critique and legal sanctions, or are these cases illustrative of the attention grabbing but ultimately ineffective nature of attempts to use cameras to expose problems in policing?
- Do these cases suggest that, in the future, police officers will be more likely to behave in a disciplined manner because of the extent to which they are recorded, or will the police continue to use violence, sometimes excessive violence, ignoring the risks of doing so while being recorded?
- Does the critical nature of many of these videos suggest that the police will understand cameras as risky, and begin to resent photographers who attempt to record them?
- How do the police understand their high visible reality and how do they respond to the cameras and photographers that produce this reality?

The final question is particularly important if we are to appreciate the implications of the police's growing visibility. I address this question in this dissertation based on data gathered during a case study on police perceptions of and responses to cameras. Particular attention is given to how my research complicates existing discussions of police visibility which centre on themes of accountability, resentment, and resistance.

1.3 Dissertation Outline

My discussion is organized in the following way:

1. In chapter 2, I will contextualize my larger analysis by addressing common misconceptions about the surveillance of police.
2. In chapter 3, I detail the research methodology I used to gather data on police understandings and responses to visibility.

3. In chapter 4, I discuss the most prominent perspectives offered by my participants, which I describe as the apathetic and strategic perspectives. These perspectives reflect my participants' indifferent attitudes about the risks associated with being recorded and/or their belief that being recorded offers them several benefits.
4. In chapter 5, I outline counter-narratives or marginal perspectives offered by my participants, which I describe as the camera-shy perspective. This perspective reflects my participants' concerns about being recorded.
5. In chapter 6, I introduce a concept which I have titled camera-friendly policing, which describes one of the ways that my participants lower the risks associated with being recorded.
6. In chapter 7, I discuss my participants' concerns about the need for privacy and camera-free environments.
7. In chapter 8, I move beyond my research to introduce a second concept, crediting images, which refers to images which celebrate and applaud police behaviour.
8. In chapter 9, I conclude by discussing my participants' understandings of, and responses to, cameras and photographers, and what my case study reveals about the implications of the police's growing visibility.

Chapter 2 Common Misperceptions About Police Visibility

2.1 Introduction

This chapter addresses two common misperceptions about police visibility. The first concerns who watches the police and the second concern the implications of this surveillance. I will discuss these misperceptions and then detail my theoretical approach to questions of police visibility.

2.2 Common perceptions about who watches the police

Discussions of the police's growing visibility tend to focus entirely on how bystanders use smartphones to monitor police violence (Wilson and Serisier, 2010; Goldsmith, 2010; Wall and Linnemann, 2014; Brown, 2015; Farmer et al. 2015). Few have considered the diversity of cameras and photographers that now monitor police (Goold, 2003a; Evans, 2015; Sandhu and Haggerty, 2015). A brief list of some of these cameras includes:

- Smartphone cameras owned by social activists
- Smartphone cameras owned by members of the general public
- Surveillance cameras dedicated to crime prevention in public spaces
- Private surveillance cameras dedicated to crime prevention in private spaces
- Journalists with cameras dedicated to producing footage for news productions
- Police vehicular cameras dedicated to recording evidence of crime and disorder
- Police wearable cameras dedicated to documenting interactions with police officers
- Police in-house surveillance cameras designed to record police activities

These cameras have several purposes. Some are used by police organizations to document crime and disorder, some are used to document routine police work, and some are used by bystanders to scrutinize police work. Many of these cameras are assembled in rhizomatic networks or

“surveillance assemblages” that compile information and images together when the need arises (Haggerty and Ericson, 2000). Accordingly, a comprehensive study of the police’s visibility must take into account a massive network of somewhat disjointed cameras that produce images that can be assembled and reassembled in various ways and for a variety of purposes. Trying to focus on an individual surveillance gaze means trying to disconnect a single element of a more complex and interconnect network of police visibility. Accordingly, my research relies on a broader and inclusive understanding of the police’s visibility by taking the plurality of cameras that monitor officers into account.

When discussing the plurality of cameras monitoring police, I rely on an internal/external binary categorization. Though I cannot account for every camera that targets the police, most cameras fit into one of these categories. Internal cameras are those over which police organizations have some distinct level of control, meaning someone in a police organization can maneuver or disable these cameras, and someone in a police organization has some level of ownership over the footage, which includes the ability to not only view but also save, delete and edit. Prominent examples of internal cameras are surveillance cameras owned and operated by a police service. External cameras, on the other hand, are those over which police organizations have limited control. Prominent examples of external cameras are the smartphones of bystanders.

In line with earlier comments, the internal/external binary does not imply the ability to disconnect internal and external cameras when discussing the police’s visibility. Instead, I acknowledge that both elements of this binary must be accounted for, and furthermore, that internal/external is not a strict categorization. This is because police officers can gain control over external cameras and can lose control over internal cameras. For instance, participants in my study claimed that they could legally confiscate external cameras should they deem the footage important for an investigation, demonstrating that they can have some power over the use and

ownership of external cameras and footage. Thus the internal/external binary must be considered flexibly in order to appreciate the fluidity of the police's control over cameras.

Although the internal/external categorization does not receive significant attention in following chapters (primarily because my participants' views did not radically differ when discussing internal or external cameras), it is worth arranging this chapter according to the internal/external binary as my research gives attention to internal cameras in a way that few other research studies have, and thus a section dedicated specifically to these cameras is useful for emphasizing the role played by internal cameras in producing the police's high visibility. In addition, the internal/external binary is useful because, though their views about internal/external cameras did not radically differ, my research participants sometimes used it to frame some of their opinions of high visibility, particularly when discussing their in-the-field concerns about being recorded by external cameras (these concerns are discussed in chapter 5).

Internal Cameras

Because the surveillance of police is often thought of as a method for criticizing police officers' behaviour, readers may be surprised at how closely police organizations monitor their own police officers. A list of the surveillance technologies used for this monitoring includes:

- note-taking: referring to notes that police officers take during patrols
- record-keeping: referring to records measuring an officer's performance, for example the traffic tickets they issue and/or individuals they arrest
- vehicular global positioning devices: which were installed in every police cruiser that I was in during fieldwork
- vehicular cameras: including cameras aimed both inward and outward of a police vehicle)

- in-station cameras: including cameras located within division headquarters and other police locations
- wearable cameras: usually attached to police at the chest or neck area, and aimed forward to create point-of-view footage

Surveillance scholars would refer to some of this surveillance as an example of peer-to-peer or lateral surveillance (Andrejevic, 2005) as it allows members of the same social group to monitor one another. Though much research on lateral surveillance focuses on citizens monitoring other citizens as a consequence of a rising culture of skepticism and suspicion (Chan, 2008; Reeves, 2012), my research experiences suggest that police-on-police surveillance is not grounded in these same motivations. Instead the police's lateral surveillance can be communal, defensive, and based in a desire to protect a group of police officers from danger and/or criticism by "keeping an eye on each other." Accordingly, I witnessed police officers regularly call surveillance cameras operators on the radio and request that they "watch their backs" as they engage a suspicious individual. I also witnessed officers use their smartphones to record their peers as they interact with members of the public.

Police-on-police surveillance can also be horizontal, particularly when it involves the surveillance of line officers by police administration through reviews of field notes, reports, and other documents detailing a police officer's behaviour over a period of time. Accordingly, internal cameras served a number of purposes and my participants expressed a variety of thoughts about the visibility which they produce (discussed in chapter 4 and 5).

Police-on-police surveillance has expanded significantly in recent decades with the invention of mobile camera surveillance systems. Examples include in-car cameras and vehicle-mounted cameras or 'dashcams' (Meyer, 2014). A cutting edge example of police-on-police

surveillance is body cameras or police wearable cameras (Stross, 2013; Thompson, 2014), which are video recording devices that police officers carry on their person (often attached to their uniform or equipment like a taser) and record a point-of-view video. Manufacturers (see Taser.com) of these technologies claim that they will:

- improve the behaviour of all parties involved in interactions with police
- reduce false complaints and lawsuits
- save time and increase efficiency
- enhance public trust and create safer communities

Though wearable cameras do not necessarily record an officer's body, they capture an officer's interactions with others and thus allow police organizations to view and scrutinize that officer's behaviour. As wearable cameras become more popular, commentators debate whether or not they can be used to bring a heightened level of transparency to police organizations and enable new ways of checking police power, often paying particularly attention to questions of who can access the footage which these technologies record (Meyer, 2014; Friedman, 2014). Major questions about the use and regulation of wearable cameras have also been raised by organizations like PERF (Police Executive Research Forum), which have conducted extensive research studies about the implementation of wearable cameras.[4]

The internal cameras that most consistently contribute to police visibility are undoubtedly surveillance cameras or CCTV cameras (Evans, 2015), which are cameras whose video feeds are transmitted to a set of display monitors and whose access is restricted. CCTV cameras are usually installed in highly trafficked public spaces (though they are sometimes more difficult to spot than

---

[4] Download the report at http://www.policeforum.org/assets/docs/Free_Online_Documents/Technology/implementing%20a%20body-worn%20camera%20program.pdf

expected) and used by policing organizations to locate and respond to crime and disorder (Norris and Armstrong, 1995; 1999; Norris, 2012; Goold, 2003a; Goold 2003b; Doyle et al. 2012). Though these cameras do not purposefully target the police, given the time frontline officers spend in public spaces, a significant amount of footage of police activities are produced by CCTV cameras.

Existing studies of internal cameras and police visibility

Unfortunately, few qualitative academic studies of internal cameras have questioned how they affect the experiences of law enforcement agents, even though it is law enforcement agents who are, purposefully or not, among the most closely monitored occupations by technology like CCTV cameras. This oversight is likely due to how young many of these technologies there are, as well as a tendency to focus on external cameras when studying police visibility. Among the few research projects to consider the police's relationship with CCTV, not just as users of surveillance technologies but as monitored individuals, is the work of Richard Evans (2015). Evans argues that while CCTV footage can be used to expose police misconduct, its effectiveness is questionable, especially when one considers the implications of creating a culture in which video evidence is treated as a basic requirement in order to prove police misconduct. Evans adds that officers try to avoid cameras by taking advantage of what he calls "black spots," where CCTV cameras cannot/do not record, which further reduces their utility as tools with which to document and expose misconduct.

Other research which considers the police's relationship with CCTV are Benjamin Goold's qualitative studies (2003a; 2003b). Goold's work suggests that police officers often feel self-conscious when being recorded and many express concerns about how footage could be used to scrutinize their behaviour. Accordingly, Goold has found that police officers sometimes try to lower their visibility, often by signalling operators to move cameras away.

Together Evans (2015) and Goold (2003a; 2003b) offer empirical evidence that the police might respond to cameras with resentment and resistance which manifests itself in efforts to avoid being recorded. As mentioned, this is a consistent theme in many discussions of police visibility, and it will serve as a key theme in my own research which raises questions about how police understand and respond to cameras, and if resentment and resistance is a consistent trend.

External Cameras

Since the Rodney King incident, discussions of how citizens with external cameras can contribute to police accountability have grown popular (Skolnick and Fyfe, 1993; Chan, 1999; Walker, 2003; Walker, 2006; Goldsmith, 2010; Walker and Archbold, 2014; Brown, 2015), particularly in literature discussing the empowering potential and the limitations of "citizen journalism" (Allan, 2007; Dennis, 2008; Allan and Thorsen, 2009; Goode, 2009; Lewis et al, 2009; Antony and Thomas, 2010; Greer and McLaughlin, 2010).

Citizen journalism is an abstract term that could refer to the efforts of those who are affiliated with some social activist organization, or those acting with specific political interest in mind (Allan and Thorsen, 2009). However, it is worth noting that many citizen journalists who record the police are not affiliated with any activist organization, and are responding to some spectacular incident that they happen to be near (Goldsmith, 2010). The original act of recording can be one of randomness, happenstance, and lack any strict political motivation, as was the case when George Holliday recorded the beating of Rodney King. Furthermore, the act of recording is not necessarily an effort to bring a major political issue to the attention of the public, but is often an effort to record a humorous or embarrassment moment, such as the image of an officer flirting with someone they find attractive and/or picking their nose. Finally, citizen journalism is rarely the work of a single photographer. Rather, photographers often rely upon an uncoordinated

network of co-producers who, record, edit, disseminate, discuss, and label videos of police. These co-producers include:

- Internet Users: who view, discuss, share, and edit citizen journalists' videos once they are uploaded to social media websites. Hans Toch (2012) compares these Internet users to a "clamorous chorus" of online audiences who negotiate the meaning of images of police through online behaviour. As a result, websites like YouTube becomes archives (Gehl, 2009) of "shared memory" (Strangelove, 2010) which can be used to facilitate political dialogue about the police (Strangelove, 2004; 2010; Burgress and Green, 2009; Antony and Thomas, 2010).
- Social Activists: regularly encourage the photography of police by publicizing citizens journalists' videos and releasing smartphone applications such as Police Tape which allow users to covertly record the police.[5] Popular examples of such social activist groups include Copwatch (http://www.berkeleycopwatch.org) and Photography is Not a Crime (https://photographyisnotacrime.com). The involvement of organizations like the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU), suggests that even those social activists who are usually concerned with privacy and the spread of surveillance technologies, are more than willing to put these concerns aside when it can contribute to observing and scrutinizing police work.
- The Mainstream Media: plays a key role in sharing, editing and reporting on videos of police (Lawrence, 2000; Greer and McLaughlin, 2010: 2011; Huey and Broll, 2012; Huey and Broll, 2013).

[5] See https://itunes.apple.com/us/app/aclu-nj-police-tape/id561497660?ls=1&mt=8 to download the app

Above I have detailed some of the key players in the surveillance of police, including both internal and external cameras. I argue that in order to appreciate the growing camera-visibility of police officers, both categories of cameras must be taken into account, as both contribute significantly to the production of opportunities to monitor and scrutinize police behaviour. Thus, I rectify a tendency to focus only on external cameras and offer a more complete study of police visibility by also considering internal cameras in my research.

2.3 Common perceptions about the implications of police visibility

There are a number of theories about the implications of the police's high visibility. These include nuanced theories about smartphone activism (Allan, 2007; Dennis, 2008; Allan and Thorsen, 2009; Goode, 2009; Lewis et al, 2009; Antony and Thomas, 2010; Greer and McLaughlin, 2010; 2011; 2012), about policing and technology (Chan, 2001; Manning, 1997; 2008), as well as theories about the use of surveillance technologies to expose police misconduct (Thompson, 2005; Goldsmith, 2010; 2013; Toch, 2012; Haggerty and Sandhu, 2014; Brown, 2015; Sandhu and Haggerty, 2015).

Despite the diversity of attempts to theorize the implications of the police's growing visibility, one simplistic approach to this topic seems to remain dominant: the idea that cameras can be used to contribute to police accountability and discipline police behaviour (Brucato, 2015; Sandhu and Haggerty, 2015). This approach can be supported by contemporary theories of surveillance particularly those which discuss how surveillance can be used to discipline closely monitored individuals, as well as contemporary theories of deterrence, which discuss the effectiveness of surveillance for controlling crime and deviance. I will summarize both theories below and then present some of their major critiques in order to explain my decision not to use these theories for my research.

Theories of Surveillance and Discipline

Michel Foucault's widely influential panoptic theories of surveillance characterize visible subjects as controlled through disciplinary gazes (1975). Foucault's analysis begins with a description of the shift away from physical punishment of criminals to less violent techniques of control which rely heavily on observation. Foucault describes this shift using Jeremy Bentham's Panoptic Prison as a metaphor. As opposed to more brutal and physically torturous prisons, the panopticon houses inmates in highly visible cells which surround a central guard tower. The inmates are not subject to physical violence. All that is necessary is that they are observable to the central tower. Sometimes these cells are backlit, making it even easier for guards to observe, document, and respond to what they see. Foucault argues that within the panopticon, control is best characterized as a form of soft-power which relies on the prison guard's ability to monitor inmates and immediately address any signs of disorder. For example, if inmates are seen trying to organize or escape, guards can immediately observe these efforts and respond. Slowly, with this observation and constant intervention from guards, the inmates are trained to follow the rules of the prison. Soon intervention by the guards becomes wholly unnecessary as the inmates begin to internalize those rules and self-discipline. Surveillance, therefore, facilitates a kind of brain-training as guards educate inmates about what is and what is not acceptable behaviour within the panopticon.

Foucault's work has grabbed the attention of many social scientists because it proposes that this kind of surveillance is not limited to prisons, but has become a common feature of many institutions. Hospitals, schools, the military and other institutions are each becoming more panoptic in form, as they rely on surveillance and supervision to encourage their so-called inmates to discipline themselves and obey pre-established sets of rules. Accordingly, surveillance scholars have adopted Foucault's theories to describe the repressive power of the surveillance

systems that have emerged over the last few decades and developed adaptations such as the superpanopticon (Poster 1990), the synopticon (Mathiesen, 1997), the omnicon (Goombridge, 2003), the ban-opticon (Bigo, 2006), the neo-panoticon (Mann, Nolan and Wellman, 2003), and several others (Haggerty, 2006).

When applied to questions of police visibility, panoptic theories support that idea that surveillance can be used to observe, examine, and correct police behaviour, producing a more disciplined police service which is less likely to abuse power. Accordingly, existing studies of police visibility speculate that the surveillance of police facilitates new ways of exposing abuses of power and, therefore, contributing to police accountability (Goldsmith, 2010). Some studies have found support for this idea. For example, Gregory Brown (2015) recently conducted some of the first empirical studies examining how the police's growing visibility might affect police behaviour. Based on data from surveys and interviews with members of police departments in Toronto and Ottawa, Canada, Brown, a former police officer himself, determined that a growing visibility may have a disciplining effect on police officers. For instance, his findings suggest that Ontario police officers admitted to using less force and doing their work more "gently" (p. 235) when external cameras are present.

Criticism of this approach

Despite empirical support for the panoptic approach to police visibility, I do not believe that the surveillance of police is an effective way of disciplining police officers, particularly when grounded in Foucaultian approach to questions of surveillance. This approach has been subject to extensive criticism and members of the surveillance studies community have questioned whether this model remains useful for contemporary forms of surveillance (Bogard 1996; 2012; Haggerty,

2006). I focus on two criticisms[6] both of which highlight the reasons that my study could not rely on Foucault's theory.

The first critique of Foucaultian approaches to surveillance is that they mistakenly overlook the key role played by mainstream media in the production of knowledge and discipline in contemporary society. According to this criticism, surveillance and discipline does not always take a panoptic form, where the few (prison guards) watch the many (prison inmates), but can be best characterized as "synoptic" surveillance (Mathiesen, 1997; Doyle, 2011), where the many (massive audiences) are disciplined as they watch and learn from the few (mainstream media). When applied to questions of police and high visibility, these critiques encourage researchers to consider the role the mainstream media plays in the production of police visibility and, in particular, in the reporting and sharing of videos of police produced by internal and external cameras. It is, after all, likely on popular mainstream news programs that most citizens first come into contact with images of police.

A consideration of the media's role in producing police visibility is particularly important for my study as my participants' responses were sometimes informed by specific concerns about how images of police are displayed by journalists and how this contributes to the production of knowledge about policing. More specifically, my participants were not necessarily concerned

[6] Though I focus on two criticisms related to media and politics, it is important to make note of a critique concerning Foucaultian theories limits in our Web 2.0 era, when we have seen the growth of surveillance that rely less on the eye and more on the storage, analysis, and sharing of digital information (Lyon, 2003). Surveillance studies have created alternative theories of surveillance which focus on questions of datification, dataveillance, and the "data double" (Clarke, 1988; Amoore and De Goede, 2005; Lyon, 2007; Esposti, 2014; Dijck, 2015;). These theories have become especially popular in light of recent revelations about the degree to which security services have begun to collect data about the digital activities of both citizens and non-citizens (Lyon, 2003; van der Velden 2015; Keiber, 2015; Garrido, 2015; Lyon, 2015a; 2015b Geist, 2015).

about being observed or disciplined in a panoptic sense, but concerned about the implications of the spread of images which criticize police on the news. It was therefore, the elements of synoptic surveillance, rather than just panopticon surveillance, which seemed central to my participants' understanding of their growing visibility.

A second and related critique of a Foucaultian approach to surveillance comes from theories which propose that rather than disciplining those individuals under surveillance, surveillance and visibility are often political tools used by individuals who wish to earn the attention of massive audiences in order to contribute to the production of popular knowledge (Brighenti, 2010). According to these theories, surveillance cannot be understood entirely through a focus on the surveillance of prisoners by guards. Instead, surveillance studies must also consider how individuals allow themselves to be watched and/or place themselves under a synoptic form of surveillance. In support of this argument, John. B. Thompson (2005) references the politician who uses their highly visible status to spread their campaign messages while on stage at highly publicized events and/or speaking to the mainstream media. According to this approach to surveillance, visible subjects are not "docile bodies" disciplined by a top-down regime of surveillance, but empowered individuals able to use the attention they receive to produce a favourable self-image (Koskela, 2004).

I find this critique especially pertinent because, when applied to questions of police visibility, it suggests a need to move beyond questions of how cameras discipline police, and to instead consider if/how the police may be able to take advantage of being recorded by creating opportunities to represent themselves in a favourable way. When successful, surveillance and visibility function as opportunities for "image work" (Mawby, 2002) where police try to construct a favourable representation of their institution (to be discussed in chapter 4).

Theories of Deterrence and Crime Control

Similar to Foucaultian theories of surveillance, theories of deterrence are often relied upon to support the hypothesis that cameras can be used to discourage police misconduct, discipline police behaviour, and contribute to accountability in policing. Traditional theories of deterrence (Norris and Armstrong 1995; 1999; Norris, 2012), are based on the popular premise that low visibility is a core ingredient of deviance, including police misconduct. According to this premise, crime is a rational process where so-called deviants, an abstract and flexible term, engage in what I call visibility calculus, as they determine how to commit crimes in a low visibility fashion and, by doing so, lower the risk of being caught and punished. For example, it is presumed that thieves will disable cameras before trying to rob a jeweller, that violent criminals will find an isolated space without cameras before assaulting their victim, and that drug users will look for private locations before shooting up. These same assumptions underlie controversial rational choice theories of crime, such as routine activity theory (Felson and Cohen, 1993), which proposes that crime is an act of opportunity.

According to deterrence theories, the key to crime control is to raise the likelihood that deviants will be caught by denying them low visibility, usually via surveillance technologies and practices. Thus, if they want to prevent crime, jewellers must monitor their customers, police must patrol isolated and low visibility spaces, and drug control agencies must obtain warrants to monitor suspected drug user's private activities. Accordingly, to prevent police abuses of power, police officers must be closely monitored.

Criticism of this approach

Deterrence theories rest on assumptions that have been debunked by empirical studies of crime control and surveillance technologies like CCTV cameras. Social scientific studies in North America and Europe consistently show that CCTVs are not guaranteed to have any significant impact on crime rates (Ditton and Short, 1999; Deisman, 2003; Gill and Spriggs, 2005; Ratcliffe,

2006; Cameron et al. 2007; Welsh and Farrington, 2004; King et al., 2008; Ratcliffe et al, 2009). Partly in response to these studies, social activists are critical of the spread of surveillance cameras, and many argue that we pay too high a cost in terms of our civil right to privacy for surveillance technologies which have a limited success rate (Taylor, 2002; Goold, 2002; Huey, 2012). The results of these studies are explained by related studies (Norris and Armstrong, 1995; 1999) that demonstrate that deviants and criminals are not always paying full attention to how probable it is that they are to be discovered and caught, or the presence of surveillance technologies. Rather, deviance and crime can be explained by referring to a number of factors (an individual's social environment, peer group, biology, as well as the labels applied to that individual) which do not correspond to visibility or opportunity as routine activity theory and other rational choice theories suggests. The variety of factors which might produce crime are described by a number of criminological theories including Strain theory (Merton, 1957; Agnew, 2009), Social Disorganization theory (Shaw and McKay, 1969), Social Learning theory (Burgress and Akers, 1966), Labeling theory (Becker, 1963) and Biological theories (Lombroso, 2006). Though they contradict one another on many points, each theory shares the premise that there is more to crime than rational thought and visibility calculus, and therefore, the goals of crime control agencies, including those which want to prevent police misconduct, cannot be achieved through surveillance alone.

When applied to questions of police visibility, critiques of deterrence theory suggest that the surveillance of police cannot be understood as a reliable way of deterring police misconduct and producing a disciplined police service. Police misconduct may be a function of various factors such as police subcultures or the immediate peer group police officers socialize with, or a result of a lack of social controls, or the labels that have been applied to particular officers. Therefore, until further research is done examining how the police respond to their high visibility,

it would be premature to declare cameras as tools for deterring police misconduct and encouraging disciplined behaviour.

2.4 The War Against Photography

Perhaps as a response to the flaws of simplistic models of discipline and deterrence discussed above, as well as studies which contradict the idea that police officers correct their behaviour while under surveillance (Miller, 2014; Brucato, 2015), a second and less optimistic approach to police visibility has emerged which acknowledges how cameras might fail as technologies for controlling the police. According to proponents of this idea, the police are anti-camera and engaged in a perpetual effort to resist efforts to monitor officers. This idea is supported by studies which suggest that police officers are waging a war against photography (Simon, 2012; Wilson and Serisier, 2010; Wall and Linnemann, 2014), employing various strategies to prevent themselves from being photographed.

The war against photography can take place on two fronts; in the court room and in the street. In the court room, U.S. police officials have been known to cite legal precedents about the obstruction of police work to encourage the creation of laws or policies against the surveillance of police, as well as to justify police attempts to censor photographers (Potere, 2012). When legal pathways are unavailable or ineffective, police continue to wage the war against photography in the street by intimidating and threatening photographers, and confiscating and destroying cameras. For example,

- Police officers can command photographers to stop recording, and officers have arrested photographers if they refuse to comply. Sometimes these arrests result in jailing. For instance, in 2010, Brett Gundlock and Colin O'Connor, two National Post photographers, were

arrested during G20 protests and held in temporary detention for 24 hours, strip searched, denied water and fed little food. They were never accused of a crime.[7]

- In cases where photographers refuse to comply with commands to stop recording, police can respond with force. For example, in July 2015, Ohio police arrested a man named Deo Odolecki (a member of the Cleveland bracket of the social activist organization entitled Cop Block) claiming that he had obstructed justice when he began yelling profanities at them as they conducted an investigation. Odolecki was initially told to "take a walk," but he was eventually arrested for disorderly conduct after yelling "say hello to YouTube motherfuckers" at the officers (Miller, 2015a).
- Police officers can also attempt to confiscate cameras, often justifying their actions by claiming that the captured footage that police require for the investigation of a crime (Wilson and Serisier, 2010). Once video footage is confiscated, the police are able to give the public a police-centric narrative of the incident. For example, in September, 2015, Louisiana police officers were recorded shooting a man named Tevin Lewis in the back and then confiscated bystanders' cameras, claiming that any footage that was recorded was evidence that needed to be examined. The police then claimed that shots were fired based on the assumption that the Lewis was in possession of a gun. Witnesses allege that they never saw Lewis's weapon, and that police officers approached Lewis with their guns already drawn, but their reports did little to disrupt the dominance of the police's narrative (Miller, 2015e). Unfortunately for the police, videos of the incident were eventually released, undermining their representation of the incident. The release of confiscated videos of controversial incidents is a common

[7]http://www.thestar.com/opinion/commentary/2013/07/28/freedom_to_photograph_under_threat.html

occurrence which suggests that confiscation is not a reliable tactic in the war against photography (discussed in chapter 6).

- If they confiscate cameras, some police officers can also delete any footage that was previously recorded and/or destroy cameras (Wall and Linnemann, 2014). For example when Miami police arrested a photographer named Narces Benoit, they held him at gun point as they stomped on his cellphone after he used it to record the police shooting of a man named Raymond Herisse.[8]

These exemplary cases lend support to the idea that officers resent and resist surveillance, and highlight ways that police can try to prevent surveillance cameras from operating as tools for scrutinizing police work.

While the war against photography concept is useful in understanding police perspectives of high visibility, I argue that it is also an ineffective approach to the study of the police's visibility because it focuses on only spectacular and news making examples of police efforts to aggressively neutralize cameras. This is an unsystematic approach which does not offer insights into the question of whether this war against photography is a consistent theme in the police's relationship with high visibility, or an extreme and uncommon trend.

2.5 Conclusion: My Approach to the Police's High Visibility

Given the limitations of the approaches I discussed above, I take an alternative approach to the study of police visibility. I ground my research most firmly in Andrea Mubi Brighenti's (2010) philosophical approach to visibility. Although visibility does not lend itself to a strict definition, I use it to emphasize the broad range of social, political, and technological factors that

[8] http://www.nydailynews.com/news/national/miami-police-claim-cops-smashed-man-cellphone-deadly-raymond-herisse-shooting-untrue-article-1.127682

contribute to making diverse people, places, and things discernible to different audiences to varying degrees.

Brighenti argues that the general societal trend, particular over the past few decades, has been towards higher visibility as technologies which facilitate documentation and scrutiny (surveillance cameras and digital recording devices in particular) grow more popular (Lyon, 2001; 2002; 2003; 2007). Think about the different ways you were watched the last time you visited a coffee shop. Other patrons, including the person you were meeting, saw you enter and could testify to your whereabouts. The same is true of the baristas who took your order. Though these face to face forms of surveillance are not new, they are now combined with various digital and visual forms of surveillance. For instance, if you paid for your coffee by a credit or debit card, both the coffee shop and your bank documented your purchases. If the coffee shop was fitted with cameras, a video recording of your stay was also produced. And if you live in an urban city, a surveillance camera outside the coffee shop might have captured your entrance and exit. You may have also decided to record your own experience in numerous ways with the use of smartphones which are increasingly used to document daily life by creating selfies and other imagery. Though you may not have noticed how many ways you were being monitored and how many visual and non-visual records of your behaviour were produced, the fact is, it is difficult to do anything, even enjoy a cup of coffee, without it being documented in some form. Our day-to-day experiences are more visible than ever before (Andrejevic, 2012).

Brighenti argues that visibility rests on a spectrum, as the more one is monitored, the higher one's visibility. In addition, the higher one's position on the visibility spectrum, the more their behaviours are documented in some form or another, for example in paper or digital data and records. These documents can be scrutinized in various ways. For instance, an individual becomes visible when digital recordings of transactions are produced after they conclude an

exchange of goods or services. These records can then be analyzed by a number of actors. A police officer, for example, may use financial records to examine a criminal suspect's movements. A banker might use the same financial records to help a client select what kind of credit account suits their interests. And a mother might use the same financial records to secretly monitor her son's spending. As these examples show, visibility, documentation and scrutiny are inextricably linked.

Visibility is complicated further when one considers the various kinds of surveillance which can monitor human populations, sometimes simultaneously. For example, a member of a marginalized population can be low visibility when one considers their lack of political representation, but high visibility when one considers how they are monitored and documented by law enforcement agencies. This highlights the importance of considering not simply the visibility produced by a single monitoring practice, but the broader network of monitoring made up of different and unique "regimes of visibility" (Brighenti, 2010).

The consequences of visibility can be quite diverse, as it can make individuals vulnerable to various kinds of control (Foucault, 1975), but it can also empower people and organizations (Koskela, 2004). For instance, public figures such as police officers can be filmed while conducting an arrest and subsequently publicly criticized for using excessive force (Goldsmith, 2010), or they can prospectively take strategic advantage of their visibility to create video evidence that defends them from those very same criticisms (Schaefer and Steinmetz, 2014). Therefore, visibility must be understood as a site of political contestation and as a malleable resource which can be taken advantage by those under surveillance in some circumstance, while being used against them at other times.

The potentially empowering qualities of visibility is a crucial detail which makes Brighenti's approach to questions of surveillance and visibility ideal for my research. His work

suggests that rather than presenting surveillance as an oppressive and controlling technology, as studies of surveillance too often do (Haggerty, 2006), it is appropriate to conceptualize visibility as a fluid concept, and appreciate that its implications can include empowerment, or vulnerability, or both, depending on a number of contextual factors. This approach raises questions about the politics of visibility, including the efforts which visible subjects may go to reduce the risks and vulnerabilities associated with high visibility, while trying to advance the empowering qualities of high visibility.

The preceding summary of Brighenti's approach will help guide readers through the following chapters as my findings are not what one might expect if they relied exclusively on Foucaultian theories of discipline, deterrence theories of surveillance, and discussions of the police's war against photography. Rather than a reflection of how visibility can make the police vulnerable to critique, and how it can be used to deter and discipline police services, my findings speak to the varied responses police officers can have to high visibility, including a mix of concerns about the vulnerable qualities of a high visibility status, as well as the empowering qualities of high visibility. Accordingly, similar to Brighenti's work, my findings speak to the complex and ambiguous qualities of high visibility.

Chapter 3 Research Method

3.1 Introduction

There are a variety of ways to gather data on the police's perceptions of and responses to cameras and photographers. A researcher could analyze the policies and procedures governing how police react and respond to cameras. However, the data produced through such a study might focus too heavily on what is said in the books, rather than police behaviour on the street. To gather data which better reflects the on the street realities of the police's high visibility, a researcher could conduct a discourse analysis of news reports of infamous incidents of police misconduct that were captured on film. However, this data would focus too heavily on extreme, news-making cases and it might miss the more common realities of police visibility. In light of the limitations of these approaches, to effectively examine the police's high visibility, particularly police perceptions and responses to high visibility, a study which involves the routine observation of police experiences and routine communication with police officers is ideal. Accordingly, I used an empirical qualitative case study methodology and employed interviews and observational data gathering strategies to examine Edmonton police officers' perceptions of and responses to their high visibility.

A case study is a research method which aims to delineate the nature of a social phenomena via an in-depth investigation of an individual case or a "instance drawn from a class" (Adelman et al. 1983). In this chapter, I discuss how I conducted my case study. I detail the context in which I conducted my research including the city and police organizations that participated. I also discuss various data gathering techniques I used to complete my study, and then address the limitations of these data gathering techniques, including ongoing discussion

about the police's tendency to misrepresent or exaggerate when speaking with researchers (Waddington, 1999; Van Hulst, 2013).

What Is a Case Study?

A case study is a research method used to gather empirical data on an exemplary case or instance which appropriately reflects a larger social phenomenon (Stake, 1995; 2005; Yin 1994; 2013; Merriam, 1998; Burawoy, 1998; Denzin and Lincoln, 2011). It is one of the prevailing traditions in qualitative research, others include phenomenology, ethnography, and discourse analysis. Many of these qualitative research methods use similar data gathering methods, and thus they are often confused for one another. Ogbu, Sato and Kim (1997) suggest that this is due to the increasingly common tendency to title any qualitative research an ethnography. Despite their similarities, particularly in the data gathering strategies that they employ, the key difference between these methods concerns their aim. For example, while an ethnography is a long-term inward-looking study which aims to describe a particular social context, including its peoples and what Pierre Bourdieu called their "habitus," a case study is outward looking and aims to gather data on a single instance of a larger social phenomena (Stake, 1995; 2005; Yin 1994; 2013).

Defining a case study can be difficult, sometimes leading to misunderstandings about its research value (Gerring, 2004; Mitchell, 1983). Verschuren (2001) argues that this is a result of difficulties encountered when trying to define the word "case," including divergent opinions about case study standards, the data gathering methods used when completing a case study, and the adequacy of a case study's results (Ragin and Becker, 1992). Adding to the confusion, historically there have been debates about whether or not a case study can be quantitative, qualitative, or both (Stake, 1995; Merriam, 1998; Verschuren, 2001, p. 122; Yin, 2013).

To clarify confusions, major voices in the field including Robert Stake (1995) and Robert Yin (2013) have written several editions of books dedicated to advancing the case study as a

valuable research methodology. Stake (1995) addresses common questions about the data gathering standards by claiming that case studies are less a decision about how a researcher will gather data, and more a decision of what they study; a case. The case study can, therefore, feature various data gathering strategies allowing a researcher to adapt to their research goals or aims.

Though case studies are diverse in their form and strategy, they are unified because they are bounded to a single or few case(s) (Stake, 2005). All case studies require a bounded system (Creswell et al. 2007) and must be "fenced in" (Merriam, 1998) to encourage a researcher to clearly define their case (Verschuren, 2001). This boundedness raises questions about how generalizable data from a single or a small group of case studies can be. This is among the most common and significant critiques that case studies receive. As Charles Ragin (1989, p. ix) states "…case oriented researchers are always open to the charge that their findings are specific to the few cases they examine, and when they do make broad comparisons and attempt to generalize, they are often accused of letting their favourite case shape, or at least colour, their generalizations."

While critiques about generalizability point to a major limitation of case study research, Stake (1995), Yin, (2013), and other researchers who employ the case study method (Merriam, 1998; Verschuren, 2001; Flyvbjerg, 2006; 2011) have argued that these critiques are often based on reductionist reasoning which ignores the values of case study research. Yin (2013) points to one of the greatest values of case study research when he argues that despite their potential limitations in terms of generalizability, case studies can offer effective ways to falsify existing theoretical perspectives (Eckstein, 1975), and thus contribute significantly to academic study. Furthermore, even if their conclusions cannot be used to make immediate and wide-ranging claims about a social phenomenon, Yin argues that they can help gather in-depth knowledge of patterns and trends in a bounded system that may indeed reflect patterns and trends outside that

bounded system (Verschuren, 2001). Accordingly, it is a mistake to look at case studies as entirely isolated data sets that do not speak to larger sociological phenomenon (Flyvbjerg, 2006).

The case study approach has been sorted into numerous types. Robert Yin (2013) defines case studies as fitting into three categories including the descriptive case study, which aims to present a complete description of a phenomena, the exploratory case study, which aims to define a question and examine the feasibility of an in-depth study, and the explanatory case study, which aims to offer a cause-effect relation. Robert Stake (1995) sorts case studies into the intrinsic type, where the researcher focuses on a particular case without making extensive generalizations, and the instrumental type where the researcher is interested in a broader social phenomena and uses the case as an exemplifying instance of that phenomenon. My research study is best characterized as an instrumental case study as it uses data gathered on police officers in Edmonton Alberta to critically examine theories and popular ideas about a social phenomenon which exists beyond this bounded research site.

Having detailed the nature of a case study and located my study in this literature, I will now shift attention to a practical discussion of how I conducted my case study, including the selection of my location, how I recruited participants, and how I carried out specific data gathering strategies.

3.2 Getting There: Where I Conducted My Case Study

Selecting which case to study is among the most important decisions a researcher must make. Because instrumental cases look outward and aim to address a social phenomenon, the case that a researcher selects should speak to this phenomenon in some direct way (Stake, 1994; Yin, 2013). This could mean that the case study's location is particularly representative of that phenomenon, such as a space where instances of that phenomenon are common. However, a case

where that sociological phenomenon is at its most extreme can also be useful, as data can be gathered easily and can offer unique information about how this phenomenon evolves in a particular way (Stake, 2005). I chose to conduct my research in Edmonton, Alberta, Canada for a number of reasons:

- It is a large metropolitan city reflective of an era in which surveillance cameras and other surveillance technologies are becoming a routine part of urban architecture.
- It has been the home of a number of controversial videos of police violence caught on tape. Among the most controversial was a video recording showing Edmonton police officers using force to subdue two men on Whyte Avenue in May 2013. The video shows the officers striking the men, and holding one against the ground in a pool of his own blood. The video went viral, sparking an internal investigation.
- Police officers within the city have recently participated in a trial of wearable cameras during which a small number of officers wore cameras on their chests while patrolling around the city.
- Police cruisers around the city are equipped with surveillance technologies including both inward and outward cameras, as well as GPS devices.

As part of providing a thorough explanation of my research site, I provide some detailed information about Edmonton below.

Edmonton, Alberta, Canada:

Edmonton is Alberta's capital city, and Canada's fifth largest municipality. It is the northernmost North American city with a population over 1 million. Socially, Edmonton is known as the "festival city" for its year-round festivals, and colloquially it is sometimes called

the capital of Canada's Texas, a reference to Alberta's similarity to the politically conservative and culturally blue-collar states in southern United States.[9]

Edmonton has seen massive growth over recent decades. As the staging point for large-scale oil sands (a kind of petroleum deposit) projects, the city attracts a growing population of people searching for high paying job opportunities. With an area of 684.37 kilometres squared, Edmonton and its surrounded metropolitan area has a population of 1,159,869 people according to Statistics Canada's 2011 census reports.[10] The majority of the city's population are between ages 15-64 years-old (70.9%) and the median age is 36.5 years old. According to the National Household Survey of 2011,[11] 795,675 people live in private households, of which 205,445 are immigrants. According to this same survey, the city's private households are made up of mostly white peoples, but the city's population includes several visible minorities (Asian and Black peoples being among the largest populations). When broken down by ethnicity via Statistics Canada survey in 2006,[12] over half the population is made up of people with European origins (510, 330) peoples. Most of Edmonton's labor force (660,815 people) own a post secondary diploma or degree or equivalent (372,220 people), and most of its labor force (660,815 people) makes a steady income (629,970 people). Edmontonians' median income is 35,363$ (32,060$ after tax) and the average income is 46,571$ (38,904$ after tax).

---

[9] Edmonton recently elected the more left-winged NDP (New Democratic Party) in 2015. Many consider this a major change in Edmonton's politics including a shift away from traditional conservativist policies and culture.

[10] https://www12.statcan.gc.ca/census-recensement/2011/as-sa/fogs-spg/Facts-cma-eng.cfm?LANG=Eng&GK=CMA&GC=835

[11] http://www12.statcan.gc.ca/nhs-enm/2011/dp-pd/prof/details/page.cfm?Lang=E&Geo1=CSD&Code1=4811061&Data=Count&SearchText=Edmonton&SearchType=Begins&SearchPR=01&A1=All&B1=All&Custom=&TABID=1

[12] http://www.statcan.gc.ca/tables-tableaux/sum-som/l01/cst01/demo27v-eng.htm

Edmonton's crime rate is often measured using the Crime Severity Index[13] (CSI). The CSI measures not only the frequency of crime but also accounts for the seriousness or severity of crimes that are brought to police attention. It does this by assigning a weight to different crimes. In 2013, when I conducted my case study, CSI reports measured a drop in the national average score (68.7) and almost every census metropolitan areas (CMAs) saw a small decrease in their CSI score. Edmonton was the only CMA not to see this small decrease. Edmonton's CSI score (84.5) remained relatively stable, higher than the national average, and it also remained several points higher than other major Canadian cities' CSI scores (Calgary Alberta's score in 2013 was 60.4 and Toronto Ontario's score in 2014 was 47.1). This stability was largely because Edmonton saw several heavily weighted crimes in 2013 including 27 homicides, 89 robberies, 448 breaking and entering crimes, and 378 motor vehicle thefts.

Edmonton has several police services that are in charge of responding to this crime, including the Edmonton Police Service (EPS), as well as peace officer organizations such as the Edmonton Transit Service (ETS), Community Standards Peace Officers, and peace officer organizations located on University Campuses (UPS).

The Edmonton Police Service (EPS)

The EPS is Edmonton's central police service. It was founded in 1892 at which point it was made up of two constables, a bicycle, and two whistles. Now, in 2015, the EPS has approximately 1,400 police officers, and 500 civilian members.[14] As it has grown, the EPS has been organized into six divisions for patrol purposes, covering different geographic areas of the city.

[13] http://www.statcan.gc.ca/daily-quotidien/150722/dq150722a-eng.htm?HPA
[14] http://www.edmontonpolice.ca/AboutEPS/HistoryOfTheEPS.aspx

Current EPS chief is Roderick Knecht. While ranked as the most senior uniformed police officer in the RCMP (Royal Canadian Mounted Police), Knecht was in charge of efficient and effective operation of all components of the RCMP, including management of the RCMP's budget. In 2010, Knecht was responsible for increasing the regional authority of commanding officers in the RCMP's 14 divisions across Canada, in an effort to encourage a community based model of policing. Knecht's community based policing policies were seen as a demonstration of his advocacy for an integrated style of policing which relies on community input and community relations. In 2011, Knecht quit the RCMP and joined the EPS, continuing his 40-year policing career by moving to Edmonton, Alberta.

According to recent surveys, Edmontonians hold the EPS in high regard.[15] A 2014 survey released by the EPS showed that 93% of respondents agreed with the statement "I have a lot of confidence in the EPS," and in questions related to overall satisfaction, 80% of respondents agreed that the EPS provide adequate levels of service. 85% of respondents agreed that the EPS are competent in their duties and 87% of respondents went on to rate the EPS as average or excellent. 81% of those that reported personal contact with the EPS rated that contact as satisfactory. The limitations of surveys, especially those conducted by police organizations about police organizations, are not to be ignored. Whether or not a high approval rating is evidence of the EPS's strong performance is unclear. It could be the case that Edmontonians hold a favourable view of policing for reasons other than the EPS's performance. However, it could also be the case that the EPS has performed strongly in recent years and earned the public's confidence. Unsurprisingly, my interviews with police officers suggest that they believe the latter hypothesis. Participants in my study said that they think of themselves as part of a cutting edge

[15] http://www.edmontonpolicecommission.com/wp-content/uploads/2014/05/5.1.-2014_EPS_CitizenSurvey_Final1.pdf

police organization and often reference their adoption of high tech crime control technologies, including CCTV cameras.

The Edmonton city website says that it has installed CCTV cameras in each of its subway stations, transit centres and in some city pedways. These cameras are operated by the ETS, as well as EPS officers who have unrestricted access to footage according to the ETS officers who participated in my study. CCTV cameras have also been installed around the city's social districts including Whyte avenue and Jasper Avenue. These projects have received extensive public support, especially from business owners who feel that they might offer a solution to crime control problems. In addition, several traffic control cameras have been installed around the city. Live feeds to these cameras can be accessed by anyone via the Edmonton Traffic Cam website.[16] The EPS can rely on footage from these cameras to locate and investigate crime.

Along with CCTV cameras, EPS and other police organizations, including the ETS and UPS, work with vehicular cameras and wearable cameras. In addition, the EPS recently completed a 3-year study[17] (completed in December 2014) with wearable cameras. The pilot study attempted to measure how wearable cameras could be used by police, and how they might affect police behaviour. The study found that police officers have mixed perceptions of wearable cameras. Some officers thought that wearable cameras encouraged professional behaviour, but expressed concern that it might encourage a more hesitant style of policing, as well as a more "robotic" style of interaction between police and citizens. Despite these concerns, the EPS will soon initiate a larger study with wearable cameras.

Among the most unique and interesting features of policing in Edmonton is the controversial relationship between Edmonton police and a criminal defence lawyer named Tom

[16] http://www.edmontontrafficcam.com
[17] http://www.edmontonpolice.ca/news/bwv.aspx

Engel. Engel has become infamous for taking pro bono case from clients who allege that they have been victims of police brutality.[18] Cases involve incidents in which Edmonton youth allege that they were tasered several times by police in under a minute, to incidents in which individuals allege that the police are heavily biased against members of marginalized racial and ethnic groups. Engel has been heavily criticized by Edmonton police who often allege that he takes on clients without considering the validity of their allegations against police. Accordingly, Engel and the EPS are said to have a tense relationship (Rusnell, 2008). Though he is controversial, Engel is a regular voice in Edmonton news where he consistently uses his on-air time to express concerns about EPS practices, policies, and abuses of power. Engel's scrutiny may have role in encouraged police officers to uphold professional standards (Ibid). In fact, Engel's constant scrutiny may be one reason that the EPS is said to have developed cutting edge policies and training techniques, which, in turn, may be the reason that they hold a 93% approval rating from the public. This is colloquially known as the "Tom Engel effect." Accordingly, Engel has been awarded several prizes for his contribution to criminal justice in Edmonton including the CTLA's Harradence Prize and the Human Rights Award by the John Humphrey Centre for Peace and Human Rights.

Research Participants

After deciding to conduct my study in Edmonton, the next step was recruiting police officers and organizations to participate in my study. I was initially granted opportunities to communicate with police officers from the EPS with the help of my doctoral supervisor who put me in contact with a high ranking EPS Superintendent. With his help, I was able to go on 5-hour ride-alongs a total of 5 times with four EPS officers in January 2013. However, recruiting more officers became a difficult task, perhaps a result of tense history between police and researchers

---

[18] http://www.avenueedmonton.com/November-2008/Is-This-the-Most-Hated-Lawyer-in-Town/

in Canada, including instances in which police have formally criticized researchers for misrepresenting their work (Ericson, 2004).

Though I earned advanced EPS security clearance after further criminal background checks, member of the EPS became reluctant to speak to me, and reluctant to let me go on more ride-alongs with their officers. For months, I had a high-level security clearance but no access to police officers and no opportunities to do fieldwork. During this period, I organized meetings with officers from three EPS divisions and I detailed my study, my qualifications, and declared my security clearance. Police officers at each division that I visited seemed receptive, and routinely voiced their approval of my study. However, I would ultimately receive phone calls from the officers explaining that although they were interested in the study, administration had decided not to support their participation. On most occasions, I was told that administration worried that having a researcher with officers during patrol would be distracting and could slow a police officer's response times.

I am suspicious of these claims because EPS police officers regularly take volunteers and social workers with them on patrol. I suspect that if these individuals do not slow response time, a researcher would not either. In follow-up phone calls and meetings with EPS officers and Sergeants, I promised that I would not interfere with police officers and that I would follow their instructions. I also asked if I could conduct interviews with officers outside of their patrols so as not to affect their response time. I was told again by the officers that administration was not willing to allow this type of research. Some of the EPS officers (whom I met while trying to organize meeting with administration and/or through existing contacts I had made through ride-alongs in January 2013) who expressed interest in my study privately admitted that they were surprised at the administration's reluctance, and expressed a desire to participate in my study. But again, most of them ultimately decided against doing so and explained that they could not bear

the risk unless they received administrative approval. As a result, I was left waiting in limbo as I continued to try to recruit participants and gain the approval of EPS police administration. Unfortunately, I was never able to speak with administration and the reasons I was given for their reluctance to participate were never fully detailed.

I suspect that beyond concerns about my effect on their response-time, the EPS may have been reluctant to participate in my study because of concerns about what I might discover, especially in light of the controversial nature of my research topic. Just like a photographer, a researcher could monitor police and then discover and report misconduct. The police may, therefore, have turned down my research proposals based on a desire to avoid being subject to what they worried might be unfair scrutiny or critique. In retrospect, I may have benefited by trying to speak with administrative heads with my supervisor and/or University of Alberta staff at my side. This may have added legitimacy to my proposed study. It may have been the case that going to meetings alone, and communicating with police officers rather than police administration gave the wrong impression, especially for a graduate student.

During the ensuing period of limbo, the EPS Superintendent who had organized ride-alongs for me in January continued to organize interviews with officers within his division. I spoke with 4 more EPS officers from April-September 2013. In total, I had conducted observational research with 7 EPS officers for over 25 hours. These officers included 6 white policemen (including 1 detective and 1 sergeant) and 1 white policewoman.

When I met with him again in April, 2013 the Superintendent offered me the opportunity to create research opportunities with other policing organizations in Edmonton. He set up interviews during which I met with administrative heads in the Edmonton Transit Service Police Service (ETS). I also spoke with the administrative heads in the University Police Service (UPS), made up of policing officers who serve and protect one of Edmonton's University Campuses and

nearby areas. Both the ETS and UPS agreed to participate in my study. I suspect that my security clearance with the EPS, and the EPS Superintendent's willingness to vouch for me played a key role in their decision.

Both the ETS and UPS organizations are made up of Edmonton peace officers. Peace officers are members of Edmonton's legal enforcement team, given legal authority by the Alberta Peace Officer Act,[19] the Peace Officer Regulation,[20] and the Peace Officer Act (Ministerial) Regulation.[21] Peace officers are authorized to enforce municipal bylaws, though their ability to enforce the law can be limited. Peace officers do not have the same legal authority or power as Edmonton's police officers (members of the EPS). For instance, a peace officer has several regulations limiting their ability to carry weapons. Unlike EPS officers, peace officers are often limited to policing a particular zone in the city such as a University Campus or areas related to city transit services. In addition, peace officers exist on a lower rung of the legal system's hierarchy as compared to the EPS. Accordingly, EPS officers have primary legal authority when working with peace officers.

Research opportunities with both ETS and UPS organizations were negotiated with administration so consent forms were signed by myself and then organization heads who emailed copies to the entire roster of officers. This saved time because I no longer had to deliver forms to each officer I interacted with. From then on, I only personally delivered consent forms during formal audio recorded interviews. As planned, no officer was required to participate and each had

---

[19] http://www.qp.alberta.ca/1266.cfm?page=P03P5.cfm&leg_type=Acts&isbncln=9780779753130

[20] http://www.qp.alberta.ca/1266.cfm?page=2006_291.cfm&leg_type=Regs&isbncln=9780779759170

[21] http://www.qp.alberta.ca/1266.cfm?page=2006_312.cfm&leg_type=Regs&isbncln=9780779759293

the opportunity to review the forms and decide the degree to which they wanted to be involved in my study.

The UPS: The University of Alberta Protective Services

The UPS hires individuals with a high school diploma and a law enforcement/security related diploma or university degree. Though consideration is given to experience in policing (including but not limited to experience working as a security guard), some officers I spoke with had no previous experience in a related field. In addition to meeting general peace officer hiring standards, UPS officers are expected to complete 6 weeks training courses and receive ongoing training in safety and control tactics, first aid and CPS, and bias free policing. When I conducted my research, Officers worked 4 11-hours shifts per week, but schedules varied tremendously as campus events were organized. Regular duties involved patrolling the campus, responding to homeless peoples on campus, helping drunken students to their apartments, working as security and safety agents at social events, responding to thefts and violence, helping people with lost items, and issuing tickets for traffic violations.

Despite the city's attempts to clarify the role and legal powers of a peace officer, as compared to a police officer, most UPS officers acknowledged that the general public as well as some members of peace officer organizations themselves were confused about the details differentiating the two groups. Accordingly, most officers simplified the key differences between themselves and the EPS as a matter of jurisdiction and legal authority. Many UPS officers seemed to understand the peace officer job as training ground where they could gain the experience needed to join the EPS. Otherwise, the UPS work was quite similar to the EPS's. In fact, both organizations regularly worked together. I witnessed this on several occasions as EPS officers and UPS officer aided one another during patrols, arrests, and when responding to security threats. UPS were often first responders to many incidents that occurred on campus.

These included anything from missing keys and lost pets to suicide attempts, sexual assaults, and drug sales. However, UPS officers took a secondary role in this process when EPS arrived, often by supplying EPS with information so that they could take over when it was deemed necessary.

The UPS officers did not carry firearms, but were otherwise fitted with all expected police gear and transport including vehicles fitted with automatically activated outward facing vehicular cameras. The officers also operated and had access to all on campus CCTV cameras, many of which are activated by movement sensors to capture footage of people in offices and lecture halls at night. Finally, many officers carried their own smartphones which they sometimes used to document evidence and/or interactions with citizens if needed.

Official demographic information about the UPS is not available. But of the 23 officers who participated in my study, 18 were white men, 4 were white women, and 1 was an Eastern Asian man. Most were receptive to my research and spoke with me and/or allowed me to go on a ride-along when I asked. Participants were of various statuses and experience levels, including rookie officers with less than 6-month experience, as well as Sergeants with over 10 years working with the UPS and an extensive history in other security and policing positions. In aggregate, I spent 20 days/nights on patrol with the UPS, totalling 80 hours, during which I conducted observational research and informal interviews (to be discussed later). In addition, I conducted 11 formal semi-structured interviews. 5 of these interviews were conducted with white men of line officer status, 3 were with white men of Sergeant status, 2 were with white women of line officer status, and 1 was with a Canadian-born man with Eastern Asian heritage.

The ETS: Edmonton Transit Service Peace Officers

The majority of my observational research, 100-hours, took place with the ETS. Like the UPS, members of the ETS hold Peace Officer status. Their jurisdiction is limited to transit locations including bus stops, bus routes, subway stations, and inside transit vehicles. However,

because these locations are spread across Edmonton, the officers regularly travelled in and out of their jurisdictions, sometimes performing duties outside of transit spaces. Regular duties involved checking passenger tickets in subways, helping citizens with directions and information about which public transport systems are available, and responding to disorderly behaviour in subway cars, usually at night. ETS officers claimed that they are known for working in dangerous and seedy locations, especially when one considers the criminal activities they regularly respond to within subway stations in the dead of night. Thus they had experience dealing with the diverse range of duties that most police services can be expected to deal with, despite their limited jurisdiction. That being said, like most police organizations, the ETS's police work is dominated by incidents such as loitering and fare evasion. In fact, reports[22] suggest that in 2014 ETS Peace officers dealt with 10,934 incidents of fare evasion versus a total of 796 criminal code offences, made up mostly of assault, fraud, and drugs.

I was not given demographic data about the ETS police service, but I collected demographic information on my participants. 19 of the 30 ETS officers who made substantial contributions to my study were white men between the ages 25 and 60, 4 were Eastern Asian men between the ages of 20 and 35, and 7 were white women between the ages 25 and 40. Of the 10 formal semi-structured interviews I conducted, 9 were white men and 1 was a Canadian born man with East Asian heritage. I spoke with officers of various ranks and position including Superintendent, Training Officer, Dispatcher, Rookie/trainee, Sergeant. Most participants held rank as an experienced frontline Officer and some had been granted status as Relief Sergeants (officers who would act as Sergeants in certain circumstances, often to fill in for Sergeants who were otherwise occupied).

[22] http://www.edmonton.ca/transportation/transit/ETSCSS-Annual-Report-2014.pdf

Particularly important for my research is the fact that ETS officers regularly work in high visibility conditions as a result of the cameras on their police cruisers, the heavy presence of cameras in transit locations, as well as the public nature of the spaces they patrol. Like the UPS, dispatchers who controlled surveillance cameras in transit locations work directly with the ETS. Accordingly, ETS officers know camera operators personally, and have strong working and/or social relationships with them (one officer was dating a dispatcher for example). Knowing camera operators also granted police some degree of control over these cameras and the resulting footage. This does not give officers unrestricted access to the footage produced by internal cameras. Nor does it mean officers have the ability to edit footage when it was made available to them. Rather, the officers have to file formal requests to view video footage and are only given access to footage for a short period of time. No officer in any of the organizations I researched had opportunity to delete footage. Only superintendents could decide how long video files are kept on a hard drive and at what point they will be overwritten. The decision to delete footage is usually based on the limits of hard drive space rather than the desire to delete certain footage and keep others. In addition to being monitored by CCTV cameras and dashcameras, ETS officers also carried personal smartphones which they sometimes used to record evidence, as well as document their experiences in the field, ranging from experiences with criminal suspects to photographs which they wanted to use for their social media profiles. A few officers also had experience with wearable cameras when they had worked with other policing organizations.

Though they differed in various ways, each of the three organizations that participated in my research is a certified police organization (not a private security organization) and charged with traditional police work including patrolling, responding to crime, making arrests, subduing dangerous peoples, traffic direction, report writing, court appearances and rare tasks such as stakeouts, vehicular chases, and crime scene investigations. In addition to performing similar

duties, the ETS, UPS, and EPS are part of an established social network. Each organization regularly work in tandem and members of the ETS are routinely promoted to the EPS after they apply, pass recruitment requirements, and receive adequate training. In addition, officers have strong social ties connecting each police organization to the other, and they regularly meet friends from other departments while off-duty. This may be why I found no significant differences between police organizations in terms of their perception of and responses to cameras and photographers. It also means that each organization could provide data about general questions about the police's relationship with cameras.

In total, I completed over 200 hours of observational research with the three police organizations. I spoke with over 60 officers of differing rank and experience, and completed approximately 60 informal interviews and 20 formal semi-structured interviews. The vast majority of my participants where white men and their ages ranged from mid 20s to early 50s. I spoke with only a few white women, 12 in total, and even fewer non-white officers, 5 in total, each of whom were of Eastern Asian ethnicity. I was not given the impression that the overrepresentation of white men in my participant sample was by choice or because of any unique reluctance among women and racial minorities to participate. Rather my sample size and quality is most likely a reflection of the continued dominance of white men in policing (Bolton Jr. and Feagin, 2004).

It is worth noting that the vast majority of research participants were line Officers, Relief-sergeants or Sergeants. This is because I focused my study on the experiences of officers who are most likely to spend their time on patrol and in public spaces as they are the most likely to be able to offer information about the lived experience of the police's growing visibility. It is also important to note that the majority of participants were aged 20-50 years old. Though most participants had multiple years working in policing, very few were near retirement or old enough

to have known a time when policing was not subject to extensive surveillance, especially since the development of smartphones. This is key to my study as it means that my data speaks to a younger generation of officers who have grown up in a time when smartphones and cameras are ubiquitous and normalized, which is likely to have played a significant role in their perceptions of and response to cameras and photographers.

3.3 Gathering Data: Participant Observation and Interviews

My primary data gathering strategy was participant-observation. Participant-observation is a popular research gathering technique with which researchers gain entry to a field (a non-laboratory space) inhabited by the social group that they are interested in studying. Once in the field, researchers observe and participate, to varying degrees, in activities to develop an in-depth understanding of that social group and/or social phenomena (Corbin and Strauss, 2008; DeWalt and DeWalt, 2010). This makes participant-observation a holistic approach that looks at an object of study within its natural context, rather than in isolation (Jorgensen, 1989; Spradley, 1980; Verschuren, 2001).

Participant-observation does not necessarily rely on a singular tactic for data extraction. Rather, its tactics can range depending on what role a researcher plays, how they document their findings, the context in which they conduct research and other considerations. Accordingly, participant-observation allows for "iterative-parallel strategy" where a "researcher carries out many different research activities in an unplanned, whimsical order, depending on what he or she finds" (Verschuren, 2001, p. 131). Classic traditions of participant-observation often try to minimize bias and maximize objectivity by aiming for unobtrusive observation (Adler and Adler, 1994; Tierney, 1997). However, based on a recognition that this can limit the quality of data that is accessed, researchers can vary their level of participation as they observe their participants

(Gold, 1986), so long as they consider their impact on their study, what Burawoy calls "reflexive science" (1998).

In my study, I relied on a tactic of following police officers on patrols, what the officers called "ride-alongs," during different times and during different days of the week. These ride-alongs ranged in length from 4 hours to 12 hours. They included morning, day, and night patrols, as well as a mix of weekdays and weekends, during which I simply followed officers, watching their behaviour and paying particular attention to their relationship with cameras. During most ride-alongs, I observed either a single officer at a time, or a pair of officers as they patrolled different areas of the city. This meant I spent a long time in the back of police cruisers, which was uncomfortable to say the least (I sometimes had to end a ride-along early or join a different group of officers if the back of a cruiser was needed after officers made an arrest and/or needed to transport an individual). I also spent a large amount of time in the police headquarters just hanging out to get a sense of policing's relationship with low visibility (which I discuss in chapter 7). Hanging out at headquarters included the chance to spend time with dispatchers and camera operators who watch live feeds from surveillance cameras.

I documented my observations using a field diary and I used an overt note taking style meaning I kept a notepad and a pen handy and recorded notes frequently (DeWalt and DeWalt, 2010). An overt note taking style allowed me to record data as it was gathered, and to record details that could be forgotten if I waited until after fieldwork to write notes. The presence of a field diary could have discouraged some officers from speaking with me, or affected what the officers said, and some officers expressed anxieties about my note taking. Anxious officers seemed curious and suspicious of my note taking, perhaps out of a concern that I would document their unprofessional behaviour and/or misrepresent their work. In response, some of these officers expressed curiosities about my field notes. For example, a few asked me what I was

writing down, or how I was writing certain things down, or made jokes about the fact that I was taking notes.

I tried to lower concerns by asking my participants for permission to take notes during the ride-alongs (all the officers allowed it). I think this courtesy might have helped officers feel more comfortable about my note-taking. Moreover, I discovered early during my research that always having a notebook open was a better strategy than only taking out my notebook during interviews. This is because using a notebook sparingly seemed to make some participants anxious. On my first ride-along, for example, when I took my notebook out of my pocket for the first time, an officer joked, “shit just got real” and his willingness to speak with me declined. Having a notebook out all the time, on the other hand, made it part of the normal research routine and, thus, something that the police seemed more comfortable with. Still, I was flexible and shifted away from note taking or used a covert style if need be. During lunch breaks with officers I had just met, for example, I would close my notebook and leave it on a desk or table in front of me, so the officers could rest assured that I was not taking notes. It was difficult to determine exactly when such decisions needed to be made, so I used my discretion based on my sense of research participants’ moods, and or any comments they made about my note taking. Such carful control over my field diary, however, was rare, as my impression is that most officers were comfortable with my note taking. In the last stages of my research, I abandoned any effort to conceal my note taking when some of my participants told me that they were not concerned about my field diary. Taking overt notes all the time allowed me to take extensive notes on the things I saw in the field.

After each ride-along, I went home and opened my field diary and then began to record my notes in digital form using a basic word processing program. I wrote my notes out as I saw them in my field diary. Once this was complete, I added subheadings and keywords to each day’s

field notes to help organize them based on what occurred, what I saw, and how they might address questions about the police's visibility.

As part of my participant-observation strategy, I gathered data via interviews. I relied on two types of interviews in particular; informal interviews (DeWalt and DeWalt, 2010; Peräkylä and Ruusuvuori, 2011) and formal interviews. Informal interviews require researchers to simply ask interview questions during casual conversations over the course of observational research. Informal interviews allow researchers to gather information without breaking conversation flow, interrupting the day-to-day routine and, perhaps most importantly, informal interviews encourage participants to discuss a topic without relying on the researcher to structure the discussion (the way surveys or structured interviews might structure discussions and thus limit participant's answers). Accordingly, interviews become part of observational research rather than requiring their own scheduling. Officers were made aware that I may ask them to participant in interviews and/or ask them interview questions in the field, however I did not formalize the informal interview process by declaring the start of an informal interview. In order to maintain the conversational style of informal interviews, I often began to ask questions when I was aware that I would have the opportunity (at least 30 minutes of uninterrupted time with an officer) to do so. In many cases, my participants prompted me by asking if I had any questions.

Interview questions ranged depending on opportunity and many informal interviews would have to be paused and restarted if an officer received a call for service. Despite this variability, I maintained some basic structure so that I could directly address my research questions. Questions included:

- How are you monitored while on the job? Who does this monitoring? What kinds of technologies are used to conduct this monitoring?

- What kinds of considerations inform how you behave in public spaces?
- Does the public monitor police behaviour? How does this affect police behaviour?
- Do the police monitor each others' behaviour? Does this influence police behaviour?
- Does the knowledge that a significant portion of the public owns a portable camera affect your performance as a police officer?
- Have you or your peers ever been video recorded by members of the public? What do you believe are the motivations of members of the public who record police officers?
- Have you or your peers ever responded to members of the public who attempt to record your behaviour?
- Have you seen police videos online? What do you think about them?

My interview questions were designed to be open-ended and allow participants to respond in diverse ways so that I did not have a limiting influence on how they thought about their visibility.

I did not use an audio recorder to document informal interviews. This is because recording police officers was subject to significant limitations due to ethical and privacy concerns. For example, recording officers as they interacted with members of the general public was not always allowed. Even if I were to ignore ethics, by secretly keeping an audio recorder running during ride-alongs, this would have been difficult because of the need to constantly change locations during police patrols and the practical limitations that this introduces.

Most interviews took a conversational style, meaning officers seemed less anxious, more candid, and even allowed me to pitch my interpretations of their answers back to the officers so that they could clarify their answers. In some cases, spontaneous quasi-focus groups emerged where officers, hearing my discussion with one of their peers, would crowd around and begin sharing their own opinions. I never planned for these quasi-focus groups, but I took opportunity

to see officers discuss their visibility with one another, getting a sense of how they agreed and disagreed about topics such as the surveillance of external cameras.

Because the administrative heads of participating police organizations had signed consent forms for the entire organization, and then delivered the consent forms to each officer, I felt it was no longer necessary to have them sign consent forms before these discussions. However, I did ask officers if they had read the consent forms and then reviewed my study and the ethics of my study at the beginning of each conversation. I then asked them if they wished to participate. Most officers I spoke with said yes and most of my research data comes from the informal interviews that followed.

I also conducted formal semi-structured interviews with officers who seemed comfortable speaking to me regardless of formalities like signed consent forms, audio recorders, and interview scripts (this included Sergeants, Training Officers, and some of the most experienced Officers in each department). I completed 20 formal interviews across all three organizations by the end of my study. Interviews lasted from 30-60 minutes. I relied on the same questions used in informal interviews. These interviews also offered opportunities to clarify what I saw in the field and triangulate (Jick, 1989; Denzin, 1978; Stake, 2005) the responses that officers had given me while speaking on ride-alongs. Most interviews took place in cafes or coffee shops while officers were off duty where I purchased participants a coffee or breakfast (as most interviews took place early in the morning) and we sat down to talk. As is common in qualitative work, I documented these interviews using audio recorders and transcribed them once the interview was over (Ericson, 1982; Bolton Jr. and Feagin, 2004; Loftus, 2009; Fassin, 2013; Brown, 2015).

3.4 Being There: How I Interacted with Research Participants

A researcher must remember that data is not "lying about, waiting patiently to be discovered" (Wolcott, 1985). Instead, research data must be actively extracted. To be successful, this means that researchers conducting fieldwork must encourage research participants to forgo their "right to be silent" (Rabinow, 1977, p. 129). Accordingly, qualitative researchers have traditionally valued data from a study in which a researcher is able to gain "insider status" with his/her participants, assuming that this status will encourage participants to allow for "privileged eavesdropping" (Burke, 1989). However, more recent work on the politics of being in the field has challenged the privileging of insider status (Labaree, 2002). There is a greater appreciation for the risks of becoming an insider and the benefits of remaining an outsider (Merton, 1974). These risks include the costs of trying to deeply penetrate a social group while trying to become an insider, particularly in terms of a researcher's ability to remain neutral and objective. Though constructionist and post-modernist researchers have rejected traditional standards of objectivity and neutrality (Lincoln et al. 2011), there remains a need to consider how the accuracy of research, and therefore, the costs of trying to be an insider must be acknowledged (Labaree, 2002). These costs are perhaps best reflected in discussions of a researcher who "goes native" (Malinowsky, 1922), a contestable concept itself (Labaree, 2002). In addition, researchers have begun to appreciate the value of conducting research from an outsider perspective (Bucerius, 2013), as well as the limitations of the insider/outsider binary when trying to describe the complexities of a researcher's position (De Andrade, 2000).

To appreciate how I interacted with research participants, I adopted the approach taken by more recent case studies which suggest that researchers occupy multiple levels of insiderness and outsiderness while conducting their study (Merriam et al. 2001). Examining a researcher's position, therefore, requires an understanding the multiplicity of roles a researcher plays while conducting research, an idea which is exemplified by the work of several qualitative researchers

who offer spectrums which can be used to describe a researcher's status. For instance, Gold (1958) proposes that a researcher can be a complete-participant, participant observer, observer as participant, or a complete observer. Banks (1998) proposes researchers exist on a scale between indigenous-insider, indigenous-outsider, external-insider, and external-outsider. Adler and Adler (1987) offer the peripheral, active, and complete membership spectrum. Among other things, these scales shed light on the dynamism of a researcher's positionality as they conduct research (Mullings, 1999).

Accordingly, I found myself constantly shifting my position while conducting my study, often from observer to participant, depending on context. For instance, during interactions with police officers in divisional headquarters, particularly early in my research, I was very much an outsider and an observer. Officers knew little about me and did not seem willing to speak to me. Even after I was introduced by organizational administration, I had to continue to build rapport (Gans, 1968). During this period, when I had yet to build rapport, I observed officers from a distance, examining how they interacted with one another, paying particularly attention to if/how/when visibility was organically brought up. I also used this time to gain a broad sense of an Edmonton police officers' daily routines and relied on my peripheral status to gather data that was least likely to be influenced by my emotions or personal biases that might later develop when I began to interact with police officers (Adler and Adler, 1987).

Over time, I shifted from observer to participant as I began to speak to officers, inserting myself into my participants' daily routine to a greater degree. It was during break time or during a late night shift that I tried to participate the most as these times allowed me to build rapport with officers while they gossiped, and I could speak to officers without interrupting their work. To participate, I joked with officers, involved myself in their gossiping, talked about what I had seen while in the field, and debated officers on a number of issues unrelated to their police work

(steroid use in sports and romance were two of the most popular topics). I sense that the officers grew to trust and perhaps even enjoy my presence, understanding me as someone whom they could socialize with, rather than strictly an observer taking notes on their actions. I avoided engaging in any excessively critical discussions about policing, and usually skirted around my opinions of policing and racism when I was asked, often in response to the sight of a non-white driver's traffic violation and/or a call for service to respond to a non-white individual's deviance and/or criminal behaviour. Reflecting on my research experience, I think this gave me the ability to encourage officers to speak their minds without being influenced by my views on controversial issues.

When asked general questions about myself, I discussed my own background as a security officer when I was younger, and my potential interest in a policing career once I completed my doctorate. I was later told by a Sergeant in the ETS that his officers said that they grew to trust me upon hearing of my interest in policing. Before long, officers began to speak to me about personal feelings and experiences including their dating lives and my own. I was also invited by officers to lunches and dinners. I often used this as a time to build rapport with officers by asking them about their experiences as police officers and/then their personal views on policing. Sometimes officers paid for my meals.

Snow et al.'s (1986) "buddy researcher" is the best descriptor for assessing my role during these interactions. The buddy researcher blends the role of a researcher and friend. When playing this role, researchers always make clear that they are indeed researchers, but attempt to build a close personal relationship with officers by participating with them, avoiding academic language, and behaving similar to them. If successful, a researcher can gain access to privileged information, and participants' backstage environments.

A few officers were not enthusiastic about being questioned or followed by a researcher and did not partake in conversation despite my best efforts. Furthermore, I found that despite my buddy status, there were scenarios in which I was either unable to directly participate because officers were not forthcoming and/or in situations where my safety was not guaranteed. For example, staying close by to officers as they conducted an arrest was not allowed, and some officers told me to stay back. I was still able to collect valuable data in these situations as I often observed from a relatively close distance and, after they completed their duties, most participants always shared any information I asked for. I was therefore trusted with insider knowledge during most interactions, even when I was told to stay back. In fact, the more time I spent with officers, the more likely it was that they encouraged me follow them to the front lines of their police work, even encouraging me to follow them when I self-consciously stepped out of their way. In these cases, I was not only trusted with insider knowledge, but sometimes encouraged not to limit my access and to gather as much data as possible.

Much of my research required some degree of mild deception and this may have affected how I interacted with participants. As mentioned, I regularly told participants that I had an interest in becoming a police officer after my doctorate, but beyond this, I also offered police officers a generally balanced view of policing, particularly when they asked me about my thoughts on police issues. I was reluctant to offer my largely critical opinions of policing, and my favourable thoughts on the surveillance of police by citizens, because I did not want to negatively affect their willingness to speak with me. Misleading participants in this way also usually involved mildly pandered to their views, especially when I wanted them to expand on controversial statements. For example, I avoided challenging or criticizing views on topics which they seemed particularly passionate about (both those which related to policing and those that did

not) including the effectiveness of Conservative governments, the non-racism of policing, and the importance of religious belief for crime prevention.

My deception was based on an assumption that sharing my views would upset some officers, specifically those officers who seemed quite hostile to popular critiques of policing, and accused a large portion of the general public of cop hating (discussed in more detail in chapter 5). There is no guarantee that this improved the quality of my data. Even though it is based on my participants' seemingly unfavourable response to critique, it might have been the case that, if I was more honest, officers would be willing to engage in nuanced conversations about policing and provide me with useful data. However, I was not willing to take this risk. My impression is that presenting myself as a neutral buddy researcher without a significantly critical view of policing would earn my participants' trust and make me seem less threatening.

Deception sometimes made me anxious (Gans, 1968). That being said, this anxiety was mild at best. With the exception of telling officers about my interests in policing as a career, I never bluntly lied to police about my intentions or my research. In addition, I offered participants as much information as possible about my research when they made decisions about if and how to participate. Accordingly, I never felt a strong sense of guilt, nor do I think that any guilt I did feel produced a tendency to over-identify with participants (Ibid). Rather, my impression is that this deception was a technique used to gather more data and develop a better sense of the police's visibility.

Finally, though there is no way of knowing exactly how my race affected my data, it is worth making note of, as earning the trust of research participants can be difficult if one's identity does not necessarily match that of one's participants. As mentioned, most of my participants were white men. I, on the other hand, am a light-skinned brown man of Indian heritage. I suspect that this may have made some officers reluctant to speak to me about certain topics such as race and

racism. That being said, it would be a mistake to argue that my race limited my access to data in any significant way. Rather, my race may have instead placed me in a unique position from which to observe and gather data (Hill-Collins, 1990), especially from officers who did speak about race and racism, often acknowledging my own identity when they did so. For example, while identifying citizens by their race, or making racial jokes, participants often apologized to me and/or began to talk about their personal anti-racist philosophies. I suspect that their apologies and efforts to prove their colour-blindness (their seeming inability or unwillingness to perceive race and/or hold racial biases) were directly connected to my own non-whiteness. In addition, many officers were forthcoming with their racial joking representing a complex relationship between my racial identity, their racial identities, and their racial joking (this is discussed in more detail in Chapter 7). My participants' willingness to joke about race and racism in my presence, and to acknowledge my race when they did so, suggests that my identity was not a limitation, but an opportunity to gather unique data. Relatedly, I suspect that my gender was key to encouraging my suspects willingness to speak with me, particularly because many of the topics that male participants gossiped about (sports and romance/dating from a male's perspective for example) seemed informed by gender and masculinity.

3.5 Analysis and Coding

Though many think of analysis as a process which begins after data collection is fully completed, analysis and collection are rarely so distinct (DeWalt and DeWalt, 2010). Analysis is an on-going process of meaning making that researchers engage in to make sense of their data. According to Robert Stake (1999), there are two basic forms of analysis, categorical aggregation or direct interpretation which begin as soon as a researcher begins to collect data. The former involves the aggregation of data until conclusions can be drawn about the unit of study, and the

latter involves the analysis of a single case without an aim to draw generalizable conclusions. Robert Yin, (2013) proposes that there are various forms analysis including pattern matching, linking data to propositions, explanation building, time-series analysis, building logic models, and cross-case synthesis. Each of these strategies begins by developing a database and filing system where data can be deposited, stored, and examined. As mentioned, I stored my data on my computer, categorizing it first based on the dates and times it was collected.

Once enough data had been collected, I began manually sorted my data into categories, a process called coding. To do so, I printed out interview transcripts as well as my own field notes, read them and re-read them. I then sorted my data according to the questions I had asked during research as well as existing theories about police visibility, what Yin (2013) calls "linking data to propositions." These included categories for each of the research questions (outlined earlier in this chapter), and categories related to the types of cameras monitoring police (smartphone cameras, wearable cameras, CCTV, vehicular cameras), and then categories related to common topics of discussion including the benefits of being recorded, the risks of being recorded, public perceptions of police, race, gender, and the dangers faced by police officers.

As I read my data I began to discover key themes including general categories which captured some of the most common ideas and/or responses that participants offered me when I asked them about their visibility. I realized that my findings spoke to a diversity of police opinions rather than a single unified opinion. Accordingly, I began to re-sort my findings into categories reflecting the variety of opinions that police officers had about their visibility, many of which ranged from generally negative or hostile opinions about being recorded to generally positive opinions about being recorded. I recognized that this binary was limiting so, once categorized, I began to develop more nuanced sub categories addressing variations in my participants' opinions. As I did so, my data became a mix of facts, police perceptions, and my

increasingly complex interpretations (Stake, 1999; Meher, 2000; Peräkylä and Ruusuvuori, 2011). The categories, including codes and subcodes, which seemed to reflect my research findings best can be organized as follows:

Code 1: Apathetic perspective: The police are indifferent about being recorded

- Professional: Professionalism reduces the risks of high visibility
- Camera-friendly: the risks associated with high visibility can be reduced

Code 2: Strategic perspective: The police want to be recorded

- Defence: High visibility facilitates the production of police-centric imagery
- Props: Cameras can be used as props during social interactions
- Crediting images: High visibility facilitates the production of pro-police imagery

Code 3: Camera Shy perspective: The police have concerns about being recorded

- Misrepresentation: videos are used to misrepresent police
- Misinterpretation: videos of police are misinterpreted
- Cop haters: videos of police support an anti-police disposition
- Backstage: police are especially concerned about privacy in backstage environments

I gave my best effort to maintain accuracy and clarity by trying to reflect what I saw in the field, rather than being influenced by pre-existing biases. I did this by reviewing my data several times and going through the coding process several times so that my final themes best reflected what my participants said and did.

3.6 Canteen Culture

In any study using participant observation or interview data gathering strategies, a researcher must contend with the critique that their data may be based on participants' lies, misrepresentations, and exaggerations. This critique can be especially common in studies of

policing because police officers are known to have a prevailing "canteen culture" (Waddington, 1999), which describes their tendency to tell highly dramatic versions of events to friends, peers, and researchers. The canteen culture may be an effort to earn praise or respect, or it may simply be an effort to joke, laugh, and play while speaking about what may have, in reality, been a fairly dull experience. I suspect some of my participants may have exaggerated their experiences during interviews. For instance, in an interview with a security guard/bouncer at a local bar (I had planned to conduct a separate but related study on bouncing and high visibility), I was told of an incident in which bouncers had to climb a speeding truck driven by an angry former employee as it rushed towards their bar. One bouncer in particular claimed he jumped on to the moving truck, scaled it to the roof, made his way to the driver's seat, and then kicked the angry driver out, before stopping the truck meters away from his bar. All of this apparently occurred while the truck was approaching speeds of 80 kilometres per hour, and while the bouncer's peers hung on to the truck's sides after their own attempts to scale it. Needless to say, this bouncer's peers did not remember these events exactly as he said that they happened.

I tried to overcome research problems caused by canteen culture and achieve a higher degree of accuracy in two ways. First, I tried to build rapport with participants by taking on a buddy researcher role and encouraging officers to speak with me often and openly. Of course, this approach may not prevent officers from exaggerating. In fact, it may encourage more exaggeration as officers try to influence my opinion of them and joke/gossip/exaggerate while speaking with me. Second, I relied on triangulation methods whenever possible. The term triangulation comes from navigational techniques that use multiple points of reference to determine location. Similarly, the term triangulation in social scientific research involves "using multiple perceptions to clarify meaning, verifying the repeatability of an observation or interpretation" (Stake, 2005, p. 454).

I used a particular type of triangulation called “between or across methods triangulation” (as opposed to within-method triangulation), as I compared data from both observation and interviews to validate my findings (Denzin, 1978). I assume that if data from both these sources was congruent, then my results were more likely to accurately speak to police perspectives about high visibility (Jick, 1989). Accordingly, I checked if what participants claimed during interviews converged with their behaviour during observational research. Though this is difficult in a study which concludes that there are multiple and even contradictory features about the police’s high visibility, I did not find my participants claims to radically contradict their behaviours in the field. For example, I never witnessed police officers confidently declaring that they were not afraid of being recorded by smartphones, and then responding to the sight of smartphones with attempts to arrest photographers. Comparing results from different data gathering strategies also offered the chance to enrich my data by discovering unexpected elements or explanations. For instance, comparing observational data while with an officer to data gathered during an interview with that officer often offered a chance to consider how that officer’s perspectives (as determined during interviews) might affect their behaviour on patrol. In addition, when possible, I asked officers to repeat their thoughts on an issue and to speak to them on multiple occasions so I could compare their answers over time, and compare their representation of incidents with that of their peers.

I also relied on follow-up interviews as a last component of my research. I conducted 4 follow up interviews approximately 7 months after completing ride-alongs with 1 EPS officer, 2 ETS officers, and 1 UPS officer. During these interviews I gave these officers, whom I felt were trustworthy and reflective of some of the key themes in my study, a basic outline of my findings, and I then asked them about their thoughts on my arguments and conclusions. As with any participant observation study, this privileged the views of particular informants, and so I selected

participants that are particularly experienced in policing, and had numerous experiences with cameras and photographers. Some of the officers who participated in follow-up interviews offered some advice for amendments, including the need to place an emphasize on the variability of police perceptions. I found these amendments valuable as I began reviewing my data and writing early drafts of this thesis. However, for the most part, the officers said that they were impressed by my data and claimed that it reflected both their own and most of their peer's views on visibility, cameras, and photographers.

I propose these attempts to verify my data and encourage officers to express themselves openly helped me gather data which speaks accurately to participants' high visibility experiences and, therefore, data which will be a useful contribution to the study of policing in an era of mass surveillance.

3.7 Conclusion: My study's limitations

In summary, my research relied on a case study method with participant-observation and interview data gathering strategies. I bounded my study to three police organizations in Edmonton. In total I conducted 200 hours of fieldwork and interviewed over 60 police officers. I encouraged my officers to be candid and participate by playing a researcher-buddy role. And I double checked my data using various triangulation strategies.

Despite the candidness of most participants and my efforts to encourage communication and informal discussions, I conclude by identifying two limitations related to my research method. Though these limitations have been discussed briefly previously, I will address them in more detail here. The first concerns the nature of participant observation studies, and cannot be solved per se. Rather it is something to keep in mind when reading my findings. The second concerns the generalizability of my study.

In participant observation studies a researcher gathers data, interprets data, and presents their findings designed to accurately reflects reality (DeWalt and DeWalt, 2010). But in interpretation, there is room for misinterpretation as existing biases shape our arguments. This is inherent in all social scientific work. In response, researchers have developed various strategies to address their biases. Most researchers at least consider their personal impact on the data they gather, and add some reflexive discussions (Marks, 2004). Some may attempt to limit their impact on their data during research. This usually means simply recording what they see without interfering and shaping the nature of their interactions with participants (Burawoy, 1998). Accordingly, some ethnographers are more "observer" than "participant" during fieldwork (Gold 1958).

Remaining an observer was not an option for my study. As mentioned, speaking with police officers during informal interviews was a valuable source of information, and staying at a distance from police during fieldwork would have greatly limited the information I could draw out. However, with this style of research comes the risk that my involvement influenced what I saw. My presence may, for example, have skewed an officer's behaviour during a ride-along. Related to this problem are risks of bias when it comes to interpreting the data I gathered. In order to limit these risks, I tried to keep an open mind about what I saw. I did not go into the field trying to confirm or deny existing theories of visibility and policing, and I tried my best to keep my personal politics out of my research. But the issue of bias and interference cannot be removed. Such issues are inherent in observational research.

A second limitation concerns the scope of my study. As discussed, case study research bounds itself to a particular site or sample that is meant to represent a larger social group. This makes a particular research project similar to a single case study and, accordingly, there is a concern that what a researcher finds in one case may not be generalizable. This is true for even

the most popular works on policing. Rob Reiner (2010), for example, who laid out the core characteristics of police culture, is often criticized for making broad generalizations and ignoring the diversity in police culture, especially outside of North America (Loftus, 2009). Similarly, my study could be criticized for studying only a few police organizations and trying to generalize my arguments to make claims about policing in Canada and North America at large.

Accordingly, I encourage other social scientists to conduct similar studies in other parts of Canada and the world to determine how generalizable my findings are. I expect some differences depending on context of course. Regardless of these differences, my research introduces ideas about the high visibility experience of police and about policing's strategic use of surveillance cameras. These ideas have not been addressed in current literature and, as such my findings can be used to develop a deeper appreciation for policing in an era of ubiquitous surveillance and to address questions about what it means to place police officers under surveillance.

Chapter 4 The Apathetic and Strategic Perspectives

4.1 Introduction

Analysis of my data suggests that my participants' understandings of high visibility can be sorted into three general categories:

1. the apathetic perspective
2. the strategic perspective
3. the camera-shy perspective

Despite conflicts between these orientations, they are not mutually exclusive as participants regularly expressed all three during interviews; participants simultaneously expressed apathetic and indifferent views about being recorded, enthusiasm about the strategic benefits of being on camera, and worries about being recorded which I call the camera-shy perspective. It is difficult to determine how common or rare each perspective was, but an analysis of my data suggests that it was the apathetic and strategic perspectives that were expressed most often and most emphatically. Accordingly, as I begin to analyze my findings, I start by discussing my participants' apathy and strategy.

To start this chapter, I define the apathetic and strategic perspectives. I then propose that both orientations reflect the utility of high visibility for police image work, and argue that this reveals the need to focus on questions of how the police can take advantage of their growing visibility rather than focusing exclusively on how high visibility can be used to scrutinize police officers, improve police accountability, and/or how police officers resent and resist cameras.

4.2 The Apathetic Perspective

The police's apathetic perspective alleges that police officers do not have to worry about the seemingly serious risks associated with being on camera. I acknowledge the term "risk" is

vague, and so I want to immediately clarify that when I discuss the risks of being recorded, I am referring specifically to opportunities for scrutiny made possible when police work is conducted on camera, and the potential for this scrutiny to initiate criticism from the general public, the mainstream media, and legal systems, often resulting in serious consequences including the loss of social status, employment opportunities, and criminal charges. Though these risks are significant, I was surprised to find that the apathetic perspective was by far the most popular response I received from my research participants. Even as I mentioned the risks associated with being recorded, many participants responded with a simple shrug of the shoulders.

When asked to explain their apathetic attitudes about being recorded, participants cited their professionalism as a key factor and concluded that they have nothing to hide from either internal or external cameras because any footage that is recorded will only show off their professionalism. As an ETS officer named Fred put it, camera footage of police will only show "professional officers behaving professionally." The apathetic perspective was expressed most clearly during an interaction with ETS Officer Raymond, a white policeman in his 50s with 33-years experience working in policing careers. I met Raymond in late October, during one of my first ride-alongs with the ETS,

Tonight I am standing in an empty subway station with the five police officers working the nightshift. The station is neither well lit nor well maintained. There are wet footprints made from snow and mud around us. Cigarette butts litter the corners of the entrance area. Whoever has to empty the garbage containers has quite the task in front of them. The only things that seem well kept are the nearby surveillance cameras. They are grey and exceptionally large, and they hang from all sides of the entrance to a central elevator. They seem positioned so that everyone in the station knows that they are being watched.

As usual the officers are taking their time before returning to patrol. They are orienting themselves, telling each other about previous shifts, and exchanging stories from their personal lives; this person is now dating that person, this person was overcharged for their camping equipment, and this hockey team is no longer the best. These are the conversations of a dull Sunday night shift. I am surprised by the amount of time the officers spend just standing and talking. Perhaps they are killing time while dreading the rest of what has been a boring shift so far. Perhaps they are trying to stay inside the station to avoid the winter cold. Or perhaps there is something deeper to their gossip. Maybe they are emotionally preparing themselves for what could be? As a police Sergeant once explained to me, a patrol officer always has to be prepared for danger, and sharing stories with peers is one way to maintain a calm demeanour despite unpredictable and sometimes disturbing work.

Officer Raymond, the most experienced of the 5 officers, has been on the force for over three decades. He is one of the most interesting characters I have met since starting my research because he somehow manages to be smug, optimistic and carefree at the same time. He claims to be neither a crime fighter nor a peacekeeper. He admits that most police work is boring and says a regular shift is highlighted by little more than gossiping with peers, issuing fines and helping people with directions. Perhaps this is why he doesn't bother to dress or behave like most of his peers. Raymond's shoulders aren't broad, his posture is not straight, and his uniform isn't pressed. He is overweight, his brown hair is messy, and he smokes too many cigarettes. Despite this, he still manages to display the experience and confidence of a veteran. He has a way of being both nonchalant and prideful about his work.

Given his experience and his candidness, I expect Raymond might have some interesting things to say about how cameras affect the police. So, as the other officers chat and share what they call "war stories," I approach Raymond and we begin talking about how Edmonton has

changed over the last three decades, particularly in terms of the installation of surveillance cameras. We walk around the subway station as we chat, entering the upper area near the exits.

Though they are not as large as they were in the 1970s, I can't help but notice the surveillance cameras, not just the ones that protrude from around the entrance of the elevator, but others that are slightly better hidden. It seems as though every entrance has at least two cameras trained on the doors, usually housed in a protective plastic dome. Though they do not necessarily target police officers, I point at one and propose that the sheer number of surveillance cameras means patrolling officers spend the majority of their time on camera. Raymond agrees with me and acknowledges how often police officers are recorded by many different cameras. In combination with surveillance cameras, he says people now carry smartphones wherever they go and regularly use them to record police. He says he does not want to exaggerate, but explains that on a number of occasions, he has looked up while detaining someone, to see a number of smartphone cameras pointed in his direction.

I ask what effect these cameras have on his experiences as a police officer. Raymond admits that he was initially suspicious of surveillance cameras when they were installed around the city in the 1970s, and that he was once again suspicious when he first noticed citizens recording officers on their phones in the early 2000s. He explains that he suspected that cameras could obstruct police work or be used to unfairly criticize police. When I ask if he is still concerned about being recorded, Raymond shrugs his shoulders and says "nope, not at all." I ask why not. Raymond responds by saying that the only people who have to worry about being recorded are people doing something wrong. He explains that he is a "good guy" and does not have to worry about being scrutinized. According to Raymond, most officers are also good people and professionals and, therefore, being recorded is not particularly worrying. "As long as we are professionals," he explains, "cameras are nothing to worry about."

I try to conceal my surprise. I expected that police officers would resent photographers and that many would resist being monitored by avoiding, confiscating or perhaps even destroying cameras. Yet Raymond seems unfazed about the prospects of being recorded. Raymond goes even further, asserting that because he is professional, he is indifferent about the surveillance of police. Resulting videos will, he alleges, only show "professionals being professional," and this footage may actually work in police interests by displaying the skill and competence of officers. Raymond is seemingly apathetic about the ways cameras could be used against the police, and simultaneously confident about the benefits that cameras might offer. Put simply, Raymond seems to hold an apathetic attitude about the presence of cameras, and he is willing to be recorded.

Like Raymond, the vast majority of my participants explained that they have nothing to hide when I asked them to consider the risks associated with being recorded. Their claims were supported by my observations as I rarely saw police officers make any extensive efforts to avoid surveillance cameras or actively discourage citizens from recording them (these rare instances of avoidance are discussed in chapter 5). As mentioned, the officers regularly linked their apathy to their confidence in their professionalism. For example, Roxanne a UPS officer, suggested the following,

> I would say the officers don't really worry about [cameras]. As long as they are trained in what they do, and have had many years of practice in what they do, I don't think they really worry about being caught on camera because they know what they do is [within] their authority.

Shi, a UPS Officer in his mid 20s, claimed to be so confident in his professionalism that he did not worry about being recorded even in circumstances where he is criticized by photographers. In support of his claims, he told me about an incident in which he was recorded while physically removing a drunken student from a bar,

> …he [the drunken student] was really resistant with us, so he actually had to be physically removed by his arms. And then as soon as he got out… his girlfriend got up and took pictures of me and said she was going to file a lawsuit. It didn't really bother me because I knew that we had done the right thing. We asked him to leave, he refused to leave, and, unfortunately in that kind of work, the only tools you have are yourself so you have to get the guy to leave. But it never really dawned on me that I was overly worried about [being recorded], because I knew that I conducted myself properly and I hadn't done anything that was outstepping my authority…

A young but experienced ETS relief Sergeant named Mo made a similar statement, claiming that if an officer knows that they are "in the right," they do not have worry about being recorded,

> I don't [worry about cameras] because I'm very conscious of my actions, I know my authority really well. I know what I can and can't do and I don't step outside that. So I don't worry about [cameras]. Even if something looks really bad, if I know its not, [a camera] just doesn't really stress me.

Many of my participants admitted that videos of police can be unfairly edited or misinterpreted, often resulting in the unfair criticisms (these concerns are discussed in more detail in chapter 5), but they often expressed a generally skeptical attitude about these risks. For instance, participants like Sergeant Mo doubted the influence of edited/misinterpreted videos and dismissively described them as a passing fad,

> I don't think in the grand scheme of things most of those videos have any long term effect. They go viral and they become big news stories and then everyone forgets about it… it does [have an effect], but not in a huge way. [Videos of police] come out all the time, they are seen, and then they are forgotten.

Many participants added that any image-management issues caused by these videos could be combatted with strong “customer service,” which include any social skills that officers can use to perform their duties in a way that reflects well on policing. Participants regularly praised their customer service skills and claimed that citizens usually leave interactions with the police with a smile and a greater respect for officers. For instance, ETS Officer George said,

> …this is where the customer service part comes in, because [if] you can leave them with an impression that’s professional, that you cared, I think that’s the way to combat the negative videos that are coming out. Just by your contact with customers, patrons, citizens and leaving them with a good impression.

Some of my participants were so dismissive of the risks associated with being recorded, that they joked about any officers who expressed a concern about being on camera, and accused them of either being excessively self-conscious or having something to hide. Participants like the UPS’s Officer Yin stated that expressing concerns about being recorded was a sign of excessive paranoia,

> I don’t really think of it much. If I go walk to [names an apartment building] I know where all the cameras are. So like, that’ll be in the back of my head. But it’s not like I’m going to do anything. …it’s not that the first thing I think about when I walk out of the office is “where are all the cameras,” and start having paranoia…

Similarly, when asked about the risks related to being recorded, EPS Officer Avi calmly stated that “cameras are only concerning for people doing something wrong.”

Some participants admitted that their apathy may come across as pompous, particularly because it is based in a confidence in one’s own professionalism, as well as the professionalism of one’s peers. For instance, UPS officer Shi stated,

> Not to sound too pompous, but I always considered myself an accountable person. So something I always strive to do is be accountable to myself and to other people. So, it's in the back of your head for sure, that you're being monitored, but for me, it's never been an issue because I don't conduct myself in a way that I would ever have to worry.

This pompous attitude was often celebrated by participants. Most officers were more than willing to praise themselves while dismissing the risks of high visibility.

After reviewing my data, and contemplating the consistency with which officers dismissed any risks associated with being recorded, my impression is that their apathetic attitude was not simply brash talk from pompous officers trying to compliment themselves, but a reflection of my participants' genuine confidence in their professionalism and how it undermines any need to worry, resent, or resist their growing visibility. Furthermore, my impression is that this perspective directly contributed to what I call the strategic perspective.

4.3 The Strategic Perspective

The strategic perspective is an appreciation for the benefits and perhaps empowering qualities of high visibility, and a subsequent eager and enthusiastic attitude towards being on camera. This was the second most common response I received from research participants, and it was often born from a discussion of their apathetic perspective, as many participants who dismissed the risks of high visibility quickly acknowledged the benefits of being recorded. Whether by internal or external cameras, participants alleged that high visibility served both their individual interest, as well as the larger interests of their police organization for a number of reasons. Perhaps most obviously, the cameras that record the police also gather evidence that can be beneficial for crime control. Theories about the crime-control benefits of cameras are covered extensively by other researchers (Norris and Armstrong 1995; 1999; Goold, 2003; 2003b; Goold

et al, 2013; Norris, 2012; Doyle, 2012) and it was not a dominant theme in my participants' views, so I do not expand on evidentiary benefits of being on camera in this dissertation. Instead, I focus on three additional benefits that participants in my research attributed to being on camera. First, participants claimed that policing on camera allows them to document what they consider their professional behaviour, and subsequently disconfirm complaints or criticism. Second, participants claimed that being video recorded and/or having cameras allows them to control their social interactions with citizens. Lastly, participants alleged that cameras allow them to create what I call crediting images, which celebrate, applaud, and promote policing.

1. How are Cameras Used to Disconfirm Complaints and Criticism

Participants in my study claimed that complaints and criticisms launched at police are often specious. They alleged that despite their strong approval rating and strong relationship with the general public, anti-police attitudes have become a fixture of contemporary popular culture and proposed that most complaints launched against police officers are based in a cop hater mentality. When describing this cop hater mentality, most participants offered examples of accusations of police brutality either without evidence and/or based in drastic misrepresentations of an interaction with police. Many of my participants alleged that these complaints are among the most serious issues faced by police, especially because they are quite costly as they require money, time, and effort to investigate. Accordingly, when asked about the implications of their growing visibility, most participants focused on how cameras can be used to document police professionalism and to quickly and efficiently disconfirm complaints from cop haters. More often than not, participants claimed that the potential to disprove complaints with cameras made them want to be on camera. For example, ETS Sergeant Mo claimed that

> …the people who are making the claims against us, they don't have anyone to be held accountable to, and a lot of them are angry about [an interaction with police], and so

they'll try to get us in trouble by lying. And then the videos will actually prove us to be correct most of the time. So I find [cameras] to be a great benefit. A lot of times I'll be like "check the video" and that will be that.

My participants' belief in the value of being recorded to disconfirm complaints manifested itself in displays of great comfort and relief when they were in view of a camera. For example, a 31-year-old ETS officer named Julie described an incident in which she and a peer named Jean physically subdued a gang member, and were then forced to consider the prospects of being criticized and suspended for doing so,

The incident began when they encountered a one-legged man during a patrol of the city's hockey stadium. Julie explained that the individual was a gang member named Kevin, who had regular dealings with the criminal justice system, and was well-known to her and most of her peers. Kevin had lost his leg earlier that year when he had shot it off with a shotgun while inebriated. On this patrol, Julie found Kevin drunk and unconscious in a central subway station. He was face down and barely moving. His crutches were scattered on the ground. Julie explained that when she and Jean tried to help him, Kevin became violent. He grabbed Jean's radio, unclipped it from his shirt, and then began swinging it and striking Jean. To save her partner from injury, Julie had no choice but to physically subdue Kevin. She grabbed Kevin by his waist and swung him towards the ground in what she described as a wrestling maneuver. Jean, after gathering his wits about him, converged and held Kevin down as Julie began to force Kevin's arms behind his back. Once they had him secured, Julie called for backup.

Minutes later, after backup had arrived, Julie expressed concern that Kevin might file a complaint accusing her of abusing her power. Julie worried that using force against a one-legged man would earn her criticism from anyone who learned about the event and that Kevin's complaint might earn traction in court or in the news media. She also worried that bystanders

might comment on the aggressiveness of her "wrestling maneuver" without knowing that Kevin was striking Jean. Accordingly, Jean worried that he and Julie would be accused of police brutality and, regardless of whether or not their superiors believed in this accusation, they might be pressured into suspending both officers involved.

Julie explained that she was quite troubled by the prospects of being criticized and suspended until she realized that a CCTV camera had recorded the entire incident, and that this meant footage could be used to show that the officers had reacted appropriately to Kevin's attack, and used only the amount of force needed to subdue a dangerous man with a criminal history. In this case, cameras were understood as a resource that could be used to defend officers from criticism, not a technology to criticize the police. When she concluded her story, Julie paused, smiled, and then said, "I'm glad that was on camera" in a relieved tone of voice.

In another incident exemplifying the strategic utility of being on camera, an ETS officer named Jack recalled a scenario in which he defended himself from complaints by using camera footage,

The incident occurred while in a subway car where Jack was checking commuters' tickets. When an elderly woman could not supply her ticket, Jack told her that she would receive a fine. She responded by spitting in his face. Jack, shocked and disgusted, stumbled backwards and grasped at his uniform to clean the area around his mouth. Jack's peers responded by grabbing and then physically removing the woman from the subway car, which had stopped at a platform near the University campus. Jack made his way to the washroom and washed his face while his peers berated the woman and issued her a ticket. In response, the woman accused them of using extreme force to remove her from the subway car.

When Jack rejoined his peers, he witnessed these accusations and he grew concerned the elderly woman would earn the sympathies of lawyers or investigators should she file a complaint.

Jack then realized that the incident had been captured on cameras within the subway car and surveillance cameras in the University subway station. This immediately comforted him as he now had evidence the woman had committed a minor assault against an officer and that his peers had not used excessive force. When the women did accuse the officers of excessively aggressive behaviour, Jack and his colleagues used the video to quickly dismiss her accusations. No legal proceedings took place and Jack never faced the threat of sanctions or suspension.

In yet another example of cameras coming to the aid of officers, Mike, a veteran ETS Officer in his mid-30s, told me a story about the arrest of a young woman for dealing hard drugs in a subway station,

To complete the arrest, Mike required the woman to climb a set of stairs towards the exit where the officer's cruiser awaited. According to Mike, the woman climbed the stairs of her own volition. Once outside, Mike completed the relatively uneventful arrest and confiscated the woman's bag of drugs. However, just a few hours after the arrest, Mike was told that the woman had issued a complaint and accused him of using excessive force. When he asked for details, the complaints division explained that the woman claimed that Mike had violently grabbed her and dragged her up the stairs before making the arrest. The complaints division added that should the woman's complaint be deemed valid, Mike might lose his badge. Luckily, Mike explained, video footage from cameras in the subway station showed that he had not physically engaged the woman and, with the video in hand, the police service was able to quickly dismiss the complaint. Mike said that when he realized the video proved that he was innocent of the woman's allegations, he let out a great sigh of relief.

While summarizing his peers' perspective, a UPS officer named Andy used an interesting metaphor describing cameras as "an extra witness" on "the police's side." My impression is that Andy meant that cameras could be used to document a police-centric version of events when

subject to complaints which, most of my participants alleged, only tell the complainer's side of the story. According to Andy and many of his peers, cameras are tools which offer the opportunity to tell their side of the story, and combat unfair complaints which, as mentioned, they understood as among the most serious problems faced my police.

The idea that cameras are a resource for police or a witness on the police's side often translated into efforts by participants to make their way in front of cameras before confronting citizens. I witnessed this several times during my research when officers asked CCTV operators to aim cameras at them or "put eyes on them." My participants also explained that they often direct confrontations with members of the general public towards a camera. For instance, UPS officer Yin stated,

> It could fall into a situation where all of a sudden I don't have a camera around, I'm getting into it with somebody, and I'd like this to be on camera and all of a sudden, oh I know there is a CCTV or any sort of surveillance camera over here, maybe I'll move the fight this way. And that's just sort of using it to your advantage.

Similarly, UPS officer Cena claimed that he is unlikely to use physical force unless he is on camera (a surprising claim given assumptions about police efforts to hide use of force),

> …say if you were to get into a fight with someone, and it's your word versus them, it looks a lot better to go into court with video surveillance of what happened from start to finish…if I'm getting into a scuffle with a guy, or a girl, I'm hoping that I'm plain view of the cameras. I'm definitely not going to go into a corner that doesn't have [cameras] [laughs]. A. we can't document them assaulting me as well and B. that would leave a major advantage for a lawyer who accuses you of using excessive force when you were out of that camera range. So if there's a camera, bring it on, it's perfect.

For Cena it is best to conduct physical elements of police work on camera. Accordingly, many of

his peers told me stories about their efforts to get in front of camera and raise their visibility. For instance, a 35-year-old EPS officer named Mark told me of an incident in which he became involved in a physical altercation with a drunken and uncooperative man outside of a nightclub. When he approached, the man began throwing drunken punches. Rather than responding immediately however, Mark said that he directed the fight close to the cameras located at the front of the nightclub (the nightclub and several other private establishments are willing to share the footage that their cameras record). Mark joked that he bobbed and weaved like a boxer to get the drunken man to chase him. Once in front of the nightclub's cameras, Mark finally responded by wrestling the drunken man to the ground in the street and calling for back up. Mark went on to explain that once he had subdued the drunken man, the drunken man's girlfriend removed her smartphone from her purse, and began recording the scene so that she could later use her footage to issue a complaint. Mark, however, countered her complaint by using footage from the nightclub's cameras to prove that he had no choice but to use force when the drunken man engaged him, and that he had behaved within the grounds of police use-of-force policy. In this case, Mike countered the criticism of a photographer with video footage of his own, highlighting the variety of internal and external cameras documenting police behaviour, and how resulting footage can be pitting against one another in order to produce a single "true" version of events.

Many participants specified that they especially liked to be on camera when interacting with racial minorities and women, as particularly damning complaints of racism and sexism were likely to follow interactions with members of these groups. With video footage on their side, the officers alleged that they could avoid what they described as frequent and unfounded criticisms. For example, Axel, a rookie UPS officer, explained that he was worried by the prospects of complaints when encountering drunken black men. He proposed the hypothetical scenario of drunken black men injuring themselves while interacting with an officer and, not remembering

how they were hurt, accusing the police of being racist and abusive. He explained that in circumstances like these, being recorded could save an officer's reputation. Drunk white men would probably pose similar concerns, but my participants focused on drunk black men in particular reflecting the proactive efforts that police will undertake to avoid accusations of racism or prejudice in an era where racism is considered detestable unless it is coded or "hidden" (Doane and Silva, 2003; Bonilla-Silva, 2003). Most of my participants were unwilling to consider how racial prejudices may indeed inform their actions and/or crime control efforts, and, while discussing complaints or accusations from the public, they primarily concerned themselves with efforts to prove their personal colour-blindness and non-racism with cameras and video footage (the officers who were willing to discuss to race and police racism are discussed in chapter 7).

Axel and several of his peers also worried that if they spoke to women about their conduct, particularly drunk women on a Saturday night, they might later find themselves unfairly accused of making inappropriate and sexist remarks. Accordingly, they argued that when engaging drunken women, they often checked and then rechecked to make sure their vehicle's in-car cameras were operational and did whatever was needed to move their encounters in the direction of CCTV cameras.

When detailing the benefits of high visibility, most participants referenced vehicular cameras, surveillance cameras, and wearable cameras. However, though it was less common, participants also discussed how external cameras such as a civilian's smartphone could be used to defend them from criticisms. A ETS Officer named Brian, for instance, told me of an experience where a photographer approached him after witnessing and video recording an arrest. The photographer complimented Brian on his professionalism, and then offered to share the video in case he was criticized or the arrestee complained. In these circumstances it was not only the camera, but also the photographer that was on the police's side. Validating Brian's perspective,

relief Sergeant Mo claimed that though many photographers are distracting, his experiences with external cameras included circumstances in which he was given footage to defend himself from criticism by a bystander,

> I find most [photographers] don't respect space and they don't really understand what's going on. More times then not they try to get really close and can sometimes antagonize or distract officers. That being said, I have had the complete reverse happened when a guy attacked us unprovoked and there was someone standing by who filmed it from a respectful distance, and as soon as everything was over he offered to provide the footage as evidence to support us.

Although I was initially skeptical of the degree of comfort participants found when being recorded by external cameras, my observational research seemed to confirm that they have a complex relationship with these cameras that sometimes manifests itself in a sense of relief when external cameras are recording and desire to be recorded. For instance, during fieldwork with each organization, I witnessed occasions when officers saw the presence of external cameras as an advantage, particularly while confronting suspected criminals. Following confrontations, the officers asked photographers if they had recorded footage and if they would be willing to share it with them so that they could use it to defend themselves from criticism and to investigate crimes.

I also regularly witnessed participants rely on footage from external cameras to investigate crimes. On one occasion, when a student on a University campus was assaulted when a thief stole her cellphone, ETS and UPS officers approached nearby bystanders, asked them if they had recorded anything, and asked if they could download the footage for use as evidence. The bystanders obliged and, with the help of their footage, the officers were able to quickly locate suspects and complete an arrest. The utility of external cameras for the investigation of crimes likely played a role in the officers' comfort with their high visibility.

Many participants were also quick to highlight the benefits of being on either internal or external camera to secure a conviction against individuals who attack police officers. For example, UPS officer Cena described the value of video footage to secure the conviction of individuals who attack officers,

> Say you get a traffic stop, someone pulled over, and basically the camera tracks you walk up to the car, and all of a sudden someone decides he is going to lean out the window and punch you in the face as you walk by. All of a sudden. Bam! I think that is the most incriminating thing that could have been captured on cameras. Bam! You record that, it gets subpoenaed, it gets brought into evidence, then it's not just my word against his... now I have solid video-audio evidence that this is what happened.

Cena's peer, officer Shi, made a similar argument when he explained how both internal and external cameras can provide evidence to clarify the circumstances of a violent interaction between an officer and a citizen, as well as the circumstance of an officer's death while on duty,

> I know if anything were to happened on a traffic stop, which are second to first most dangerous calls next to domestics or what not, I can rest assured that even if I don't make it, there's evidence of what happened to me…so yeah, I feel really comfortable about having [cameras] and I have no issue with those. And same with the [external cameras], it's just something else to document what happened to you.

2. Controlling Police-Citizen Interactions

A second reason that participants expressed a strategic perspective is because they can use cameras to control their interactions with citizens, often by turning cameras into what a Dramaturgist like Erving Goffman might call "interactional props." Aussie, an ETS officer with several years of experience on numerous police services overseas, was one of the first to tell me that he had purchased his own wearable cameras and used it in such a way. In support of his

claims, Aussie told me of the recent arrest of a gang member. As he handcuffed the gang member, he said that he realized he was surrounded by other members of the gang. The gang members seemed to be growing boisterous as he continued to apply the handcuffs. Fearing for his safety, he took out his camera and recorded the gang. This quickly calmed the gang down as they seemed to realize that attacking the officer while being recorded was not a good idea. Aussie was able to complete the arrest and leave safely. In this situation, it was not what the camera was recording that was of particular interest. In fact, the camera did not even have to be on. Rather, the camera itself operated like a prop and had a deterring effect.

I did not witness such violent and dangerous circumstances during my fieldwork, but I did see officers regularly reminding people that they were being recorded to encourage them to cooperate. They did this during traffic stops when an individual was uncooperative or rude, or when engaging an individual whom they suspected was lying about something. The officers would simply say "sir/ma'am, remember, you are being recorded" or, if they suspected someone of lying, they could say "is that what I'll see if I check the tape?" One such incident occurred on an October evening when ETS officers encountered a man who was to be fined for riding the subway without a ticket. The man claimed not to speak English, and not to understand the officers' questions or instructions. The officers suspected he was lying and told him that they could check the video from inside the subway cars to see if he was speaking English at any point before they approached him. The man eventually admitted that he could indeed understand the officers and that he was lying to try to avoid a fine. He angrily snatched the ticket after it was issued to him. The officer later explained that he had bluffed the man, as the cameras in this subway car did not record audio and could not actually produce evidence of the man's English speaking.

A similar incident occurred when transit officers approached a young woman on a subway platform and asked her for her ticket. She claimed that she had not ridden the subway but was only on the platform to say goodbye to a friend. The officers asked her if this is what they would see if they checked footage from the CCTV cameras above her. Fearing this prospect, she admitted to having ridden the subway and was issued a fine. In this case, there was no guarantee that a camera was in fact recording her. Instead, it was the visual of a camera's lens overhead which benefited the officer during his interaction with the young woman.

3. Promoting Policing with Crediting Images

In addition to disconfirming criticism, some participants claimed that cameras may offer police officers a way of promoting themselves by producing crediting images, which are images highlighting police professionalism that can be used to educate the public about the importance of policing. In support of these claims, participants from the ETS and UPS regularly took me to their headquarters and showed me examples of crediting images. They entered their organizations name and/or the terms "police" and "Edmonton" into the YouTube search and scrolled through dozens of videos until they found one that they wanted me to see. Most of these images were unspectacular videos of uneventful interactions between my participants and citizens, or videos which indeed praised the police for their professionalism during a relatively safe and easy arrest. For example, on a ride along in mid November with the ETS, Officer Joy proudly showed off videos of his polite confrontations with teens who had to be kicked out of a bar, and on a ride along with several UPS officers, Officer Cena proudly showed off videos of his interactions with drunken students while photographers praised his efforts and criticized the "drunken frat boys" he dealt with. While we watched, my participants suggested that when these videos go viral, they

function as promotional advertising as they show viewers the professionalism of Edmonton police officers.

My participants' claims reveal an oversight in previous studies of police visibility which tend to focus almost entirely on images which criticize or shame police officers, what I call discrediting images. Rather than focusing on these images, my participants suggest a need to consider images which can function as promotional advertisements that are favourable to policing. Only a few of my participants could point to specific examples of crediting images of themselves. Accordingly, I conducted my own search for examples of crediting images. I discuss the results of this research on crediting images and discuss their promotional potential in more detail in chapter 8.

4.4 Discussion: Cameras as Tools for the Police's Image Work

Given that participants' apathetic and strategic perspectives were most prominent, my research contrasts with the idea that policing, as an institution, is waging a war against photography. Rather than resenting and resisting the tools and technicians of high visibility, my data suggests that my participants have learned to limit the risks associated with high visibility, and even leverage their visibility, regardless of whether it is produced by internal or external cameras. In specific, my participants' responses suggest that they are learning to use their growing visibility to bolster their image work capabilities by producing images which defend officers from complaint, control interactions with citizens, and promote policing as an institution (Mawby, 2002). This suggests that the relationship between policing and visibility is more complex than either questions of accountability or the war against photography rhetoric appreciate. In order to understand these complexities, I argue for two changes to existing ideas about police visibility. First, I suggest a need to connect discussions of police visibility to

discussions of the police's ability to adapt to new technologies. Second, I suggest a need to connect discussions of police visibility to discussions of the police's image work.

The Police and How They Adapt to New Technologies

There has long been a debate about how new technologies change policing, especially in response to claims that information technology can be used to create a more efficient police service (Colton, 1979; Manning, 2008; Garicano and Heaton, 2010). These claims have become especially common in a post 9/11 era when various information technologies have been developed to help police locate and confront terrorists (Lyon, 2003a; 2003b; Zureik and Hindle, 2004; Amoore and De Goege, 2005; Ceyhan, 2008). A common and related argument is that these technologies, surveillance technologies in particular, can be used to restrict police misbehaviour and contribute to police accountability (Manning, 2008; Goldsmith, 2010).

Despite these claims, research on how policing is effected by technology updates has been ambiguous at best (Northrop, 1995; Nunn, 2001; Manning, 2002; Chan 2001), and some scholars have challenged hypotheses about how technological updates change policing, explaining that these hypotheses are built upon fallacies which ignore the political agendas informing the integration and use of new technologies (Colton, 1979; Dupont, 2001). A particularly important lesson to take away from this research is that the belief that technologies can radically change policing tends to overlook the surprising consistency of police structures over time. As Peter Manning (2008) argues, this is because technology is adopted in a way which protects existing police practices and structures. Accordingly, instead of examining how new technologies supposedly force police to change, Manning encourages a study of how police organizations integrate new technologies into existing police structures, and how police officers adapt to new technological environments often in service of existing police structures.

When the lessons of literature on policing and technology are applied to questions of police visibility, it encourages a movement away form approaches which assume that cameras will radically change policing, specifically by introducing improved accountability standards and resulting in a backlash in the form of a war against photography, and to instead consider the politics which inform how cameras are integrated, potentially in ways that protects existing police structures. My research suggests that the key to understanding how surveillance technologies can be used to protect existing police structures is an understanding of the police's image work.

Cameras as Tools of Image Work

Image work is particularly important for police organizations. As Peter Manning (1998; 2005; 2008) argues, police are not only a controversial institution, but an institution faced with the insurmountable task of controlling all crime. This "impossible mandate" (Manning, 1997) requires police officers to somehow lower crimes rates despite accepted criminological theories (summarized in chapter 1) which associate crime with social structures the police cannot address via street patrols. Given the impossibility of its task, Manning (1997; 2012) argues that in order to maintain public respect, the police have shifted focus away from crime control and towards attempts to legitimate policing through image work including promotional efforts, media relations, and the disconfirmation of complaints. Specifically, this includes the creation and display of advertisements which promote police, the development of media relations departments dedicated to negotiating with mainstream media, the adoption of a "community-based policing" (Manning, 1997; McLaughlin 2007) model, and, my research suggests, the adaptation to camera-packed environments.

I argue that rather that tools for scrutiny, critique, and accountability, cameras and photographers are often tools that support policing's image work, also known as "legitimation

work" (Ericson, 1982), "spin control" (Haggerty, 2006), and "dramatic labour" (Manning, 1997). With cameras, police officers are creating images which display a police-centric view of police work, and developing their capabilities to discredit criticism, to control interactions with citizens, and to produce promotional imagery. Future research on police visibility must, therefore, develop beyond ideas that cameras can be used to scrutinize police behaviour and hold officers accountable by considering how the police are adapting to their high visibility and learning to use cameras for image work. There is more to the story of police visibility than popular ideas about accountability and the war against photography suggest, and the police's image work must be accounted for in order to develop a full appreciation for the effects of high visibility on policing.

4.5 Conclusion: The War of Interpretation

To review, one of my key findings is that my participants did not resent or resist cameras and photographers, and that they did not wage a war against photography. Rather, they most emphatically expressed apathetic and strategic perspectives, responses which I argue are based in their ability to use high visibility to facilitate various types of image work. Accordingly, I suggest a need to focus on not simply how cameras can be used to scrutinize police behaviour, and hold officers accountable for misconduct, but also how police can use cameras to defend themselves from critique and to promote themselves by producing police-centric imagery.

As part of this shift in focus, the study of police visibility must examine how the meanings of images of police are produced through editing, distribution, and display. Questions of meaning making will be particularly important for two reasons. First and foremost, my research suggests studies of police visibility will require an increased focus on circumstances in which the police negotiate the meaning of videos so that they can be used to disconfirm complaints, to defend police actions and, by doing so, to protect police structures. Accordingly, it

is important to ask how police how constructed the meaning of videos in a fashion which defends their institution.

Second, I expect that debates about the surveillance of police will soon involve an examination of various videos. As police begin to work with a larger network of cameras, controversial events like deaths in police custody are likely to be recorded by several cameras including vehicular cameras, wearable cameras (perhaps from several officers), smartphone cameras and surveillance cameras. Each of these videos will have to be examined closely and compared to come to some official understanding of what has occurred. This will likely feature debates over which cameras captured the best footage and which can be most trusted. Thus there will not necessarily be a war against photography, but a war of interpretation, as various actors do their best to read several videos in order to serve their competing interests. Accordingly, future research would benefit by asking who is in control of how images of police are constructed, displayed, labeled and discussed? And, who is best armed to win the war of interpretation?

Chapter 5 The Camera-Shy Perspective

5.1 Introduction

As discussed, the apathetic and strategic perspectives were not the only perspectives expression by my participants. Rather, in direct contradiction with the apathetic perspective, participants also regularly expressed what I've called the camera-shy perspective, which is made up of several concerns or worries about high visibility. Though it was not expressed as emphatically as previously discussed perspectives, the camera-shy perspective is not a minority perspective. Rather it is a counter-narrative or counter-perspective expressed by the very same participants who expressed the previously discussed perspectives. Thus it deserves special attention as it reflects the complexities of police responses to visibility.

To start this chapter, I detail the particularities of the camera-shy perspective, including the two concerns that participants referenced when asked about their camera-shyness. First participants worried about the potential for cameras to obstruct their work. I call these in-field concerns. Second, participants worried that video recordings will damage the police's legitimacy. I call these image-management concerns. Next I address an obvious question; how do the police display a camera-shy perspective despite their previous and contradictory apathetic perspectives about high visibility.

5.2 In-field Concerns

My participants' in-field concerns focus almost exclusively on external cameras. As a reminder, external cameras are those over which police officers have limited control. Images from external cameras are most often produced by ordinary citizens using their personal cameras to record officers. These photographers do not necessarily have any direct ties to political organizations dedicated to monitoring the police, nor do they have a direct connection to a

journalistic organization. Rather, they are photographers who record the police when they happen to find themselves in viewing-distance of circumstances that they decide are worth recording. Participants in my study alleged that because they lack professional standards, external photographers can obstruct police work in a variety of ways. For instance, they can stand in an officer's way, distract officers, impede an officer's ability to move around an environment, and add tension and stress to already complex situations such as a confrontation with a violent criminal. These obstructive photographers can be characterized as hecklers and blockers.

Hecklers

According to my research participants, one of the most common ways that photographers can obstruct police work is by speaking to and/or criticizing officers as they video record. I call these photographers hecklers. Examples of hecklers include people who accuse an officer of using excessive force while they arrest a violent individual, or charge an officer with racism as they interact with members of marginalized social groups. Participants worried that this kind of heckling can introduce tension into what is otherwise an unremarkable and safe interaction between officers and civilians. I witnessed an example of just how stressful hecklers can be when on patrol in November with an ETS police officer named Aussie near Rexall Place, Edmonton's largest hockey stadium.

It is late, approximately 9:00 PM, and a major hockey game between the Edmonton Oilers and San Jose Sharks has concluded. The streets and subway stations around the area are crowded. The officers are patrolling the subway platform and keeping a close eye on drunken fans. Aussie has noticed a drunk man and has begun to watch him from a distance. The drunken man, who I will call Justin, seems to have lost track of his friends and, in his drunken stupor, has begun to flirt with groups of women. The women he is speaking to now do not seem impressed by

his behaviour, and seem to be trying to get him to leave. I look over at Aussie, he is preparing to approach Justin.

Suddenly, before he can get Justin's attention, a crowd of bystanders encircles Aussie and begins to heckle by making jokes about the police and even starting chants. One group chants "cops have seen better days," and begins to makes jokes about Aussie's stressed and tired appearance. Aussie seems to ignore the crowd and their jokes. He does nothing more than smile when members of the crowd begin to ask him personal questions like "do you hate your job?" But Aussie is clearly frustrated, his smile looks fake and the crowd is only getting louder and more rowdy. I look across the crowd and see several people holding their smartphones. At least one of them is certainly recording Aussie with a camera.

Aussie seems to have lost interest in looking for Justin, and I follow him as he leaves the subway platform. Aussie's face is pink and swollen, and he is breathing deeply. I ask if he is okay, and Aussie explains that he is "fine," and just tired after a long shift. After a short pause, he admits that he is irritated and then describes how difficult it can be to have to deal with citizens who heckle. He explains that the stress of being disrespected by the very people that police officers intend to protect and serve can be extremely mentally taxing. Other than intermittent complaints about aches and pains, Aussie is quiet for the rest of the shift.

I rarely witnessed such aggressive heckling, but most participants had stories which spoke to the stresses of being heckled, and similar to Aussie, many seemed emotional about being criticized by the people whom they are entrusted to protect and serve. For instance, an ETS officer and 10-year veteran named Joy described the motivations of these hecklers as "sinister" noting that they often want to get officers in trouble,

> They don't want to police you and then tell you, you're doing good. I got hired doing loss prevention when I was 18 years old. I'll be 27 next month, …and I have had hundreds of

people pull out cameras and cellphones, and it has never been with pure intentions. It has always been to get me in trouble.

Similarly, a rookie UPS Officer named Axel characterized hecklers as cop haters and suggested that they are primarily interested in getting under an officer's skin and then filming any frustrated responses,

Axel: …They want to create a reaction. They are looking for you to get thrown off by [their heckling]. Of course in the days of social media and stuff, they are looking for [their video] to go viral which, arguably, in most situations, it does.

Interviewer: So is this why [police officers] get frustrated when [they] see the camera come out?

Axel: I'm not really sure what exactly makes you frustrated when the camera gets pulled out. I think it's just more the fact that people are being disrespectful ... it does throw you off your game a little bit. It's just hard to think on the spot and try to stay focused and not screw up…

Axel's description refers to a type of heckling defined by efforts to provoke police officers into acting in a manner that looks bad on video. Many participants voiced concerns about provocative hecklers, and most mentioned hecklers who try to tease officers in order to encourage an angry response which could then be video recorded. Participants explained that once these angry responses were recorded, the provocations would be removed leaving an image which seems to suggest that an officer became upset and aggressive without reason. It seemed that for my participants, provocation was not an effort to critique police misconduct, but to misrepresent and shame innocent police officers.

I witnessed heckling briefly during my research but it was rare, usually only occurring during nightshifts where police had to deal with large and often drunken crowds. These hecklers' comments were often wild jokes such as loud announcements that a police officer was nearby and

a warning that everyone in the immediate area should mind their behaviour. University students near bars, for example, regularly yelled “look out it’s the cops!” or something to that effect. However, even these jokes were mild in their tone and delivery. I very rarely witnessed direct criticism of police, and any heckling that I did witness did not last long.

I sense that my participants’ concerns about heckling photographers were exaggerated to a degree. Though my participants were undoubtedly disrespected by some proportion of the general public, it was rare for members of the public to heckle police as they did so. That being said, the fact that most participants seemed to have stories about heckling at the ready suggests that, even though they are rare, these experiences had affected their perception of external cameras and their operators.

Blockers

Blockers are photographers who are physically assertive while recording police. I call them blockers because they usually place themselves physically close to an officer while recording, which has consequences for an officer’s ability to move and control their interaction with others. For example, several participants in my study alleged that blockers are more than willing to place themselves and others in danger for an opportunity to produce a good image, perhaps in an effort to create footage that they can share on social media websites or sell to news organizations. Blockers and hecklers are not mutually exclusive. Instead, many blockers are initially hecklers, closing the distance between themselves and police as they continue to pester officers. Though I never witnessed this kind of photography, officers told me a number of stories to support their claims. For example,

It is Thanksgiving night, and an ETS officer named Campbell, a 5-year veteran, has just recounted a situation in which he engaged an uncooperative and potentially violent subject named Trigg in a subway station. The subway station was almost entirely empty as Campbell and

his partner contemplated if and what kind of force would be necessary to detain Trigg, as their verbal direction was not having an effect. When they slowly positioned themselves in the safest and most effective ways to subdue Trigg, a bystander approached the scene, coming within touching distance of Trigg. The bystander, holding a camera phone, took pictures and then a video of the officers. Campbell asked the bystander to step back, but he refused and continued to record.

Campbell explained that the bystander's presence had complicated a potentially dangerous situation as he was placing himself in danger and forcing officers to recalibrate the situation. In particularly dangerous circumstances, Campbell proposed this can result in injury to the photographer, and perhaps to the officers. He emphasized that blockers regularly feign ignorance to police officer's instructions to stay at a safe distance.

Given their concerns about obstruction, some participants admitted to trying to move blockers. For example, ETS Officer Joy gave an example of a blocker interrupting his ability to respond to a tense scene where two large gangs met outside a bar on a Saturday night,

> …working at the West Edmonton Mall, we would sometimes have 30 person brawls in the parking lots, and the one I was referencing, it was a birthday party in a bar, and somebody got hit with [a 2x6 panel] and all these people just started pouring out of the bar, and these people are intoxicated, some are on narcotics, and they are jumping around, rolling up their sleeves, taking off their jackets, one guy is taking off his belt, and so we form a line. And then we have this one guy, in his skinny jeans and Chuck Taylor's, he is aggressive with his cellphone camera, in between the two lines of people. Almost like medieval combat, there's this one lone guy in the middle with a camera, and he is not video taping the drunken mob, taking off their belts to use them as weapons, he is video taping the officers. So we kind of shoved him

> out of the way. If he doesn't get out of the way, you move him away. You take him out of the equation.

Interestingly, officer Joy said that he never told a person to stop recording him, only to move. This detail is crucial in understanding my participants' complex relationship with cameras. Though many participants expressed some concerns about external cameras, most proposed that they would not command photographers to stop recording, but only to record in a safe way. This sentiment was expressed by several officers despite their concerns about being recorded. As Officer Axel puts it,

> If you want to police the police, that's great. Watch from the sidelines and all power to you. So that's fine if you want to video tape the police, or video tape me doing my job, all power to you. But do it in a safe way.

Based on these kinds of statements, it seems that the more passive photographers are, the more tolerant of them my participants were. These statements matched what I witnessed while in the field as no officer made an explicit effort to stop passive photographers from recording them.

Passive Photographers

I am not suggesting that passive photographers are not cause for concern for police. Even if they are tolerated while in the field, passive photographers can make officers feel self conscious while being recorded which may affect how they do their work. Many of my participants claimed that when there is a photographer close by, they sometimes feel a pressure to rethink their actions, knowing that everything they do can be scrutinized by anyone who has access to a photographer's video. Several participants worried that this may cause officers to become uncomfortable, which may cause them to hesitate and prevent them from doing their duties effectively. For example, a 5-year veteran of the ETS named Shane stated,

> What I don't like about [cameras] is there is a potential for hesitation there, because of the worry of the camera, and that hesitation, in the right circumstances, could be deadly. Instead of the officers acting with their greatest concern being their safety and the safety of others, maybe they're fearful of that camera, and that changes their behaviour and could cost them.

A rookie UPS officer named Kelly made a similar claim and added that delays could endanger the health and safety of police officers and others. Kelly explained that being recorded may cause her to hesitate when she considers if she needs to use a greater level of force when dealing with a dangerous subject,

> Um, it could be an officer safety thing, because I could be so concerned with my job and wanting to keep my job that "oh I better not go to the next level because I'm being recorded," when really my life is at risk and I need to go to that level. I know that obviously … I would do what I need to do so I can go home alive, but just the fact that that has to cross my mind in general, or anyone else's mind, or that there's that time lapse from reaction because I have thought about it, could get me seriously injured because I've had to hesitate. That's where I get concerned. And it is just officer safety in general, any type of distractions can be … life threatening.

I witnessed an example of how these kinds of considerations and doubts cause hesitation while in the field on Thanksgiving with Officer Sand and Christian of the ETS,

The officers have located an extremely drunken and unconscious man in a subway station. The station contains several large cameras that monitor the area, and a crowd of bystanders who may be carrying smartphones. Sand and Christian approach the man and help him to his feet. He asks the officers to help him into the washroom. They do. After approximately 10 minutes Sand knocks on the door and hears no response. He opens the door to find the man unconscious on the ground. The officers help him up and try to walk him to the exit of the station. In response, the

man throws a wild right hook at Sand. The punch misses and the man slumps over slightly. Sand pauses for a few seconds, he seems to be hesitating as he considers what to do next. He then holds the man's arms against his sides as he directs him out of the subway station.

Sand later explains that in those few seconds he had to decide how best to respond to a potential violent subject by considering questions like the following; was physical force necessary to subdue the man? Would the drunken man be severely injured if the officer used force? How would a physical response appear to bystanders? Had anyone began recording with their smartphones? Sand admits that the best course of action was not easy to determine and the presence of bystanders and cameras complicated the situation, as it forced him to reconsider not only how to react, but how he would appear on camera.

In addition to making officers self-conscious, passive photographers may also contribute to image-management concerns, one of my participants' central concerns about being video recorded.

5.3 Image-Management Concerns

Participants' image-management concerns focus on how police are represented in photos and video recordings, especially when they go viral on the Internet. Participants expressed these worries because, they alleged, images of police are regularly misrepresented by photographers and misinterpreted by viewers.

Misrepresentation

There is a large body of research on the power of the mainstream media to influence the public's confidence in policing as an institution, as well as a subsequent body of literature exploring how police organizations respond to concerns about how they are represented (Lasley, 1994; Skolnick and Fyfe, 1994; Lawrence, 2000; Rafter, 2006; Doyle, 2007; Huey, 2010;

Callanan and Rosenberger, 2011; Huey and Broll, 2012; McCombs, 2014). This literature argues that the media can indeed affect on police-public relations, and the same may be true of images of police recorded by external and internal cameras (Goldsmith, 2010; Greer and McLaughlin, 2010; 2011; 2012; Haggerty and Sandhu, 2014; Brown; 2015). Accordingly, my research participants expressed several concerns about what these images could mean for public trust and confidence in policing (this same idea informs my discussion of crediting images in chapter 8). These were especially severe concerns given that participants believed that most of the popular recordings of police are misrepresentations, and often lead to inaccurate and unfair criticism of police. For example, concerns about misrepresentation were expressed during fieldwork with veteran ETS Officers Liv and George in October,

I join relief ETS Sergeant Liv and her partner ETS Constable George for an early morning ride-along. We are standing in an empty parking lot outside of a mall. In the evenings these parking lots are full of shoppers buying jackets, boots, and winter hats. But in the early morning, the parking lots outside of malls are empty spaces, void of shoppers or civilians. I've noticed that officers like to take advantage of these low visibility moments for mildly unprofessional and unhealthy behaviours. So I'm not surprised to find constable George chewing tobacco and Sergeant Liv eating sugary snacks as they share funny but what some might consider inappropriate jokes about sex, alcohol, and drugs.

Liv and George are both young, fit, and experienced officers who have served on the Transit Police Service for close to a decade. Both have strong opinions about visibility, and how the presence of cameras can force them to adjust their behaviour. Interestingly, the behaviours they have in mind are neither violent nor controversial. Rather, it is relatively banal actions like dancing, joking, and picking one's nose, that the officers feel they must keep unseen. For example, both admit that their visibility can determine what they eat and how they gossip with

coworkers. Liv explains that she avoids fast-food restaurants and especially donut shops when either are crowded. She does not want to be seen consuming unhealthy food and confirming what she thinks are derogatory stereotypes about the police. Liv claims to be especially bothered when civilians try to use their cameras to record police in order to support such assumptions. She says that videos making offensive jokes about police and calling officers "pigs" are already far too common. Before Liv can finish her thought, our conversation is interrupted by a call over the radio asking Liv and George to respond to a situation at a construction site nearby. George spits his tobacco one last time and we enter the police cruiser and drive a few blocks West.

When we arrive at the construction site we find Jon, a homeless man, sleeping underneath plastic sheeting. We are told by dispatchers that Jon is trespassing on private property and has been harassing nearby construction workers. Jon's jittery behaviour seems to confirm that he is intoxicated. Officer George explains that this is likely because Jon has been drinking from the hand sanitizer bottle to his left.

Sergeant Liv and I stand approximately 10-feet away and watch as George approaches Jon. George politely asks Jon if he would accompany us to a homeless shelter. George tells Jon that he could join a detoxification program at the shelter, and perhaps find a space to sleep indoors and away from the autumn cold. Jon yells "Fuck you! you motherfucking cop" in response. George breathes deeply and, keeping his professionalism, he again politely asks Jon to accompany us to a shelter. Jon again responds angrily by screaming "Fuck you!" The interaction quickly devolves into a yelling match. Jon begins to threaten George with violence, and George responds by firmly instructing him to calm down. Jon slowly transitions into a drunken fighting stance. George's instructions grow louder as he orders Jon to calm down.

As we watch the yelling match, Sergeant Liv motions for me to move alongside her. She is surprisingly calm and rather than helping George deal with Jon, she wants to continue our

conversation about policing's visibility. Liv sees this as a good opportunity to tell me more about one other reason that she worries about being recorded by citizens. She explains that if someone were to begin recording the George/Jon encounter at this moment they would see an officer yelling at a drunken man and miss all efforts George made to help Jon. "That's the problem," Liv continues,

> *…There are a lot of clips out there on YouTube that are only 45 seconds. But most interactions we have with people are 10 minutes, and if they are bad people they can be 20 minutes. So [the videos] only show the part that's maybe the most exhilarating, the most eye catching.*

As Liv explains the problem of video recordings, George and Jon continue to yell at one another. The interaction seems to have become a yelling-stalemate and I wonder what George will do to rectify this awkward standoff. After a few more curses from Jon, George seems to completely lose whatever remained of his patience. He points angrily at Jon and yells "Pick up your shit and leave!" His instructions are intense now. Jon's facial expressions change in response. Probably realizing that he could face a fine or an arrest if he continues his current course of action, Jon becomes quiet and begins to pick up his bottle of hand sanitizer and his plastic sheeting. As George watches silently, Jon walks away from the construction site. After Jon is at a safe distance, George lowers his posture and walks to where Liv and I are standing, cursing Jon as he does so. After George assures us that he is okay and that he just needs a moment to catch his breathe, Liv and I continue to chat about the politics of recording the police. George, hearing Liv's criticism of video recordings of police, eventually joins in,

> *I don't think any videos [of police] are fair representations. Because they just show the visual and usually just capture a period of time when the situation is at its worst. They never capture what the report was, what the initial context is, and so basically what it captures is the fight.*

> *It doesn't capture the officers trying to explain to the person what's going on, trying to deal with it in a civil manner. It never really captures the subject being uncooperative and leading to the fight…*

As Sergeant Liv and Officer George suggest, videos of police often lack contextual details. They do not show police officer's efforts to politely talk to people like Jon before turning to more assertive and aggressive language or perhaps violence. Rather, they only show viewers what occurred when "shit hit the fan," as Sergeant Liv put it. As a result, my participants worried that videos can result in extensive criticism based on videos which show limited excerpts from a larger incident and are therefore inadequate for assessing police behaviour. For example, referring to the lack of contextual information in popular videos of police, ETS Officer Joy said,

> …that's where the problem is. You have police officers that are getting crucified in the court of public opinion, because we are getting half-true video, only half the story, little bits and pieces of something.

An ETS Officer named Christian, with whom I spent 12 hours during a night shift in November, made a similar comment about the lack of contextual information in many videos of police that are recorded,

> … It is tricky because it's taken out of context. Everything that is online is a 30 second clip out of a 5 minutes dealing. What was the context? And that's what bothers me. The public will just focus on 30 seconds of the officer loosing it, or using language, or using force, when for 5 minutes you don't see the officer being professional and diligent and using verbal judo. For 5 minutes you don't see that aspect of it. That's frustrating.

In addition to lacking contextual information, ETS Training Officer Clint claimed that these videos fail to provide viewers with a sense of the "atmosphere" surrounding an interaction

between police officers and citizens, making it unfair to use said videos to critique police behaviour,

> …I've seen videos in the past, that paint a certain picture of a calm and fairly controlled setting, but when you're there it doesn't feel that way. You can't capture all the emotions, the things going outside of the video, … the concern, panic, and anxiety. So you can't say what you would do if you weren't really there …To sit there and criticize someone else and say "I would do different", that's unfair, because we're not there and we don't know what was going on.

Several officers from EPS, ETS and the UPS alleged that the lack of information in videos is not an accident. They alleged that videos of police, especially those recorded by external cameras, are selectively edited in order to make the police disrespect-able. For example, ETS Officer Joy described videos of police in the following way,

> …generally you find the videos are heavily doctored. You have to watch it really intently. You'll see sentences don't quite match up, somebody's head is in a slightly different angle than two minutes earlier, there are chunks missing. It'll be like us talking and right now you're writing and then the video would skip a little bit and you'd be moved over just a little bit. It wont be a clean flow.

Misinterpretation

A second set of image-management concerns expressed by my research participants has to do with how images of police are interpreted by viewers. Even if videos are appropriately edited and contextualized, my participants believed that viewers misunderstand the footage that they see, and that this is often to the detriment of the police. Officer Shi explained that this is because the public lacks the necessary insight to be able to interpret videos of police appropriately,

> …I just recently saw [a video] and it was like a minute snippet of what actually happened. So I know, being in this line of work…I know that wasn't the whole story. So I take it with a grain of salt whenever I view those type of videos. I'd rather prefer for the investigation to come out regarding the incident rather than to jump to a decision. That's my insight. The public doesn't have that insight…

Officer Shi, who in the same interview admitted to perhaps being pompous for stating that cameras not worrying about cameras, added

> …nowadays, the [public's] attention span is very short nowadays. I think these minute videos they see of a cop assaulting someone whether it be right or wrong, sticks in their mind, and than the story to them gets old and then they don't follow it to the end when the officer gets cleared and was in the right. All they remember was the fact that this guy had shot a guy on film and that the people watching by said that the guy didn't do anything wrong and that he was an outstanding citizen. So I think that's a bit dangerous. I mean hopefully if more of these incidents are filmed and the cops are cleared, hopefully the publics' perception changes to the fact that they don't know the whole story right away, and maybe should reserve their opinions.

A related point was raised by ETS training officer Clint, who teaches rookies use-of-force policies and techniques including techniques like open-palm strikes and pressure point strikes which are designed to pacify dangerous individuals without causing serious and long-term harm. He explained that the public, having no knowledge of use of force, often misunderstand video footage of techniques used to pacify, and often claim that officers are using excessive force. He compared judging the police based on video recordings as similar to a lay citizen without expert knowledge trying to assess a doctor's diagnosis, or mechanic's assessment of a vehicle, or teacher's lesson plan,

> … it's the same way that I don't know necessarily what my doctor does, or what my mechanic is looking at, or the lesson plans that my daughter's teacher is using. We don't know their jobs. It's very rare that someone is going to their doctor's office and ask for their charts and start reading and making conclusions or criticizing them. Yet, it happens in policing to some degree. Because we're inundated with this attention that law enforcement captures. There's movies that obviously exaggerate what the job is – police are arresting 5 guys at once without thinking about it – so it's kind of constantly put out there by people without having ever having worked in a similar role. It's very hard to understand the difficulties of policing. I don't think the public understands it.

Several participants seemed to resent the criticism that they received from citizens who watched videos of police. Some participants accused these citizens of holding anti-police biases.

Cop Hating and Racism Against the Police

Many participants alleged that the public represents and interprets videos of police in a critical way because they are raised in an anti-police culture. Among the most passionate arguments of this type came from an interview with transit Officer Joy and his description of what he called "racism against the police." Officer Joy was not alone in making these arguments, but he was among the most vocal and forthcoming. So while I focus on his description of racism against police, it should be kept in mind that his perspectives represent popular ideas articulated by a large number of my participants.

Joy is a tall, strong, and intelligent veteran officer who is not afraid to compliment himself for being each of these things. He regularly expressed interest in my study before our interview in November, probably because he has been involved in controversial and spectacular events which have been recorded and can be found on YouTube. He seemed proud of these

videos, perhaps because this meant that he could speak to the issue of police visibility based on direct personal experiences.

The videos he showed me before being interviewed were fairly uneventful. For instance, they showed Joy approach a man taking pictures of a police cruiser or engage a few shoppers as they were ejected from a mall. In the latter video, the photographers recording Joy tried to criticize his decision to remove them from the mall, but Joy was polite, and they give up any resistance in a couple of minutes. Joy claims that this is just one of several videos of himself and his peers on the Internet. He admits that they were relatively mild but stated that even mild videos like this can be concerning as they can be mislabelled and used to make what was an otherwise uneventful video into a reason to criticize the police. For instance, Joy claims that videos like this could be used to make claims that officers are being racist, by asserting that the officer had no reason to remove the individuals from the mall except for their skin colour. Joy added that these kinds of accusations are commonplace, and a reflection of what he called racism against the police.

When I asked Joy to clarify what he meant by racism against police, Joy took a long breath, and then said that it is made up of two parts. Firstly, he alleged that the public tends to hold negative stereotypes about police. He detailed that many of these stereotypes frame officers as lazy, unhealthy, incompetent, excessively violent, biased, racist, and therefore, people who need to be closely monitored. Second, Joy proposed that the public holds unrealistic expectations of police and tend to criticize officers for failing to meet these expectations. As he described it,

> *…[people] educate themselves on TV. They watch CSI and they think that's the way the world works. They think every case is resolved in an hour, and it's all wrapped up in a nice little bow. As we talked earlier in the week, they also have this perception that we are ten-feet tall*

and bullet proof, that I'm a martial arts expert, that I don't need to eat, go to the bathroom, that I don't ever need to sleep, I don't ever get tired, I don't ever get scared.

After a few more sips of his coffee, Joy leaned in and added that videos of police only add to this racism as they do not speak to the realities of police work,

One thing the video cameras don't actually convey is what's going on with you during an experience. Even if you are wearing body-worn video, and it shows your point of view, they don't tell you "okay right now I'm on my tenth hour into a 12 shift, it's 5 in the morning, I'm friggin exhausted, I'm doing split shift and had to stay up for a 24 hour period because I had to get accustomed to nights because yesterday I was working at 5:30 in the morning because I started my shift at 7 A.M– we do that all the time.

…Each of those days, I'm a complete zombie, it takes its toll on the body, and the camera doesn't convey that. It also doesn't convey that I've gotta run for two or three blocks after a guy, wearing 25 pounds of gear. I weight 160 pounds. 25 pounds of gear, that's a lot for me. And I have to fight, I have an extra 25 pounds, reduced mobility, plus I've got to make sure I don't get hit with my own stuff. So I've got the fear, if I get knocked on my back, and he takes my baton, he can beat my head it.

…The other thing the public doesn't understand is how visceral fights are. They watch caged combat, UFC, they don't see that once a referee is there, everyone is safe. They have governing bodies to makes sure it is as safe as humanly possible. Yes, someone might get knocked out by a kick in the head, but once that guy is knocked out, he has EMS there, paramedics, doctors, nutritionists, they've got everybody. They don't have to worry about it. But, I'm in a back alley, I get knocked out, someone is stomping on my head. Out of all the assaults I have ever seen, the first person that gets knocked out gets punched in the head or

> *kicked in the head on the ground. I have never, in all the years I've been doing this, seen someone knocked out and "okay I win and then they leave".*

According to Joy, the police's growing visibility means that police officers may face an image-management crisis, as misrepresented and misinterpreted videos continue to gain popularity and enable citizens to unfairly accuse officers of misconduct. It is not surprising then, that Joy and several of his peers are frustrated by their growing visibility, and accuse photographers of cop hating.

In response to their frustrations, a few research participants admitted that they had considered changing careers. For example, Officer Connor, an EPS officer for nearly 30 years, admitted that the criticism and flat out hatred of police that he sensed from the public was draining him of his pride in his occupation, and that he had considered quitting several times, before finally deciding to take an early retirement just years before he would qualify for improved benefits packages. Similarly, an ETS officer named Carter, with nearly 8-years experience, had recently handed in his resignation and admitted to me that, though he had offered the administration alternative reasons, a major cause of his decision to quit was the disrespect that police officers suffered.

Though they did not claim to want to change careers, rookie officers including Officer Kelly and Officer Axel both admitted to me in private that they did not take pride in their career and often avoided discussing their work with friends. Kelly and Axel went so far as to suggest that they had done their best to separate their police life from their social life as many of their friends did not respect their decision to work in policing. As evidence of this attempted separation, both officers showed me that they had created distinct social media profiles, one for their life as a police officer and one for their life outside of policing.

Avoidance

A few of my participants admitted that they were so camera-shy in certain situations, that they tried to avoid being recorded. This avoidance focused exclusively on external cameras. Avoidance is not a traditional counter-surveillance tactic in the sense that it does not try to censor or neutralize surveillance (Marx, 2003; Monahan, 2006), but instead, includes all efforts made by those who are monitored to stay out of sight. My research participants explained that their avoidance is not motivated by a desire to conceal misbehaver. Rather avoidance is motivated primarily by a desire to escape what they consider unfair criticism from viewers who misrepresent or misinterpreted footage. When avoiding cameras, participants claimed that they attempt to stay away from people or locations were cameras were prevalent, even if it delays police work. For example, EPS officers Avi and Gary claimed that they will sometimes try to control the location of their interactions with suspicious persons by either following or leading them into spaces where cameras and crowds are less common. I witnessed some examples of avoidance while patrolling with UPS and ETS officers.

We were near a lecture hall when a UPS officer Axel recognized a South Asian man walking out of a crowded pub. Axel explained that the man was known to many police officers in the area as he had been involved in a number of domestic violence incidents. The man was joined by a young girl and Axel responded by stating that he would like to stop and question the man. However, he did not do so, and admitted that the nearby crowd was the reason. Axel explained that the crowd and, crucially, its cameras meant that he would likely find himself under extensive surveillance which may translate into complaints, particularly if the man were to respond to the officer aggressively.

Axel added that he worried that the man may notice the crowd and try to use them to his advantage by launching complaints and criticisms, including accusations of racism, at him in an effort to attract the crowd's cameras. Axel decided that the best course of action would be to

confront the man only if/when he entered a less public space. He followed the man for a few blocks, but eventually grew tired of waiting for the man to enter less crowded space and decided to return to headquarters to finish other work. Axel told me that he would probably run into the man sooner or later, and would confront him when there are less people around.

Reinforcing the role that identity politics can play in avoidance, Axel's peer UPS Officer Shane made the following comment,

> …you see some intoxicated person walking down the street that happens to be an aboriginal person, I'm going to be more hesitant to stop that person if they are in a busy area. Just because being a white male stopping a disenfranchised aboriginal, intoxicated person on the street, it's probably going to be easier for me to do it somewhere where there's not a lot of people just because it looks bad optically right. People always view the police as picking on aboriginal people…so, I'm not going to stop that person on [University] street, right outside the entrance to [Sociology building] where there's lots of foot traffic, people coming and going. I'll wait 'till has on a side street and stop him over there, where there's less people to view the situation. Just because you are opening yourself up for more people to express their opinion, and yell at you, and start video-ing and whatever they choose to do, thinking that I am picking on him or whatever the deal is.

Axel and Shane's concerns resemble what some police officers refer to as a "fuck it, drive on" or FIDO mentality that emerges when officers face the decision to either do one's duties and face criticism, or avoid one's duties in order to avoid criticism (Mac Donald, 2012). None of the officers I spoke to admitted to adopting an extreme FIDO mentality in response to their high visibility, but the rare officers admitted that there were indeed moments when camera-shy concerns could force them to not necessarily forgo police duties, but postpone their work until it could be done in the safest and least visible way.

While actively engaging in avoidance, my participants' claimed that they tried to maneuver police work into spaces like the police cruiser or the police headquarters, spaces that are accessed only by authorized personnel and/or security agents. For instance, police officers patrolling a subway station would avoid conversing with suspicious persons and/or issuing a fine or arrest until they could lead them into the police cruiser. Once inside, the police could do their duties without concern that they would be recorded. EPS officers Avi and EPS Sergeant Bruce said that this kind of avoidance was most common when confronting individuals on weekends in social areas of the city containing pubs, nightclubs, and bars. They claimed that during these nights, confrontations with "partiers" were common, and often came with the risk of complaints and criticisms from photographers who hold anti-police biases. Accordingly, Bruce explained that he regularly had to lead suspicious individuals, usually drunken students, away from photographers and into low visibility spaces like their cruisers. If this was not possible, he tried to lead them into secure locations inside of a bar/nightclub such as the kitchen or the security area. Though this change in location was motivated by various considerations such as the danger a suspicious person might pose to other partiers, Bruce made it clear that the desire to avoid external cameras was a key motivation as well.

I want to reiterate that avoidance was extremely rare. Only a few participants admitted to engaging in this kind of behaviour, and they always made it clear that they did so only in circumstances where they felt especially worried about being misrepresented.

5.4 Discussion: Apathetic, Strategic, and Camera-Shy at the Same Time?

Though I am generally confident in the idea that cameras can successfully be used to expose misconduct and abuses of power, after conducting my research, I find myself empathizing with my research participants' camera-shyness, and their image management concerns in

particular. My sense is that there are videos of the police, particularly those that are shared on the internet, that are regularly mislabelled with language like brutality and racism and do not provide contextualizing information about what has been recorded. Accordingly, there is the chance that these images are misrepresentations and inform unfair complaints. This is not necessarily because those who record images of police purposely want to misrepresent police. The accuracy of a photographer's video could be a matter of timing, exactly when a camera begins to record an incident involving police in particular shapes what the is included in the video, which details are missing, and it will no doubt play a role in how it is (mis)interpreted and (mis)labelled. Regardless of a photographer's motivations, I understand why my participants expressed concerns about how footage of officers is represented. Given these concerns, I find myself asking questions like the following; how can my research participants be apathetic, strategic and camera-shy at the same time? This seems to be an obvious self-contradiction especially in light of clear reasons to be concerned about the risks of being on-camera.

The Variability of High Visibility

My findings suggest that the key to understanding how my participants are able to maintain such diverse perspectives is appreciating how diverse my participants' experiences with cameras can be, and the contextual factors that change how police understand and respond to their visibility. These factors include the following:

- the race and gender of the individuals they are interacting with
- the politics of the individuals who are recording them
- whether they are being recorded by internal or external cameras
- the location that an officer finds themselves in while being recorded
- the behaviour that they are engaged in while being recorded

Each factor plays a key role in determining if an officer is likely to express an apathetic, strategic or camera-shy perspective in a given circumstance. For instance, an officer is likely to understand and respond to external cameras radically differently if they are a white male being heckled and recorded while using force to subdue a black male, as opposed to being recorded by a passive photographer while politely issuing a ticket to a white female who has recently run a red light.

Given the complexities of these variables, and the diverse range of experiences that my participants had with photographers, it should not be surprising that they expressed such diverse perspectives about their high visibility. As Brighenti (2010) suggests, the meaning of high visibility is variable and complex, sometimes too ambiguous to easily define at the moment one finds themselves being monitored. A complex and self-contradictory perspective should, therefore, be expected. Accordingly, a singular framework which focuses on questions of accountability and/or a war against photography is not adequate when addressing questions about police visibility. Instead, an examination of police visibility requires a framework which allows for self-contradiction and variability.

The Camera-Shy Perspective Remains a Counter-Narrative

Although my participant's views did seem to range, camera-shyness remained a counter-perspective, meaning it was not expressed as emphatically or as often as the apathetic and strategic perspectives. This is likely because the camera-shy perspective was based in specific concerns about the recording of violence, use-of-force situations, arrests, and other types of police work which, in contrast with popular beliefs, are actually quite rare (Bittner, 1974). As discussed earlier, most police work is banal and uninteresting, so it follows that most footage of police work will be banal and uninteresting. In addition, in my experience most police work is completed relatively professionally and safely. Thus most footage of police work will show professionalism rather than misconduct. Accordingly, it should not be surprising that, for the

most part, my participants' experiences with cameras and photographers was not a reflection of the risks of high visibility, but the banality and/or benefits of high visibility. This again highlights the need to develop an approach to police visibility which reflects not only the complexity of policing on camera, but focuses on the variety of ways that police officers can take advantage of being on camera, as was discussed in chapter 4.

5.5 Conclusion: Still Apathetic?

To summarize, this chapter details the third perspective offered by participants in my study, the camera-shy perspective. This perspective includes concerns about how the general public can misrepresent and misinterpret footage of police in a way which reinforces an anti-police culture, or what one of my participants called racism against the police. The nature of these camera-shy concerns raises an obvious question; how can my participants express such concerns, including an appreciation for the risks of high visibility, while simultaneously expressing an apathetic and strategic perspective of high visibility?

I have argued that one reason research participants express such a self-contradicting perspective and ultimately an ambiguous and confusing response to high visibility, has to do with variations in their experiences with high visibility. That being said, I argue that the apathetic and strategic perspectives remain the most emphatic perspectives, highlighting the consistency with which cameras are used for image work rather than for scrutiny and critique. The following chapter continues to explain why the apathetic and strategic perspectives were dominant by suggesting that my participants have learned to actively reduced their camera-shyness by practicing what I call "camera-friendly policing," a sophisticated effort to reduce the risks of high visibility.

Chapter 6 Camera-Friendly Policing

6.1 Introduction

Instead of trying to neutralize cameras or avoid them, most of my participants claimed that they reduced the risks of high visibility by behaving in a manner which looks good on camera. I call this camera-friendly policing. This chapter details the varieties of camera-friendly techniques used by my participants, particularly when being recorded by external cameras.

My discussion is organized in the following way. First, I review existing theories about the defensive tactics that police use to lower the risks of being recorded, most of which presume that police officers engage in counter-surveillance as part of their war against photography. Second, I present my research findings, including evidence of camera-friendly policing. Third, I consider the implications of these findings for hypotheses that the presence of cameras can improve police behaviour.

6.2 Popular Perceptions About Police Responses to Cameras and Photographers

Policing on camera is risky. Police officers around the world are regularly caught on camera while abusing their power, and the resulting footage is used to launch complaints against police organizations. The spread of such images can sometimes result in loss of employment, fines, the investigation of police policy, criminal charges, as well as large-scale social movements dedicated to challenging existing police structures. I refer to several examples in chapter 1, but I will refer to a few more examples here to reiterate the degree to which cameras can be used to launch complaints against police, and can result in significant and often negative consequences for police officers' employment opportunities, and police organizations' reputations. Each of the following examples occurred in October 2015 and media reports on each were easy to find online, highlighting just how often videos of police go viral.

- In October 2015, A Senior Deputy named Ben Fields was fired after video showing him aggressively throwing a young black student to the ground went viral online. The incident took place at Spring Valley High School in South Carolina when Fields was asked to respond to a black student who refused to comply when her teacher asked her to put away her smartphone (Miller, 2015b).
- In October 2015, Arkansas State Police were forced to pay Eva Robinson and her son Matthew Robinson a settlement of 225,000 dollars (US) to conclude a law suit (originally filed by the ACLU). The lawsuit was connected to an incident which occurred in September 2011 when Matthew, who was 16-year-old at the time, was choked, beaten, and tasered. Key to the Robinsons' settlement victory (and acquittal when they were charged with misdemeanour criminal mischief, disorderly conduct, and resisting arrest) were dashcam videos, which allowed the Robinsons' to support their claim that the officers had used excessive force and that Matthew had suffered permanent injuries and emotional distress (Miller, 2015c).
- In October 2015, an Oklahoma police officer was charged with battery for beating a suspect with the butt of his shotgun. The officer, Owasso Police Lt. Michael Dwain Denton, initially defended his behaviour by claiming that the suspect had repeatedly tried to strike the police, hence the extended strikes with the shotgun. But video evidence not only showed Denton's excessively violent actions, but discredited his representation of the interaction (Miller, 2015d).

Existing research (Wilson and Serisier, 2010; Simon, 2012; Wall and Linnemann, 2014) suggests that given the risks of being recorded, we should perhaps expect the police to resent photographers and resist surveillance through counter-surveillance tactics. The police's counter-

surveillance is not quite the same as social activists' counter-surveillance which tries to challenge dominant surveillance structures (Monahan, 2006). Instead of challenging power asymmetries, the police try to resist surveillance in order to avoid scrutiny and, therefore, protect existing power asymmetries. Accordingly, some may describe the police's resistance as "counter-counter-surveillance." To avoid confusion, I avoid the term counter-surveillance and rely on the term resistance.

Reports of police resistance focus on neutralization tactics, a concept that is discussed in detail by surveillance scholars like Gary Marx (2003) who offers an analysis of how individuals nullify surveillance practices, often by breaking surveillance cameras, distorting or blocking them, and even trying to mask themselves to avoid being identified. While there are several ways for police to lower their visibility, building on Marx's categories, I sort the police's neutralization tactics into the following groups:

- Intimidation: Police officers sometimes respond to photographers with commands to stop recording (see Photographyisnotacrime.org). Officers might claim that their photography obstructs police work, as it can be distracting and/or photographers can stand in an officer's way (my participants made similar claims as discussed in chapter 5). For example, a Princeton University Research Assistant named Nyle Fort was threatened by police officers when he began recording their interaction with a black man. According to Fort, he began recording when he saw a "black boy, who shared [his] complexion and hairstyle, running from the car, and 3-4 other white male police officers. After tackling him to the ground and calling him a dirty motherfucker, they pulled what looked (and smelled) like a bag of weed out his back pocket." As he recorded the police, Fort claims he was approached by an officer who said, "You know you can get locked up. You're impeding an investigation. Turn your phone off and walk away." This was clearly a threat and an example of an officer trying to

intimidate a photographer in order to reach the ultimate goal of reducing the visibility of his police work.

If intimidation is successful, photographers often turn off their phones and/or leave the scene. If intimidation is not successful, officers often follow up with threats, often stating that they will issue photographers with tickets and fines. Unfortunately for police, many photographers, including Fort, assert their right to record the police. As a result, intimidation often fails as an effective resistance strategy (Meyer, 2014).

- Legal Punishment: Police organizations sometimes claim that the photographing and/or recording of police officers is illegal, often by citing abstract privacy laws and/or declaring the surveillance of police an obstruction of justice (Potere, 2012). In extreme cases, police officers have fined and arrested photographers. A recent example involved the arrest of New York Times Photographer named Robert Stolarik who was accused by New York police of interfering with an arrest by blinding Officer Michael Ackermann with his flash. Stolarik was charged with obstruction.

  If legal punishment is successful, the police can immediately censor a photographer's recording, and deter future efforts to record police officers. If punishment is not successful, photographers can rebut attempts to punish them, and/or challenge any fines/arrests, often using their imagery to support their challenges. In the Stolarik case, his footage revealed that his camera did not have a flash, and that he was kicked in the back and dragged to the ground during the arrest, resulting in several scrapes and bruises. Ackermann was convicted of falsifying an arrest report and may face jail time.[23]

[23] see http://www.nytimes.com/2012/08/06/nyregion/robert-stolarik-times-photographer-is-arrested-while-on-assignment-in-the-bronx.html?_r=0

- Confiscation and Destruction: According to police officers, the confiscation of external cameras is sometimes acceptable if videos will be a vital piece of evidence in the investigation of a criminal offence (Potere, 2012). Accordingly, infamous incidents involved in the recording of police violence are often characterized by police attempts to seize cameras (Haggerty and Sandhu, 2014; Wall and Linnemann, 2014). Although officers might frame confiscation as an act in service of investigations, it can also be used to prevent people from using their videos to scrutinize police. In addition, it can be used by police to prevent information about a given incident from being accessed by the public. Confiscation, therefore, allows the police to maintain their "account ability" (Ericson, 1982; Goldsmith, 2010), which refers to their status as the primary source of information about police activities. A recent example involved a South Florida police officer's efforts to delete a bystander's footage of the frisk of an 18-year-old as part of the investigation of an auto theft investigation. The incident occurred when a friend of the 18-year-old, Juan Santana, stepped out of his home nearby and began recording the frisk. Officer Sentamanat of the South Florida police ordered Santana to hand over the camera and, when he did, all recordings were immediately deleted.

  If confiscation and destruction are successful, the police can successfully maintain their account ability. However, attempts to confiscate and destroy footage are limited, as there are often several cameras recording police officers meaning confiscating all cameras is impractical. In the previously mentioned case, for example, Juan Santana responded to Stenamanat's confiscation by getting a second camera to discretely record his ensuing argument with the officer (Miller, 2013).

Neutralization tactics are practically unreliable for a number of reasons many of which are made obvious in the cases I have discussed. Two themes define this unreliability. First, photographers are not always noticeable and police officers are unable to recognize exactly when

they are being recorded, limiting their ability to respond. Second, even if photographers are aggressive and noticeable while recording, police may have trouble accessing their cameras. For example, many social activists have developed strategies for recording police without having their videos confiscated. These strategies include hiding their phones or passing them off to friends and peers after recording the police in order to prevent officers from getting to them. Wilson and Serisier (2010) describe the resulting tension between police and photographers as a "surveillance arms race," as both sides attempt to find more complicated tactics for locating/hiding cameras. Given the limitations of neutralization tactics, as well as a lack of empirical research into the consistency with which such tactics are used, reports of police resistance leaves several questions unaddressed.

My data offers empirical evidence about the police's resistance and how they may overcome the limits of the previously discussed neutralization tactics. In particular, my findings suggest that police may try to reduce the risks of being on camera by abandoning neutralization tactics, and adapting to a high visibility environment by behaving in a camera-friendly fashion.

6.3 Camera-Friendly Policing

My participants claimed that they actively try to reduce the risks of being on camera in two ways, neither of which correspond with existing reports and theories about police resistance. First, a minority of participants claimed to avoid cameras (discussed previously in chapter 5). However, most officers claimed that they usually had no desire to avoid cameras, both because they have nothing to hide (discussed in chapter 4), and because, my participants admitted, attempts to avoid cameras often fail. Accordingly, most of my participants concluded that rather than trying to avoid cameras, a better strategy for reducing the risks associated with being

recorded would be to conduct one's self with cameras in mind. For instance, ETS training officer Clint stated,

> there's no bylaws, no rules in relation videotaping in a public place …so we we're stuck. ...I have always said to my members, if a camera does end up in your face, you're better off just being polite

Accordingly, participants in my study claimed that rather than trying to intimidate photographers, legally punish photographers, or confiscate and destroy cameras, they primarily focused on trying to look good while being recorded. This kind of resistance does not meet the definition of the neutralization tactics discussed by Gary Marx. Instead of trying to disable or sabotage existing surveillance practices, my participants adjust the way they present themselves, or what Erving Goffman (1959) called the "presentation of self," and by doing so, the officers try to make footage appear as favourable to themselves as possible. Still, I refer to camera-friendly policing as a form of resistance as it disrupts surveillance gazes which often intend to scrutinize police work and expose police misconduct.

The Presentation of Self and Camera-Friendly Policing

The dramatics of police work has received extensive study (Manning, 1988; 1997; 2003; 2012). For example, research shows that police aim to craft a particular image of themselves by speaking, dressing (Paperman, 2003), and behaving like representatives of the legal system and as typically masculine authority figures (Martin, 1999). To do so, police follow both formal and informal "display rules" (ibid) which govern how a police officer should perform to give the impression of a tough, masculine and confident authority figure (Parnaby and Leyden, 2011). This represents the street level image work that police organizations engage in at the institutional level in an effort to influence public opinion (Mawby, 2002).

Camera-friendly policing is similar to this street level image work except that it appreciates the expansion of the police's visibility as a result of cameras, and the need to consider what a police officer looks like not only to bystanders around him or her, but how they look on camera at any particular moment. I categorize camera-friendly policing tactics into two groups based on behaviours that I either witnessed while conducting my research or incidents that were detailed to me by police officers during interviews. These categories are titled verbal strategies and physical strategies of camera-friendly policing.

Verbal Strategies of Camera-Friendly Policing

Verbal strategies of camera-friendly policing involve spoken efforts by police officers to control how the oral component of their recorded behaviour is perceived by viewers. Verbal strategies can range from attempts to sound respectful by adjusting one's tone, to efforts which try to insert information into a recording that justifies police work.

UPS officer Roxanne explained that verbal techniques are now part of regular training, especially training about how to engage a criminal while being recorded by a bystander. She explained how in situations where criminals resist arrest, an officer may decide that they have no option except to use their baton to strike the criminal. At this point the officer may attract the attention of a citizen a with smartphone who may create a video showing the officer violently striking the criminal with a baton, and a video that could be misinterpreted as evidence of police using violence without cause. Recognizing this, Roxanne claimed that officers are now trained to continuously yell, "stop resisting arrest," loud enough so that it will be picked up in the video recording. In doing so, the officer becomes a performer, reshaping the meaning of any video recordings by inserting commentary that rationalizes their violent behaviour. Accordingly, the video becomes a text demonstrating the professionalism and rationality of the officer's actions

rather than something that could be used to accuse her of police brutality. UPS officer Shi echoed this point during an interview,

> … if I was in a situation where someone was resisting arrest, I would tell them, "Stop resisting arrest!" "Stop resisting!" and have like verbal cues, because if it was being video and audio recorded, people would watch and be like "oh yeah he gave that person verbal command." [And the video] shows that your actions were consistent with your training…It could help you in court for sure.

Several participants in my study offered similar examples and suggested that rookies are now trained to pay particular attention to how they appear, because they are likely to be recorded. As Rookie UPS officer Carla, who had recently completed training, put it, officers need to "… act as if a video of their entire shift will be on the Internet within the next five minutes."

Camera-friendly strategies can be used outside of violent interactions such as during those when officers issue instructions to individuals. Police officers from each organization claimed that they now carefully consider what they might sound like in a video recording before issuing instructions. ETS training officer Clint claimed that extra consideration usually means thinking about what to say, and then speaking in a stern but respectful tone and using politically correct language. Clint admitted that making sure that he sounds PC can be bothersome and distracting, but claimed that it is a necessity in today's surveillance society.

ETS relief Sergeant Mo, who is sometimes involved in training recruits, gave more details about camera-friendly speech and how it is used when stopping and searching a suspicious person. Mo explained that officers are repeatedly told not to use racial or controversial language and to instead use neutral but polite language like "sir" and "ma'am" when referring to others. Mo added that officers are trained to issue specific instructions. For example, rather than asking a suspect to "spread em," which is a generic way of telling a suspicious person to assume the

position to be searched, and an instruction that could be easily misinterpreted, officers now issue instructions like “Sir, please stand facing the wall with your legs spread so that I can search your pockets.” In addition, Mo explained, officers are encouraged to constantly issue instructions and detail their behaviour as a search is conducted. They may even list behaviours they engage in as they do them during a stop and search by saying something like, “I am now searching your pockets, I am now patting your shoulders and arms sir,” all of which will be caught on camera and serve to contextualize the officer’s actions. By doing so an officer reduces the risk that they will be criticized for making inappropriate comments or searching in an inappropriate fashion.

While speaking to a group of ETS officers at a cafe, many told me that they will sometimes approach passive photographers and speak directly to them in an effort to rationalize their behaviour and help viewers of any video recordings interpret the footage in a way that is more accurate. For example, after conducting a search or an arrest, the ETS officers explained that a police officer may approach a crowd of photographers and clarify why the search was conducted, what contraband was found, and why an arrest was necessary. By doing so, the officers said that they grant viewers the information needed to interpret images of police in a way that better reflects the police officer’s perception of events.

The value of verbal strategies of camera-friendly policing becomes clearer when we recognize the malleability of images of police. Despite a commonly held belief that camera footage provides an objective record (hence the old adage “the camera never lies”), video images are subject to editing and interpretation. The verbal strategies described here allow police officers to prospectively sway the meaning of a video in such a way that serves their interests. If successful, the meaning of videos can see radical changes, shifting from evidence for the critique of police, to evidence used to defend police (Stuart, 2011). Accordingly, verbal strategies are a key strategy in the war of interpretation (discussed in the conclusion of chapter 4).

Physical Strategies of Camera-Friendly Policing

Verbal strategies of camera-friendly policing have several limitations. Police officers engaged in particularly brutal actions will have trouble avoiding criticism by simply yelling "stop resisting arrest!" Moreover, verbal strategies will be completely ineffective if cameras without audio are used to record police officers. So camera-friendly policing also relies on physical strategies, which try to influence how images of a police officer will be interpreted through changes in body language.

Some physical strategies of camera-friendly policing involve following basic expectations about dress and body language. While discussing how to look good in public, ETS Sergeant Bruce emphasized the importance of wearing pressed uniforms, and standing with a tall and confident posture. He added that officers should avoid sitting down or resting in public spaces to avoid accusations of laziness. ETS training officer Clint added that police rookies have to be taught to smile and look as approachable as possible by making eye contact with citizens and offering a nod of the head. Clint claimed that these basic rules can make significant differences to how the officers will appear in a video recording, often to an officer's benefit.

Another physical feature of camera-friendly policing involves considering the visuals of hostile interactions with individuals, and the efforts one can make to influence how they are recorded and interpreted. For instance, during an interview with ETS officer Aussie, I was told of how the presence of cameras affected his behaviour during a recent interaction with an armed subject. Recognizing that the incident was being video recorded by audio-less surveillance cameras overhead, Aussie explained that he began to use his body language to support his instructions to the criminal and to make clear what his instructions were for secondary audiences including viewers of surveillance camera footage. For instance, his verbal commands like "drop the weapon!" were followed by physical gestures like pointing to the weapon in the criminal's

hand and then the floor in the smooth motion. By doing so, the video recording could be used to show that he had made several efforts to de-escalate the situation before eventually using physical force to subdue the criminal. In case a complaint of excessive force was made, Aussie knew he could use the video to defend himself as it showed he only used force after all other tactics had failed. Similarly, Sergeant Mo told me that he used cameras to produce footage justifying his behaviour and offered the example of a recent incident in which he searched a suspected criminal and located weapons inside the criminals' pockets. Mo explained that he then held the weapon towards a camera in order to both record the evidence that he had found, and justify whatever physical actions he took to subdue the suspected criminal.

Physical strategies of camera friendly policing also include efforts to control the in-field arrangement of police officers. I witnessed an example of this during fieldwork with ETS officers as they patrolled subway cars checking passenger's tickets. Of particular interest was the way that ETS officers rearranged themselves while an officer named Jacobs confronted Jack, a young, Aboriginal-Canadian student dressed in sagging jeans and a white T-shirt. My field notes describe the interaction,

Jack responded to Jacob's request to see his ticket by accusing him of unfairness and racism. I sat and listened to Jack loudly scold the officers for constantly monitoring "his people," issuing them fines, and making arrests without cause. The word "racist" was yelled several times. Jacobs responded by telling Jack to "calm down." He held his hands up with palms open as he did so. Jack was not responsive and continued to accuse Jacobs of racism, and so two officers, including officer Marcus and Sergeant Steeves, joined Jacobs for support.

The confrontation was eye-catching. I looked around to see other passengers watching intently as a group of officers surrounded Jack. Few passengers made any effort to conceal their

staring. Most, if not all, of the passengers also had smartphone cameras in their hands, ready to record the interaction between the police officers and Jack.

Steeves, noticing the attention that her officers were receiving from passengers, suddenly told everyone besides officer Jacobs to disperse. The officers followed her directions and returned to checking other passengers' tickets. Steeves advised Jacobs to calm Jack down, and to avoid using any language that might be perceived as racist by any viewers. Jacobs promptly led Jack into a corner of the subway car. Intentionally or not, his body now obstructed the other passengers' ability to easily record his interaction with Jack.

Having reorganized her officers' positions, Steeves joined me at my seat and smiled. She explained that she noticed how many people were watching her officers as they spoke with Jack. She said that their interaction would probably be perceived badly by the other passengers, especially as Jack loudly accused the officers of racism. Predicting these complaints, Steeves said that she had to make the scene "look good" by spreading her officers out across the length of the subway car instead of having them crowding around Jack. Having done so, the interaction appeared less hostile and was less likely to look bad on camera.

When I later asked her about the incident, Steeves explained that officers always have to think about the "optics" of their behaviour when there are people with cameras around.

6.4 Discussion: Camera-friendly Policing a Sign of Progress

The implications of camera-friendly policing are complex. Some may declare it a victory for social activists who hope to use cameras to discourage police misconduct, and some may understand it as favourable evidence of Foucaultian theories or deterrence theories which suggest that surveillance may discipline police behaviour. I am skeptical of both perspectives, and propose that the implications of camera-friendliness are ambiguous.

In some cases, camera-friendliness might be equivalent to disciplined behaviour. For example, a camera-friendly officer who recognizes that photographers are nearby might reconsider his decision to engage a suspicious subject with unnecessary and excessive violence. However, the camera-friendly officer could also respond to the presence of cameras by politely asking the suspicious individual to follow him into a low visibility environment like his cruiser and or to the headquarters, and then proceed to engage in an excessively violent interrogation. In this case cameras did not encourage disciplined behaviour, only an effort to conceal undisciplined behaviour behind camera-friendly politeness until the officer could move to a low visibility location.

Consider another example of camera-friendly policing: a racist officer approaches a group of black males and realizes that there are several CCTV cameras and smartphones in the area. Because of the presence of cameras, the racist officer may be deterred from relying on racial prejudices when deciding whether or not to approach the group. In this case, high visibility could be described as having a disciplining effect on the officer's behaviour. On the other hand, the officer may move forward with his initial decision to approach the group because of their race, taking an extra step of concealing any racist biases behind a cloak of camera-friendly speech and body language. In this case, high visibility did not discipline the officer's behaviour, it only encouraged the coding of any potentially unethical motivations.

For a real-life example of how coding may work, reconsider the scenario I described in the previous section when Officer Steeves tried to change the optics of her officers' interaction with Jack. Through Steeves altered the appearance of the officers' interaction with Jack, making it more camera-friendly by spreading her officers out, she did not address the racial stereotypes that may have initially informed her officers' decision to approach Jack. Rather, Steeves camera-friendly tactics may have only concealed these biases in an effort to look good and, by doing so,

avoid allegations of racism. Critical race scholars would call this as an example of hidden racism (Doane and Bonilla-Silva, 2003; Bonilla-Silva, 2003).

The issues raised have serious implications for our understandings of police efforts to look good while on camera and encourage us to ask the following questions:

- are the police truly learning to behave respectable and professional because of the presence of cameras and photographers? Or does this effort to look good reflect just that, an effort to *look,* but not necessarily *behave,* professionally?
- Do police efforts to adapt to high visibility (discussed in chapter 4) reflect an attempt to discipline their behaviour? Or are they motivated primarily by a desire to look good and avoid criticism?

The key to addressing these questions is an appreciation for how those under surveillance can find ways to avoid being scrutinized or criticized by concealing their misconduct behind performances which make them *seem* innocent. With this difference in mind, camera-friendly policing must be respected as a complex and ambiguous attempt to reduce the risks of policing on camera, and not necessarily a sign of discipline.

6.5 Conclusion: Camera-friendly policing and the Apathetic Perspective

Along with offering us a sense of how police respond to the risks of being on camera, an understanding of camera-friendliness helps answer lingering questions about why my research participants displayed an apathetic perspective despite their recognition of the risks of high visibility and their display of camera-shyness. That is, my participants' confidence in their professionalism, combined with their camera-friendly adaptations, mean that they may be able to actively reduce the risks of high visibility. If successful, they may be able to use videos to defend themselves from critique, to control interactions with citizens, to produce crediting imagery,

while simultaneously reducing photographers' ability to use their cameras and resulting footage to accuse police officers of misconduct.

Chapter 7 Coping, Joking and The Police's Backstage Behaviour

7.1 Introduction

Though they most often expressed apathetic and strategic perspectives, my participants did not completely abandon their need or desire for privacy. Rather my participants agreed that they must be able to rely on the existence of backstage spaces where they are guaranteed to be free from most forms of surveillance. I borrow the term "backstage" from Erving Goffman (1959) to refer to low visibility environments where my participants were able to rely on some degree of privacy from the public. Examples of backstage spaces include the divisional headquarters, the inside of a police cruiser, the locker room, as well as public spaces which have, for one reason or another, been emptied such as parking lots at night, public spaces that can only be accessed by those with security clearance, and crime scenes that have been cordoned off. Though some of these spaces are monitored by distant internal cameras, my participants seemed to think of them as spaces where their visibility is reduced significantly enough to guarantee some privacy.

This chapter examines my participants' understandings of backstage spaces, and what their desire for backstage spaces reveal about the police's relationship to *low visibility*. To start, I discuss the behaviours limited to backstage spaces, and then discuss why the exposure of these behaviours was among the biggest concerns that participants in my project had about being on camera.

7.2 Backstage Behaviours

The majority of what my participants consider backstage spaces are police-only, meaning when in a backstage space, my participants were surrounded by just their peers. Though many of these backstage spaces are work spaces, the officers occupying them are on-break in the sense

that they are not required to prioritize the need to perform for the general public by following "display rules" (Martin, 1999). Instead, within these spaces, my participants could step out of character, forgo any camera-friendly policing techniques, and engage in behaviours that might look bad if seen by the public, what I call backstage behaviours.

Backstage behaviours are not abuses of power, though they could include this. Instead my research suggests that these backstage behaviours are primarily forms of leisure, relaxation, and socializing. Examples include eating, smoking, exercising, debating, playing video games, watching movies, texting, angrily venting about this or that, expressing sadness or depression, and hanging out and joking. Given their seemingly harmless character, I was surprised to find that it was relaxation, leisure, and socializing that were what my participants were most concerned about keeping hidden in the backstage. When asked to explain their focus on relaxation and socializing, participants responded by suggesting that, if seen by the public, such behaviours would immediately earn them criticism. For example, UPS officer Kelly suggested the public would be offended by her peers' style of backstage joking,

> …Jokes can be made that, if they were made in the presence of the regular public, who doesn't deal with that negative aspect of life on a daily basis…, there would be some shock, and possible some disgust, and some concerns as to the appropriateness of the behaviour.

Accordingly, two specific types of backstage behaviours stood out when my participants discussed what they are most concerned about keeping private: coping and joking.

Backstage Coping

Backstage coping behaviours include activities that my participants said help them relieve work-related stress. One of the most common types of coping behaviour that my participants discussed was expressing emotions to peers. My participants alleged that emotional expression

was especially important after performing an emotionally taxing duty. For example, EPS officer Avi recounted an experience where he had to inform a mother that her daughter died in a car accident. Avi explained that as a father, he felt shaken by the incident but tried to suppress the emotion because it was his responsibility to professionally direct the mother to help. After doing his job with a mostly calm disposition, Avi said that he immediately returned to the headquarters to speak with his peers and express emotions that he had kept inside while in public view.

Similarly, a group of UPS officers explained that they regularly met to discuss tragic incidents on campus, including students' suicide attempts. UPS officer Axel recounted having to respond to a gruesome scene where a student had tried to cut and burn himself. Axel stated that he had to come back to police headquarters immediately after respond to the scene, so that he could speak with peers in order to cope with the shocking sights and stomach-turning smells he had just had to deal with.

ETS Officer Aussie told me of a situation in which he had to confront a large gang with a reputation for violence. During the confrontation, many gang members seemed ready to attack him, but Aussie was able to complete his work and escape danger. He admitted to being stressed and said that he needed to "decompress" immediately after his confrontation with the gang by going back to the headquarters and thinking about how close he had just come to injury or even death.

Coping in a backstage space took many forms including calmly talking to peers, crying, yelling, ranting, and joking. I witnessed coping first hand as officers regularly expressed frustrations to one another after a shift by describing interactions with cop haters. For example, ETS Officer George explained that the headquarters is often used to let loose (rant with peers) after he is "vented on" by angry and drunken sports fans,

> You are constantly out there putting on a show, dealing with people's crap, and a lot of time they will vent on you, if there is no one else to vent on, they just beeline to you and vent. So when you get back to the squad car or the HQ, you just let loose. It's a good way to deal with it.

I sometimes played the part of a peer as many of my participants sat with me in cruisers and angrily ranted about feeling disrespected. The disrespectful behaviours that angered my participants almost always involved a young person yelling "fuck the police," or something to that effect, from a distance. During their rants, my participants most often questioned the general public's lack of intelligence, and their lack of appreciation for the important work that police officers do to keep citizens safe.

Ranting officers received immediate supported from peers. For example, when frustrated officers ranted about their interactions with rude citizens, their peers listened, shared similar stories, and explained that rude people are mad at policing and not the "person behind the uniform." Peers concluded by telling ranting officers "not to take it personally." Several officers described this type of communication between peers as a kind of therapy with members of the police family. For instance, UPS officer Kelly stated,

> Um, I think you work along side people, for more than 40 hours a week, and they become your family, your best friends, and you feel comfortable and you can be yourself and really let go around them, and vent. And I think, for me personally, and I know for a few other officers, not necessarily on my squad, it's kind of a source of therapy to just kind of be able to talk [things] out, get it out of the system, vent about it and then you're good…

Another common type of backstage coping was engaging in leisure activities, often used to deal with the sheer boredom of a workday. Participants explained that most work shifts are boring, and defined by paperwork, aimless patrols, and unremarkable interactions with people

who need help findings their way to a bathroom or their car. Participants seemed disappointed that the realities of policing were not what Hollywood promised them, and explained that they felt the need to enter police-only spaces because there simply wasn't much exciting work to do and they needed to find something to occupy their time while free from prying eyes. Accordingly, within police headquarters, I found that many on-duty officers would watch television, browse the internet, take breaks with peers, meet with friends who are not police officers, visit the gym and exercise, and even take naps.

I sometimes found myself wondering if the officers were shirking their responsibilities as they sated their boredom. But, the officers noted that there simply wasn't much to do at a given moment and spending the entirety of their 11-hour shift patrolling aimlessly would be unhealthy and stressful. Accordingly, participants regularly returned to headquarters and took unplanned breaks without guilt or concern. In my experience supervisors and sergeants accepted their officers' arguments about the utility of breaks, and rarely asked officers to get back into the field unless they remained in headquarters for a particularly long period of time or failed to respond to radio calls.

I appreciate why leisure can be a form of coping, but I ultimately concluded that the officers were, at least some of the time, slacking off. I point to instances when officers spent excessive amounts of time socializing with peers (sometimes hours) rather than patrolling their assigned area, or when officers distanced themselves from work to the extent that their ability to respond to calls for service were undermined. These included circumstances in which officers left their immediate jurisdiction and went to lunch with friends or visited the gym in the middle of their work shift. It seemed to me that describing all of these behaviours as coping would not do them justice as forms leisure and work avoidance.

Backstage Joking

My participants regularly used the backstage to joke about topics like race, ethnicity, religion, sex, politics, their stresses and suffering, as well as the general suffering of others. An especially routine form of joking was disparaging citizens. Most of these jokes targeted what ETS Officer Joy called "human tragedies," including the underprivileged, the poor, the ill, and other people whom the police routinely interact with. I witnessed my participants' backstage joking on several occasions including when Officers Andy and Mack insulted and laughed about what they described as the sad but stupid behaviour of members of poor and marginalized communities, displaying a mix of empathy and contempt as they did so. This type of joking often included mentions of race and ethnicity, as officers sometimes laughed about the "strangely childish" behaviour of Asians (they never clarified who they were speaking about, but I suspect they referred to those from Eastern Asia), the lazy life style of Aboriginals, and the criminal behaviour of black peoples.

As they joked, some officers seemed mildly anxious, and responded by trying to justify any seeming bigotry. For example, while he joked that he sometimes focused his attention on black men, one UPS officer rationalized his bigotry by stating, "they [referring to black men] just commit more crime, what am I supposed to do?" In addition, to justifying bigotry, many officers dealt with their anxiety by following racial jokes by joking about joking, sometimes poking fun at the racist assumptions underlying an original joke. As with attempts to justify racial biases, this joking about joking also seemed like an effort to deny potential accusations of racism (perhaps from me), and even mirrors some of the techniques that comedians are trained to use to avoid accusations of racism (Pérez, 2013). More often than not, participants concluded by claiming that any racial or ethnic jokes were "just jokes" and not to be taken seriously. This was especially common when officers realized that most of the individuals they described as "human tragedies" were non-white.

My participants also joked about their peculiar experiences while on-duty. For example, during fieldwork in August with UPS officer Cena, we once witnessed a drunken student who, while in his underwear, decided to sit in a bush and play a popular video game entitled Pokémon on his Gameboy. Cena approached the young man as I watched, and asked him if he was alright. The young man casually responded "Yeah, I am fine, I just have to *catch 'em all*," (a popular catchphrase associated with Pokémon), and then headed towards his dorm room. Cena later brought this up with peers at the divisional headquarters and he and his peers joked about it while eating their lunches.

Other joke topics including problems with the younger generation of students, the unique ways that East Asian peoples walk, and speculation about the existence of nerve endings in Russians' testicles. Many officers acknowledged the strangeness of this humour and admitted that it sometimes spoke to an immature disposition in the backstage. For example, when asked about his joking, ETS officer Christian described them as childish,

> I think cause it's a private setting and everyone is comfortable with each other, we joke around. We're all kids [laughs]. A lot of the guys in the squad are 20-something. Sergeants are in their 30s. But, we're all still kids…

Among the more bizarre jokes I witnessed during fieldwork was made during fieldwork with the UPS. At around 1 A.M., several officers stepped into a building that had been locked up for the night and began an extensive debate about how a person can demonstrate true friendship. After a prolonged discussion, one officer concluded that allowing a friend to lick sensitive areas on her face was the best sign of friendship. When we asked for clarification, she mimicked licking her friend's eyeball, and then held one of her co-workers in place while she licked her cheek. UPS officers explained that bizarre joking is exactly what is needed in the middle of an 11-hour ship to stay sane. Regardless how we understand the utility of bizarre jokes, it is not surprising that my

participants wanted to keep it in a backstage; most jokes discussed controversial topics and would likely earn my participants criticism.

The Purpose of Coping and Joking: Stress Relief

It is difficult to determine the meaning of police officers' backstage humour, but we can draw on work conducted by Humour Studies and Critical Humour Studies, which have proposed a number of theories about the meaning and purpose of humour. For instance, disparagement and superiority theories of humour (Ford and Ferguson, 2004) suggest that humour is a technique of domination used to reinforce a particular social order and point to social practices such as Minstrel shows as key evidence. Incongruity theories of humour suggest that humour is based in a realization of incongruity between social processes or within social structures. Alternatively, relief theories of humour suggest that joking is a way of relieving societal tensions (Morreall, 2009). Relief theory is reflected in my participants' claims about the utility of their humour as they regularly referenced the importance of joking for stress relief.

Most participants pointed to their "dark humour" as evidence of the cathartic nature of their joking. For example, a pair of EPS officers Avi and Gary described how they coped after seeing the aftermath of a suicide where a man had shot himself in the head. The gruesome scene was difficult to cope but the officers successfully maintained their professional and calm demeanour while investigating the scene. Later, however, the officers returned to their headquarters to write up a report and began laughing hysterically about the situation with peers. During their investigation they had discovered that the man had shot himself twice, once by accident. The first and fatal shot was purposefully directed at the man's head. After he was hit, the gun dropped out of the man's hands and upon hitting the ground fired a second time, again

hitting the man in the head. The officer joked about the scenario dubbing it the "shot in the head while dead" incident. The officers were adamant that as disconcerting and perhaps offensive as it may seem to laugh at such a scenario, humour and joking became central to their ability to cope.

ETS training officer Clint described this dark humour as one way that police deal with the realization that they are often unable to prevent crime,

> You might start your career thinking you can save a lot of people and solve a lot of issues, and I'm sure some of that stays with you or you'd find a different career, but you also become …more realistic, realizing these are ongoing problems that will always be there. And with that, I think comes a coping mechanism, and that's our humour, morbid humour. You make inappropriate comments, but you do them when in the company of others that would understand them.

I routinely witnessed this kind of morbid joking in response to people who had caused themselves or others harm. On a nightshift in November 2013, transit officers including Officer Raymond located a drunk man who had tripped and smashed his head against a metal railing (I was later told that he had fractured his skull). The man was disoriented and unable to communicate clearly. I watched as the officers tried to speak to the man while waiting for medical services. The man's slurred speech and strange unintelligible comments prompted some smiles from the officers, which they tried to conceal behind hands over mouths or by turning away from the scene. Medical services eventually arrived and took the man to hospital. The officers maintained their professional demeanour until we entered the headquarters where they, at first, began laughing about the man's slurred speech and then expressed frustrations about the behaviour of drunkards. Officers used similar coping mechanism after ride-alongs where we witnessed drunken sisters fighting and drawing blood, ill individuals slipping on ice and injuring themselves, and a drug user's "word salad" (incomprehensible speech) before being arrested.

Though ETS Sergeant Freeman noted that he was not particularly happy about the extent of the unprofessional and perhaps unsympathetic joking displayed in the backstage, he claimed that he was supportive none the less. He said that he encouraged his officers to cathartically “let it out” in the headquarters, both for the psychological wellbeing of his officers, but also so that it would not happen in public spaces, where it could be seen by the public, or worse, captured on video. Freeman was well aware that footage of officers laughing at the ill or injured would be condemning, and so, if it had to happened, he preferred that it was kept private. Most officers agreed and emphasized the cathartic benefits of joking and the need to keep in the backstage. For example, UPS officer Kelly described her divisional headquarters as a…

> … safe place, where you can sort of joke around and take the edge off, take that hyper-vigilance down a few notches, and ultimately, I think that keeps us, mentally speaking, healthy. Cause I think that if everyone was just hyper-vigilant all the time … I think you'd go batty!

And UPS Officer Cena explained,

> … I have a very dark sense of humour and I’m loud, I joke a lot, I like to go on adventures, it’s a bit ridiculous. But [in public] I have to be completely different. None of that can come out. So when I get back to the office, it’s just venting [laughs]. The joking is also a good way to deal with the things you see, because you see some unpleasant things. It might be coping…

7.3 How Sexuality and Gender Impact Backstage Coping and Joking

The tendency among policemen to question one another’s sexuality was particularly common, as was joking about a police officer’s ability to fight. This joking was clearly shaped by traditional notions of masculinity, including ideas about a policeman’s ability to protect and

defend themselves (Martin, 1999). Unsurprisingly, these jokes also tended to reflect a homophobic prejudice held by many officers corresponding to research discussing how humour can be used to reproduce heterosexual hierarchies and normative masculinity (Collinson, 1988; Kehily and Nayak, 1997; Martin, 1999). This was best reflected on occasions where my participants tried to contain their laughter while interacting with men whom were presumed were gay. UPS officers Boise and Jeff for example, were asked in mid-September to help a flamboyant young man named Rajdeep to his dorm room after his drunken behaviour began to annoy several students at a nearby pub. While directing Rajdeep his dorm, he began to flirt with the officers and myself. At one point Rajdeep asked Officer Boise if he had found a date, and when Boise said "no" with a smile, Rajdeep passionately exclaimed "well, don't worry, if you can't find anyone, I will fuck you!" The officers held in their laughs (though eye-rolls and winks were a constant) until we finally said bye to Rajdeep. As soon as we were out of sight of the campus residence, Officer Jeff began to aggressively shove Boise and laughed as he questioned Boise's heterosexuality. As this example suggests, low visibility was not only a space for joking about civilians, but about teasing peers, often along sexual and gendered lines.

Accordingly, policewomen had a unique style of joking while in a backstage environment, especially when no police*men* were nearby. In this gendered low visibility environment, a backstage within a backstage, policewomen claimed that they could talk about the experience of being a police*woman*. I first realized this when I was with two female dispatchers who laughed as they talked about the pressures policewomen face when in public, including the need to put on what one dispatcher called a "butchy" guise in order to earn the respect of men. The dispatchers argued that the pressure to maintain a butchy guise meant that it is only is low visibility environments that policewomen can gossip about what they called "girly topics," like romance from a woman's perspective.

Coping also had gendered qualities. For example, some policewomen, particularly those of middle-age, added that in the backstage they took on an emotional support role for their peers, often becoming mother-like figures. A UPS officer named Mindy, for example, explained that her male peers felt especially comfortable engaging in coping behaviours with a female officer who is old enough to be their mother. This supports existing research about the pressure that policewomen face to perform in particular ways in order to earn the respect of her peers and the public (Bolton Jr and Feagin, 2004). For instance, research by Martin (1980; 1994; 1999) highlights the various ways that gender norms impose unique emotional responsibilities such as taking position as a "nurturing mother" in the police headquarters. Martin noted that this sometimes places policewomen in a problematic space as becoming a nurturing mother sometimes undermines their ability to play up their butchy guise and earn the respect of policemen. Accordingly, some of my female participants refused the role of the mother. These policewomen were not forthcoming about their gendered experience, and many denied that gender was significant to their work. Instead, they alleged that they dislike the idea that policewomen are any different than men. This was often followed by a critique of "femi-nazis."

7.4 Discussion: Racial Joking and Stress Relief

Rethinking The Relationship Between Joking and Stress Relief?

As mentioned, a consistent theme in my participants' discussion of their backstage behaviours is the idea that coping and joking are used for stress relief. This is not surprising, as police stress has received significant attention by police officers and scholars studying the police (Conroy and Hess, 1992; Fell et al. 1980; Reiser and Geiger, 1984; Carter, 1991). Many examinations of police stress reflect the popular opinion that the police are under extensive stress, perhaps facing the most stressful working conditions in contemporary society, given their routine

interactions with violence, crime, and tragedy (Storch and Panzarella, 1996). Some studies suggest that the police may even suffer from post-traumatic stress disorder and other stress related issues (Hart, Wearing, and Headley, 1995), particularly when involved in shooting incidents (Gersons, 1989), and that this may cause high levels of stress resulting in alcoholism, excessive worrying, sickness, "burnout" and suicide attempts (Territo and Vetter, 1981; Violanti, Marshall, and Howe, 1985; Schaible and Gecas, 2010).

However, claims about the exceptional levels of stress that police officers endure have been subject to criticism because of a lack of empirical support, especially in light of studies which suggest that police officers are not so quick to mention violence, crime, or tragedy when discussing what they find most stressful about their job, as well as studies suggesting police stress levels may not be much higher than the stress levels of other members of the workforce (Schaible and Gecas, 2010). In fact, many studies have shown that what police officers find most stressful about their work is their schedules, their income levels, the tedious nature of much of their work, the blame and criticism they must contend with, as well as conflicts with administration (Cooper and Davidson; 1988; Brown and Campbell, 1990; Storch and Panzarella, 1996). These should sound familiar to just about anyone in the workforce, suggesting that police work may not be uniquely stressful. In addition, rather than being a source of stress, studies have found that violence and tragedy may be what police officers enjoy about their duties, sometimes to the point that they help mitigate the organizational stresses described above (Stotland, 1991; Crank et al. 1993). Given critiques of the idea that the police have a particularly stressful job, how can we understand my participants claims about high levels of stress, and the subsequent need for leisure time and stress-relieving joking?

While there is no doubt that my participants experienced high levels of stress, and that some of this stress can indeed be related to interactions with violent peoples as well as sights of

human misery, based primarily on my observations, I am skeptical of the tendency to limit backstage behaviours to a stress-relieving undertaking. As previously mentioned studies predict, I did not witness any behaviour on the part of my participants' that would reflect extreme levels of stress, and what seemed to stress my participants most was the boredom and tedious nature of their duties. Accordingly, I sense that when my participants described their coping and joking as stress relieving activities, they were, at least some of the time, trying to justify behaviours that are better described as fun, play, and relaxation during a boring shift.

This is not a dismissal of, or disregard for, my participants' stress, especially stress based on the perception of threat. I do not doubt that my participants were often very stressed, and that their coping and joking were stress-relieving activities, a view that is supported by studies highlighting the value of humour in high stress workplaces including firehouses, emergency rooms, and of course police departments (Mindess and Turek, 1981; Hart et al., 1995; Kuhlman, 1988; Burke, 1998 Wormer and Boes, 1997; Pogrebin and Poole, 1988; 1991; 1995; Anshel, 2000; Charman, 2013; Vivona 2014), However, I propose that a full appreciation of my participants' backstage behaviours cannot rely strictly on discussions of high stress. Instead, these discussions require a consideration of procrastination, downtime, relaxation, and slacking as ways of filling up a boring workday.

Viewed from this lens, my participants' desire to conceal their backstage behaviours may indeed have been because the public "wouldn't get it," but not necessarily because these behaviours amount to a complex form of stress relief, but because these behaviours did not constitute what might be considered hard work by those responsible for protecting and serving society.

Racial Jokes and Police Privacy

It is also important to consider the quality of the joking that my participants engaged in by asking why these activities involved jokes about homosexuality, gender, injury, suffering and, in particular, race and ethnicity, one of the riskiest subjects to joke about in North American societies which go to great efforts to protect a (problematic) colour-blind self-image (Bonilla-Silva, 2003; 2009; Pérez, 2011).

For obvious reasons, my participants were particularly concerned about keeping their racial and ethnic jokes private. They alleged that they were "just joking" when they commented on topics such as black criminality or Islamic terrorism. I question whether this was indeed a desire to keep a legitimate coping activity hidden, and I wonder if it was in fact an attempt to keep evidence of racial prejudice hidden. Was this joking meaningless banter or was it indicative of the racist biases held by many officers? If the latter is true, then would the surveillance of the police's backstage serve an anti-racist purpose?

Many who learn of racist joking in the police's backstage will probably respond to these questions by asserting that it is evidence of racial prejudices, and then justify the need to monitor police backstage behaviour for an anti-racist purpose. I ground this assumption in the response to the infamous *Secret Policeman* documentary which exposed a group of UK police rookies' backstage racism. The response to this documentary was largely positive and, despite their privacy violations, the filmmakers were credited by fellow media professionals and political commentators for contributing to anti-racist causes (McLaughlin, 2007; Reiner, 2010). Critical humour studies scholars would also likely conclude that racial joking in the backstage is evidence of my participants' racial prejudices and encourage the surveillance of their backstage. I base this assumption on the fact that most critical humour studies scholars argue that racial joking cannot be dismissed as "just jokes" and "harmless" (Boskin and Dorinson, 1985; Lowe, 1986; Apte, 1987; Davies, 1990; Pickering and Lockyer, 2009), because they contribute to the reproduction of

racist ideas (Billig, 2001; Ford and Ferguson, 2004, Howitt and Owusu-Bempah, 2005; Lockyer and Pickering, 2008; Bonilla-Silva, 2009; Weaver, 2011, Pérez, 2013).

While I appreciate the perspective that racial joking in the backstage may indeed be evidence of racial bias, I believe that a more nuanced perspective is required when assessing my participants' joking. My sense is that, though backstage joking may reflect racist prejudice at some level, it is also true that the aim and goal of my participants' joking seemed to be inappropriateness for its own sake, rather than the expression of their genuine views on race and ethnicity. For instance, when my participants joked about licking eyeballs as signs of friendship and whether or not there are nerve endings in Russians' testicles, I doubt that their intention was to express their honest belief about either topic. Rather, their intention seemed to be to shock others, to break social norms of professional behaviour, and to break display rules governing police behaviour, all in order to earn a laugh. Accordingly, my participants' breaks often seemed like contests between officers who wanted to determine who could violate display rules the most by behaving in the most inappropriate ways possible, sometimes by sharing jokes about race and ethnicity. This suggests that my participants' joking was not always a sign of bigotry, but a reflection of the unique thrill that one can achieve by transgressing social norms (Katz, 1988). It seems that there was something exciting and entertaining about using racist language or making extreme jokes about sexuality, violence, crime, and even police brutality. It seemed that the jokes brought about an excitement that could be used to fill the tedium of boring police shifts, and enjoy downtime with peers. Accordingly, there seemed to be more to their joking than just racial prejudice.

Viewed through this lens, we may also be able to understand why some of my participants were willing to engage in racial joking in my presence. As mentioned in the methodology section

of this dissertation, my race and gender probably influenced by participants' behaviour. For example, my identity likely discouraged some officers from discussing race for fear of being described as racist by researcher. This is evidenced by the fact that many participants seemed anxious when race was brought up, and responded by trying to either justify their mention of race, or employ defensive strategies to rationalize their mention of race (including joking about racial jokes, as discussed earlier). But, because this joking was sometimes an effort to experience the trill of inappropriateness, I presume that, once I earned some degree of trust as a buddy-researcher, my participants felt comfortable including me in their joking, even when it was about race. I believe that they concluded that I understood their joking as something more than an expression of racist prejudice and, therefore, something that they felt comfortable letting me witness.

My skepticism about the argument that police joking is evidence of racial prejudice should not be taken as a suggestion that my participants held no racial prejudices. Rather it is an attempt shed light on the complexities of their racial joking, including the thrill of inappropriateness. Thus, the politics of my participants racial joking is difficult to simplify. In some cases, it may have been an effort to entertain others and be inappropriate, in other cases it may have indeed reflected prejudices, and sometimes it could have been both. The ethics of this joking are complicated further when one considers how they might protect existing racist structures, regardless of by participants' intentions (Bonilla-Silva, 2009). What is clear is that this complexity only furthers the idea that such joking is best kept hidden in the backstage as it is likely to earn the police criticism for being racist and/or inappropriate.

7.5 Conclusion

Backstage relaxation and socializing are not rare among public service work. Backstage humour, in particular, has been used by various professionals including police officers, ambulance staff, surgeons, and other professionals who have to cope with stressful work duties (Wanzer, 2005; Bennett, 2003; Ziegler, 1998). What makes the police's backstage unique is that is under the most significant threat, a function of the increasing desire to watch and monitor police activity with the advancement of technologies like smartphones and wearable cameras.

Because these backstage spaces house inappropriate behaviours according to both formal and informal norms of police professionalism, it is not surprising that despite their apathetic and strategic perspectives, my participants were adamant that these spaces be kept camera-free. My participants were not confident in their professionalism in these spaces, they were not confident in their backstage camera-friendliness. Thus, my findings suggest that though high visibility can be a utility in some circumstances and in some spaces, in the backstage, lower visibility is usually the ideal for police. This raises questions for future research about wearable cameras which can peek into the police's backstage; do the police respond to wearable cameras differently when they enter the backstage? Will the police have to employ camera-friendly tactics in the backstage? What happens to police officers who are without a camera-free backstage?

Chapter 8 Crediting Images

As mentioned, one reason that many participants expressed a strategic perspective is that cameras can be used to create promotional images which present police officers in a positive light. Though few participants referenced specific examples, this idea remained intriguing to me during my research and so I began to examine promotional imagery of police, particularly images created without the extensive involvement of promotional companies or media relations departments. These images are the topic of this chapter.

This analysis of crediting images does not rely extensively on data gathered during my fieldwork in Edmonton with the EPS, ETS and UPS. Accordingly, I have left this discussion of crediting images to last.

8.1 Introduction

Type the words “police” or “cop” into the YouTube.com search, press the return key, and you will find yourself staring at raw images of police officers beating people, using racist language, and making violent arrests. These images will be labeled with terms like brutality, hypocrisy, and racism, and they will sometimes be used to make arguments about the need to reform policing. The number of these discrediting images is staggering, and accordingly, the police may be heading towards an “image-management crisis” (Haggerty and Sandhu, 2014).

However, there is more to the story of policing in an era of mass surveillance than discrediting images. Examinations of the police’s “new visibility” (Goldsmith, 2010) have not considered a different type of image that is growing in popularity on YouTube, images which praise police work, celebrate the heroic efforts of individual police officers, and have the potential to act as promotional media. Popular examples (based on their view count) of these images include the following:

- A video shows an officer save a woman from choking on a piece of food. The footage, which is recorded from a police cruisers dashboard camera, starts with an officer approaching the driver side of a parked vehicle. When the officer approaches, the driver exits the vehicle and begins heaving. The officer performs the Heimlich maneuver, dislodging a piece of food in the driver's throat, and saves her life. When she catches her breathe, the driver becomes emotional and tightly hugs the officer. The video can be found here: http://youtu.be/0MTXjsJXUL8
- A video shows an officer rescuing a group of ducklings that have fallen into a sewer drain. The ducklings' mother stands nearby, as the officer collects the ducklings in a cardboard box. After rescuing the ducklings, the officer is shown returning them to a pond with their mother. The video can be found here: http://youtu.be/EmFCplrAXrU
- A video shows a Colombian police officer patrolling a train platform as a train arrives. The officer notices a man walking towards the speeding train, presumably in a suicide attempt. The officer grabs the man by the shirt and pulls him back just before he walks on to the train tracks. The video can be found here: http://youtu.be/rjrwFwacY4s
- A video shows a police officer enthusiastically lip-syncing to a song by a popular musical artist. The video goes viral and is reported by news and entertainment media. The officer is interviewed by several journalists, and the attention he receives encourages him to produce a series of follow-up lip-sync videos. The video can be found here: https://youtu.be/8XFBUM8dMqw

This chapter introduces what I call crediting images, including videos showing police officers humorously dancing to popular music, heroically confronting violent criminals, and images that display the kindness of officers as they help the desperate, injured, and impoverished.

While discrediting images criticize and shame police, I argue that crediting images hold the potential to promote the police by spreading what can be considered pro-police materials to a large body of viewers. This paper examines the promotional politics of crediting images, and reflects on the complexities of their production and interpretation.

8.2 Popular Representations of Police and the Production of Knowledge

Representations of the police in mainstream media can range from the comedic like the characters in the film series like Police Academy, to the suspenseful like depictions in television shows like The Wire or The Shield, to the corrupt like in the film Training Day. Though some might characterize this media as just entertainment, representations of police can have profound implications for popular understandings. This is because the mainstream media is a primary source of information about law enforcement, one of the few ways that the public interacts with police officers on a regular basis, and therefore it has the capacity to "explain" the police to viewers (Ericson, 1995). Accordingly, several social scientists have studied how media platforms impact public perceptions of police (Lasley, 1994; Skolnick and Fyfe, 1994; Lawrence, 2000; Rafter, 2006; Doyle, 2007; Huey, 2010; Huey and Broll, 2012; 2013; Callanan and Rosenberger, 2011; Huey and Broll, 2012; McCombs, 2014). More recently this literature has begun to study the impact of images of police recorded on smartphones, CCTV cameras, and other surveillance technologies (Goldsmith, 2010; Greer and McLaughlin, 2010; 2011; 2012; Haggerty and Sandhu, 2014; Brown, 2015; Sandhu and Haggerty. 2015).

The vast majority of this research has focused on discrediting images, which include photos and videos which portray the police in a negative light and allow the producers of these videos to critique police officers. Among the most infamous examples of such a video is the footage of the beating of Rodney King by Los Angeles Police in 1991 (Crenshaw and Peller,

1993; Skolnick and Fyfe, 1994; Lasley, 1994). Since the Rodney King incident several more and different types of imagery have been displayed on news media and/or social media platforms. These include morally ambiguous images of police officers walking, dancing, and picking their noses, to morally condemning images of police brutally beating individuals, to images which praise police for their professionalism, kindness, bravery, and the like. Accordingly, new questions have been raised about the types of impact these images can have on public perceptions of police. Can such images explain the police to viewers in different and diverse ways? Can certain types of images act as promotional imagery?

Critics might argue that there are several limitations which might prevent images of police, regardless of their content, from having a significant influence on viewers, including the degree to which internet users consume online content as a source of entertainment rather than a source of information (Hess, 2009; Schaefer and Steinmetz, 2014). However, it would be a mistake to entirely overlook the influence that these images can have. Images of police have a history of producing influential popular knowledge and conjuring emotional and political responses from large sections of the public in the form of demonstrations, protests, and even riots. The riots following the acquittal of the police officers who beat Rodney King case are probably the most prominent example, but more recent examples of protests like the Black Lives Matter campaign in New York City (which were strongly influenced by the spread of videos of NYPD officers choking a black man named Eric Garner to death), suggest that surveillance videos continue to play a key role in shaping popular knowledge of policing and encouraging political action. It is my argument that crediting images may have a similar power, but rather than producing discrediting knowledge, crediting images operate as promotional media.

8.3 Crediting Images: COPS for the web 2.0 era

When considering the political impact of crediting images, we can compare them to the types of reality television promotional efforts undertaken by police organizations in the 1990s. Examples of these programs, which Hille Koskela (2004) called "crime control pornography," include America's Most Wanted and COPS, both of which claimed to show the reality of police officers and criminals as they attempt to capture/elude one another.

Aaron Doyle (2003) demonstrates that though these programs claimed to show real and unedited footage of the police, in actuality this footage was carefully designed to make the police appear exciting and heroic. Police organizations often staged events and acted with cameras in mind to produce content that was favourable to police. Once edited and aired, these programs entertained and educated audiences about the supposed moral righteousness and crime-control successes of police. By doings so, these programs attempted to earn police organizations the public's respect. Similar to COPS, crediting images represent an internet-age promotional media that entertains and educates audiences about the police's heroic efforts to save the day or help the downtrodden. A crediting images promotional power may rest on the fact that they are unlikely to be tarnished as fake or overproduced the way movies or other entertainment media would be. Instead, like COPS and other reality television programs, crediting images are likely understood as a chance to learn the so called truth about the police.

While they hold the same promotional potential as reality televisions programs, crediting images are significantly different in their production. Rather than being created by a team of police organizations and reality television producers that want to make the police look good, crediting images are often created by amateurs who have no social, political, or economic responsibilities to construct such accounts (Goldsmith 2010; Haggerty and Sandhu, 2014). These amateurs have no affiliation to a political activist organization, and they record images of police officers on their smartphones after they happened to find themselves witness to some spectacular

circumstances, such as an arrest. Further, the distributors of crediting images are not professional media companies, nor are they the individuals who record footage of police. Instead distributors are often internet users who appropriate crediting images and upload them to a video sharing websites (Schaefer and Steinmetz, 2014; Evans, 2015).

This does not mean that the police have no control over how these images are produced or distributed. The following analysis of a few popular crediting images reveals that the police may have found ways to involve themselves in the processes of production and distribution. The first crediting image is titled Honest Cops and it demonstrates how police officers can interact with photographers in an attempt to try to influence how they are being recorded. The second is titled A Not Uncommon Example of Humanity and it demonstrates how police officers can play a role in constructing the meaning of a video by discussing it after it has gone viral online. The third is titled Hip Hop Cops and it demonstrates how police officers can try to produce their own crediting images with cameras that are owned and operated by a police organization.

Honest Cops

Many crediting image shows police officers responding to angry or aggressive individuals with an appropriate level of force, and these images often earn the police praise for their professional behaviours. A popular example of this type of crediting images is entitled Honest Cops. The incident which this video depicts occurred in Hamilton, Ontario, Canada. Not much information about the incident is available in the video itself, as it begins after officers have already begun to arrest a young woman. The video shows officers using force to direct the woman to their police cruiser while she struggles and screams. At one point the woman notices that she is being recorded by several bystanders. In response, she yells "I hope everyone sees this," implying the video will definitively show the officers are using excessive force, and could be used in her favour if she chooses to file a complaint. A particularly vocal photographer agrees

and, throughout the video, he accuses the officers of being too aggressive. If one were to watch only the first half of the video, it would probably be filed away as yet another discrediting video showing a police officer's excessive use of force and being criticized by bystanders with cameras.

However, a couple of minutes into the video, one of the officers approaches a crowd of bystanders, including the vocal photographer, and begins to explain his actions. The officer can be described as calm and respectful. He is also apologetic, not for using force but, as he explains, for creating a disturbing scene, "okay, for all the nice people filming," he says, "…I know it may look to be much worse than it is, but I can tell you it is only because she is resisting." He continues, "our mandate is to effect arrests while doing the minimum amount of damage possible and that's what I tried to do. While it may appear to be very rough to you, I apologize to you for having to see that." The vocal photographer does not accept the officer's attempts to explain his violence and continues to launch accusations of excessive force and brutality. In response, the officer becomes slightly more hostile, "It's nice people like you who want to make the police look bad… you chose to come outside sir and you chose to film me, that's fine. I am not put off by your efforts to put me into a bad light. I'm used to being made a bad guy by nice folk who are getting a fraction of the picture."

Despite the criticism from the vocal photographer, when the video was uploaded to YouTube.com, viewers expressed their support for the police officers in the form of online commentary, as well as phone calls and thousands of emails praising the officer for his patience and professionalism. The officer also received positive responses from his peers, including the Ontario ombudsman who shared the Honest Cops video on a twitter account.

The Honest Cops incident not only demonstrates the promotional power of crediting images, but demonstrates how the police can contribute to the production of a video by communicating with photographers in a respectful manner and explaining any police actions. In

doing so, the officers interject information into the video and, therefore, contribute to the production of its meaning (Stuart, 2015). Through these camera-friendly actions, viewers of the Honest Cops video are given the opportunity to consider the police officer's side of the story and, based on the largely favourable response to the video, it seems that this is the version of the story that most viewers accepted.

A Not Uncommon Example of Humanity

Not all crediting images take video form. Some like *A Not Uncommon Example of Humanity* are still-images which display police professionalism and kindness (Barry, 2015). Like the last example, the image in this case offers little identifying information or context. All that is seen is a black officer in a grey uniform helping an older and seemingly distressed white man into the shade. Just enough of the white man's shirt is visible to know that it displays a Nazi Swastika on top of a shield coloured in the stars and stripes of the American flag. Even without context, the image is likely to grab the interests of viewers. It is not everyday that one sees a black police officer helping a white Nazi.

As the image quickly went viral, details about the incident emerged. Apparently, the image was taken as the black officer named Leroy Smith performed crowd control around the South Carolina State House in USA. Several officers were needed for crowd control as two opposing rallies took place in response to the recent decision to permanently remove the confederate flag from the State House (a symbol of American Southern pride to some, and racism to others). The Black Educators for Justice conducted their rally on one side of the courthouse, and soon afterwards the Ku Klux Klan (KKK) and the Loyal White Knights rallied on the other side, declaring their opposition to the removal of the flag. The KKK chanted "white power," and waved their own confederate flags as police officers watched.

During these rallies, Officer Smith noticed that one of the KKK's members seemed distressed. It is believed that he may have suffered heat stroke and fainted. Officer Smith approached the white man and helped him up the Statehouse's stairs to its air conditioned interior. As he did so, another state employee snapped a photograph and posted it on Twitter, adding the following description, "not an uncommon example of humanity in SC: Leroy Smith helps white supremacist to shelter & water as heat bears down." The image was retweeted nearly 6000 times (Aghbali, 2015), and people reacted to it by celebrating the kindness of Officer Smith calling him unselfish, professional, and a gentleman for his actions. Smith was also asked to comment on the image and later issued a statement[24] declaring the image evidence that he and his police peers serve the public equally, regardless of skin colour, nationality, or beliefs. When he was asked why it had received the attention it had, Smith stated, that the image was evidence of love, "the greatest thing in the world."

This is another example of an image taken without the officer's approval, this time without his awareness, which is then used to praise his actions. The popularity of the images is, on its own, evidence that crediting images can grab the public's attention just as much as a discrediting image can. It is also evidence of police participating in the production of crediting images by making statements directly related to the image during interviews. By describing the image as evidence of egalitarianism and love, Leroy Smith constructed a framework from which to view the image, one which likely affected how mainstream media reported on the incident and how the image was shared on social media. In fact, a search for the image on Google now brings up several references to Smith's statements. Accordingly, Officer Smith inserted key information into the larger conversation of the image and, by doing so, played a key role in its production and

[24] http://www.scdps.gov/comm/nr2015/072015b.html

distribution increasing the likelihood that it would operate as a crediting image rather than a discrediting image.

Hip Hop Cops

Perhaps in recognition of the appeal of crediting images, some police organizations have begun to produce their own, often humorous crediting images. Some organizations such as the Edmonton Police Service have even put together YouTube channels[25] dedicated to collecting and displaying a mix of both heavily produced advertisements and crediting images which seem designed by officers without the aid of professional video directors or media relations departments.

One of the most popular examples of this type of crediting image is entitled Hip Hop Cops and was created by the Rosenberg Texas Police Department. The video is shot from what is likely a dashboard camera aimed at the inside of the vehicle. It begins with two officers Ranell Roy (black man) and Ariel Ronell (white woman), entering a police cruiser. Both have serious looks on their faces as they put on their seat belts. Ranell Roy, the driver, picks up the radio and calls dispatch to let them know that they are back in service. A popular "southern rap-techno" song begins to play, and both officers begin to nod their heads to the beat. Ranell Roy begins to lip-sync enthusiastically. About half way into the video, Ariel Ronell joins in.

The video is both a display of the softer, humorous side of policing, as well as an example of a black policeman and white policewoman playing with their gender and race by lip-syncing to opposite gender/racial parts during the song. The video is also interesting because the lyrics of the song are not what one would expect to hear from professional police officers, and not what

---

[25] https://www.youtube.com/user/EPSVideoOnline/videos

one would expect from a more PG-rated and heavily produced advertisement. Ronell's section, for example, goes,

"Woo
Damn I think I love her
Shawty so bad
I'm sprung and I don't care
She ride me like a roller coaster
Turn the bedroom into a fair
Her love is like a drug
I was tryna hit it and quit it
But lil' mama so dope
I messed around and got addicted"

Two minutes into the video, the officers arrive at their location, stop the music and Ariel Ronell, after removing her sunglasses, smiles and says "wow" prompting a chuckle from her lip-sync partner.

During a radio interview, the officers explained their motivations (Cerota, 2014). Ronell stated, "we actually want to be able to show people that we're just people, just like everybody else," And Roy says, "the message is that we're not the enemy, we're the friends of the community" Sergeant Ariel Soltura, who helped create the department's Facebook Page, added "If we can get people to laugh then *we can gain cooperation from the public...*" [emphasis added]. The officers' comments suggest that the police are aware of the promotional potential of crediting images and have produced them hoping that they will influence popular perceptions of police.

Genres of Crediting Images:

The differences between the examples described above highlight the variability of crediting images. Crediting images can celebrate a range of police qualities including professionalism, compassion, and a sense of humour. This suggests that crediting images must be understood as a category of promotion imagery that is made up of a number of genres, distinguished based on the police qualities that they celebrate. Of these genres, images which reflect on police kindness, bravery, and tragedy seem to be among the most popular.

- Kindness: Videos of police kindness are a staple of crediting images. These range from images of police helping individuals with minor issues like lost keys, to images of police letting drivers off with a warning, to videos of police simply being friendly to passers by. A recent crediting image showed a New York police officer helping a homeless man who sat outside in the cold. As the story goes, the homeless man awoke on the street after a nap to find that his shoes had been stolen. An officer learned of his situation and purchased a pair of boots for the man. As he handed the new boots to the homeless man, a tourist took a photo and later emailed it to the NYPD. It was subsequently posted to the police force's Facebook page. The photo received several positive comments and prompted journalist to report the story and interview the officer (Ghitis, 2012).
- Bravery: Videos of police bravery are another staple of crediting images. They range from videos that show police officers involved in shootouts against criminals to those that show officers saving injured citizens from danger. A video of police bravery which stands out simply because of the sheer number of copies of it that exist on YouTube shows a police officer rescuing an injured man after a gas pump catches fire.[26] The video, which seems to be recorded from an overhead CCTV camera, starts with off-duty New York State Trooper, John

[26] http://www.cbsnews.com/news/video-shows-daring-rescue-after-n-y-gas-station-explosion/

Vescio, standing at a gas pump. Suddenly, a car speeds into the frame, barely misses Vescio, and crashes into the pump adjacent to him. Flames ignite almost immediately and Vescio sprints away and off screen. But after a few moments, he returns, rushing to the car that crashed into the pump. Inside he finds an unconscious 69-year-old man behind the wheel. Investigators believe that the man was in diabetic shock. As the flames from the pump grow quickly, Vescio grabs the man and begins dragging him away from the scene of the crash. Despite the fire, Vescio actually returns to his own car once more, opening the trunk and removing police equipment including ammunition. He leaves just in time as a bigger explosion engulfs the pump and nearby cars. Once released, the video received extensive attention from mainstream media and the story of Vescio's heroism was celebrated over various social media websites.

- Tragedy: Some images of police are characterized by tragedy and failure. These include images of police officers being injured as well as images that tell the story of an officer's death. Rather than ridicule, these videos earn the sympathy of viewers. Examples include videos showing officers being shot and killed while saving civilians from a dangerous criminal or videos of officers suffering unprovoked attacks. An especially popular crediting image is titled "Final act of kindness" and captures the compassionate actions of San Diego Officer Jeremy Henwood (former US marine who had served two tours in Iraq) before he was shot and killed.

The video, which looks to be a copy of footage taken from an in-store surveillance camera, shows Henwood placing an order at the counter of a fast-food restaurant when a 13-year-old boy appears besides him. The boy asks the officer for change so he can buy food. The officer asks him what the money is for. "Cookies," the boy replies. Henwood says he will buy them for him, and then asks the boy what he'd like to do when he grows up. The boy says

he wants to be a professional basketball player. Henwood smiles and responds "you got to work hard for that." The video ends here but the story continues. After leaving the MacDonald's, Henwood entered his cruiser and sat down. A nearby car flashed its headlights and then pulled up next to Henwood. When Henwood lowered his window, he was shot in the head. A 23-year-old man named Dejon Marquee White committed the unprovoked shooting. White immediately ran from the scene and shot another man in a parking lot before being confronted by more police officers. After a short stand off, White, who had written a two-page suicide note, was killed by police.

The Final Act of Kindness video was replayed on news media channels, and copies have received over one million views. Perhaps the best demonstration of the popularity of the video is the amount of tribute videos which exist on YouTube, most of which set images of Henwood, his peers, and his family to soft music. A YouTube version of a news report on the incident has received over 6 million views. In that video, the young boy for whom Jeremy purchased cookies is interviewed and talks about the incident and his new dedication to basketball. Henwood's story became so popular that soon after Henwood's death, a candle light vigil was held and there has been an outpouring of support for Henwood's family. The incident even inspired a documentary entitled "Heroes Behind the Badge" released two years after Henwood's death demonstrating that crediting images can not only produce favourable news reports which praise police, but inspire art which serves to produce and share a positive message about policing.

My description of the types of genres of crediting images is not meant to suggest that crediting images follow a strict categorical system. Rather, genres are a conceptual tool that I have used to describe the range of crediting images which are being created and the different ways that they can celebrate police behaviour. Among other things, the differences between

crediting images highlights the range of imagery that can be created as the police's visibility grows and, therefore, the complex and contradictory implications that this visibility can have.

8.4 Discussion: Who Watches Crediting Images?

The examples discussed highlight the various processes of meaning making involved in the construction of a crediting image, and the various points at which the police can insert themselves into the meaning making process. However, even in cases when the officers create their own crediting images, it should not be assumed that the police are in complete control over the social construction of crediting images as this ignores the role played by viewers. Viewers of crediting images are not passive subjects who consume crediting images of police, accepting any pro-police messages implicit within. Rather, they are active media consumers who play a central role in socially constructing the meaning of crediting images through processes of interpretation and re-sharing (Stuart, 2011). Thus, in order to appreciate their promotional potential, one must also consider who watches crediting images and how they can respond to what they see.

Addressing questions about the audience of crediting images requires a nuancing of a massive categories such as Internet video watchers or YouTube viewers. Though developing an in-depth understanding of these audiences is difficult, some generalizations can be drawn and some speculation can be engaged in. For example, there is likely a segment of the audience for which the promotional potential of crediting images will be higher/lower depending on their pre-existing views of police, which itself is closely tied to identity and specifically race.

This variation is demonstrated by the reaction to video recordings of a police officers shooting and killing a man named Kajieme Powell. The recording was created on August 18th 2014, when Powell approached police officers with a knife drawn. He threatened the officers while pacing before yelling "shoot me, kill me now!" Officers commanded him to put down his

weapon. Powell continued to approach and the officers shot him dead. There remained some distance between the officers and Powell, and Powell's approach was not excessively fast. A cellphone recording of the incident inspired tremendous controversy when it was uploaded to YouTube. Viewers wondered if the officers use of deadly force necessary or if alternatives may have been available. Whether the video was a crediting image or a discrediting image hung in the balance. Differences of opinion between viewers of the video seemed to be defined by race. Black viewers were more likely to understand the video as evidence of police racism, while white viewers seemed more likely to deny such racial considerations and support the police officers' decision to use deadly force (Friedersdorf, 2014). The meaning of the image, including whether or not it was a crediting or discrediting image, was therefore shaped by the pre-existing opinions of viewers.

Complicating the discussion of viewers further, there are likely some who want to watch raw footage of policing because they are exciting and spectacular regardless of the pro or anti-police messages they contain (Hess, 2009). Many crediting images offer viewers a chance to see armed officers "kicking ass" and "beating up bad guys" in the same way that Hollywood blockbusters often do. Thus their appeal may have more to do with their exciting qualities, and a voyeuristic opportunity to see criminality and violence rather than form strict opinions of policing. Though these images may continue to influence a viewer's opinion of policing to some degree, it may undermine their promotional effect as they are more likely to be understood as a chance to see exciting imagery rather than something like the heroism of policing.

A consideration of the viewers of crediting images suggest that determining whether or not a particular image functions as promotional media may be a question without a strict answer. Determining whether an image will function as a crediting image requires a carful consideration

of how that image is interpreted by a massive audience of online viewers, as well as particularities such as the audiences' identity and their motivations for viewing a video.

#MyNYPD and Resistance to Crediting Images

In addition to considering the role that interpretation may play in determining the promotional potential of crediting images, we must also consider how viewers might resist the police's attempts to produce crediting image. For example, the NYPD, among the most well known and controversial police departments in North America, recently set up a Twitter account and designed a hashtag, #mynypd, which they seemed to want to use to popularize and share crediting images. The police department asked people to post photos of themselves with its officers and tag them with the #mynypd hashtag. The police department undoubtedly hoped that this would result in an influx of crediting images showing officers laughing and smiling with New Yorkers.

Unfortunately for the police, the media campaign failed dramatically (Ford, 2014). Twitter users took the opportunity to share images showing officers aggressively arresting screaming citizens, images of brutal police violence, and disturbing images including those of an officer shooting his gun at animals. These images were accompanied by stories of questionable arrests and rude behaviour from officers. Images of embarrassing moments, such as officers sleeping in uniform while riding the subway or eating unhealthy take-out foods, were also shared. Before long, a search for #mynypd resulted in more discrediting images than crediting ones.

The failure of #mynypd suggests that because they do not have any semblance of control over online behaviour, the police cannot guarantee that Internet users will act in their institutional interests. In fact, the failure of #mynypd suggests that their efforts to produce or cultivate crediting images may only encourage citizens to sabotage their efforts.

Interestingly, despite the failure of #mynypd, the NYPD has carried on with its #mynypd social media campaigns. The top spokesman for the department said "you take the good with the bad," and voiced the police department's continued support for social media campaigns. This may leave police officers vulnerable to criticism, and yet, it might also be a sign that police services are committed to being recorded and to recording themselves in search of promotional opportunities.

8.5 Conclusion: Crediting Images as Promotional Media?

We know that vicarious encounters with police play a major role in determining public satisfaction with policing (Weitzer and Tuch, 2005), it is my argument that what I call digital encounters on video sharing websites play a similar role and that crediting images, in particular, can operate as relatively powerful promotional devices for police. Though they are not nearly as popular as discrediting images, the response to videos like Honest Cops suggests a need to consider the countervailing effect of crediting images for some audiences. Videos showing police rescuing puppies, making kind gestures, dancing to popular music can go viral and get millions of views on YouTube as well as other popular websites. They can encourage calls, letters, emails, and the creation of related videos to applaud and celebrate policing. It seems that rather than being strictly a space from which to criticize the police, the Internet is becoming a space for image work as different types of imagery are used to declare different and opposing things about the police.

As more police services realize this, officers may not be concerned with escaping cameras or destroying cameras (Wilson and Serisier, 2010; Simon, 2012; Wall and Linnemann, 2014), but more willing to place themselves under surveillance and allowing others to record them in hopes that their professionalism will produce crediting images instead of discrediting ones. Perhaps

police officers will want to engage in their version of "empowering exhibitionism" (Koskela, 2004), exposing themselves to viewers in search of opportunities to display their professionalism, kindness, bravery, tragedy, and humour. Though they cannot control how images are interpreted or responded to by viewers, there is no doubt a promotional opportunity here for police organizations should they learn how to cultivate it.

Chapter 9 Conclusions

9.1 Introduction: A Summary of My Findings

Police officers are recorded by more internal and external cameras than ever. My research examines how a particular group of Albertan police officers understands and responds to these cameras and the photographers operating them, and my findings contribute to the discussion of how high visibility affects the daily experiences and institutional realities of police officers. To summarize my findings, rather than resenting and resisting surveillance, my research participants expressed a range of perspectives which highlight the range of possibilities that are brought forth by a growing visibility. Their perspectives included the following:

1. The apathetic perspective: most participants understanding of high visibility was defined by an indifferent response to the risks of cameras. My participants explained that because they are professionals with nothing to hide, they do not have to worry about being recorded. Any footage that is recorded, they alleged, will only show professional police officers behaving in a professional fashion and, therefore, not pose a significant risk to police officers or policing as an institution.
2. The strategic perspective: most participants claimed that being on camera has several benefits including a way of handling unfair criticisms, one of the most significant problems faced by policing today, as well as a way of controlling interactions with the general public, producing promotional imagery, and collecting evidence.
3. The camera-shy perspective: in contrast with the previous orientations, my participants admitted to worrying about how cameras could be used to make frivolous complaints against police, based primarily in a failure to fairly represent and interpret videos of police officers.

4. Camera-friendliness: My participants attempted to lower the risks of high visibility by learning to look good on camera, what I call camera-friendly policing.
5. Backstage Behaviours: The only time that my participants expressed an adamant camera-shy perspective was when they considered the implications of cameras entering private backstage spaces and documenting their coping and joking behaviours.

Having discussed my findings, it is time to directly address popular assumptions and questions about the police's visibility (discussed in chapter 2):

- Is the surveillance of police a method by which police officers can be scrutinized and held accountable for their actions, and/or deterred from abusing their power?
- Will the police resent and resist their growing visibility because of various concerns related to being monitored and scrutinized?

My research findings suggest that the answer to these questions is that the assumptions informing both are problematic as they focus too extensively on the aspects of visibility which make police vulnerable to criticism and not enough on the potentially empowering qualities of visibility. The police's high visibility is a complex and diverse social phenomena, and one that requires an approach which respects the varied ways that visibility will affect policing, and the varied ways that police will respond.

9.2 Discussion: Theories About the Variability of Visibility and Surveillance

There is a tendency to frame those who are made visible as passive subjects and victims of systems of panoptic surveillance (Haggerty, 2006). My sense is that these ideas, many of which draw on Orwellian narratives, claim that to be highly visible is to lose one's privacy, to be subject to constant judgement and manipulation, and to be easily controlled. In response, these ideas propose, visible subjects engage in resistance and try to reclaim their low visibility. I argue

that these theories are limited. The modern surveillance society is marked by a range of surveillance gazes, assembled or dissembled (Haggerty and Ericson, 2000) in various ways and for various purposes, and responded to in complex ways by those under surveillance, none of whom are passive victims of high visibility. For example, research on the contemporary "viewer society" (Mathiesen, 1997) suggests that visible subjects are quite active, responding to their visibility in a variety of ways, sometimes by taking advantage of being watched (Mann, 2002; 2004; Mann et al., 2003; Marx, 2003; Koskela, 2004; Monahan, 2006; Doyle, 2012; Whitson, 2013). Brighenti (2010) offers one of the best theoretical perspectives to capture the activity of highly visible subjects as his work describes how these subjects negotiate with a high visibility that can be simultaneously empowering while also making high visibility subjects vulnerable to scrutiny and criticism. As he puts it, the line between empowerment and vulnerability is increasingly thin, and high visibility subjects do their best to shift the balance towards empowerment and away from vulnerability.

My research findings support this approach to visibility and surveillance, and encourages the adoption of Brighenti's work for the study of police visibility. My research participants were not passive victims of surveillance regimes forcing them to behave in disciplined and accountable fashion, and my participants were not consistently resenting and resisting these regimes. Rather, my research shows how officers are learning to adapt to high visibility environments. In particular, my participants try to use their visibility to bolster their image work and to disconfirm complaints, to control social interactions with citizens, to produce promotional crediting images, and, potentially, to conceal misconduct behind camera-friendly behaviour. Accordingly, my participants' understanding and response to their visibility is defined by an effort to make the best of policing on camera.

My findings do not to overlook the many ways that high visibility can be used against the police. Cameras can, no doubt, be used to document police misconduct, to facilitate the scrutiny of police officers, and to shame police officers. In some cases, this may indeed improve police accountability, and in others it may produce a backlash of police resistance in the form of a "war against photography" (Simon, 2012). However, to focus exclusively on this element of the police's high visibility, my research suggests, is to overlook the complexities of the relationship between police and visibility. Thus, it is my central argument that the study of police visibility requires a complex perspective which appreciates the variability of high visibility, a perspective that accounts for how highly visible police try to tread the increasingly thin line between empowerment and vulnerability.

Factors which Complicate the Police's Response to High Visibility:

Police work involves tasks that range from the extremes of banality to the extremes of life and death. On some days, police officers must spend hours aimlessly patrolling and on others, police officers must protect the safety of others by putting themselves in danger. Police work is dynamic and cannot be fixed to particular times and spaces. Given these degrees of variation, it only makes sense that the nature of police visibility will be quite variable, and that responses to visibility will vary from the extremes of desire for high visibility to the extremes of desire for low visibility.

Determining exactly how police understand their visibility and how they will respond must account for several factors. These include:

- the type(s) of camera recording the officer
- the type(s) of photographer recording the officer
- the nature of the task a police officer is performing while they are placed under surveillance

- the officer's identity
- the identity of any individuals they are interacting with
- the way that images of police are taken up in mainstream media and social media

For example, an officer completing an arrest in a backstage environment is likely to respond radically differently to an external camera than an officer standing on a busy street corner in the middle of the day. Likewise, a near-retirement white policeman fighting off a black gang member is probably going to react radically differently to a social activists' external camera than would a black policewoman interacting with a handsome young and well respected lawyer who has recently run a red light.

Accordingly, the next steps in research on the police's visibility is to expand the discussion beyond if/how cameras can be used to improve accountability in policing, or how police wage wars against photography. Rather, it is to determine the diversity of cameras monitoring police, the complex and contrasting regimes of visibility which monitor police officers, and how factors like the internal and external nature of cameras, time and space, the nature of given police work, and the identity of a photographer, each play a key role in determining how the police understand and respond to cameras, as well as the effects high visibility has on policing. Such an expanded view respects the various gazes which contribute to the police's visibility, and the various ways this visibility can be used for and against the police, including the various ways that the police try to balance the empowering and vulnerable qualities of being a high visibility subject.

Naïveté and High Visibility

My work presents the police as extremely involved with their high visibility, proposing that they are keenly aware of how and when they are being recorded, and how they can make the

best of being on camera by engaging in complex forms of image work. I could be criticized for presenting the police's relationship with high visibility as more of a rational process than it is. Those who study what I call the naivety of high visibility (studies which often focus on the surprising willingness of today's citizens to give up their privacy by placing themselves on social media so that they can be viewed and scrutinized), for example, might argue that my participants' apathetic and strategic perspectives may be a failure to recognize the risks of being on camera rather than a proactive effort to make the best of high visibility (Strangelove, 2010; Mayer-Schönberger, 2007; Goldsmith, 2013; Yar, 2012). Perhaps the police are yet to recognize these risks? Perhaps they are still acclimating to their high visibility? Perhaps they are willing to expose themselves without an appreciation for how risky it is?

Research has shown that such an unaware perspective is held by many in society. As opposed to a previous era when personal family videos were meant for private use by only one's closest family members (Strangelove, 2010), the contemporary environment is marked by a willingness to place our most private moments online for others to view without realizing the consequences (Yar, 2012). This is one reason that privacy advocates have expressed concerns about not only governmental surveillance, but the spread of smartphone cameras (Ku, 2004; Lum, 2004) and the popularization of video sharing (Lange, 2008; Strangelove, 2010). My participants might be acting out of the same unawareness. In fact, it has already been argued that the police have not avoided this culture of self-exposure and unawareness. As Andrew Goldsmith (2013) has shown, the police regularly share discrediting images of themselves on social media websites like Facebook, sometimes in uniform, and sometimes engaging in embarrassing and/or what some might consider unprofessional behaviour (drinking alcohol, using drugs, picking their nose). Goldsmith argues that not only do the police seem to overlook the consequences of these images, they seem unaware of how some images have been used against these officers by legal

officials who intend to disconfirm an officer's testimony, or shame individual police officers, or make an argument against a police service's effectiveness.

While I think it would be a mistake to characterize my participants' apathetic and strategic perspective as ignorance or naivety in its entirety, as this would ignore the way that my participants have been able to successfully use their visibility for image work, I recognize that the contemporary culture of self-exposure likely plays a role in my participants' apathetic response to cameras. This should be kept in mind when considering my research results, the limitations of my study, and perhaps in future research which asks not only about the contextual elements of police visibility, but if the police are actually aware of the consequences of high visibility.

I conclude with some speculation about the implications of my research for our understandings of general trends in policing. Because they reflect the dominant narrative in my participants' responses, I will focus on the apathetic and strategic perspectives.

9.3 Conclusion: Speculation about the Future of the Police's High Visibility

If my participant's apathetic and strategic perspectives are common among police officers across North America, this may mean that the way officers relate to external and internal cameras will be less destructive or hostile over time. It is likely that the police will be increasingly accepting of both internal and external cameras, including technologies like wearable cameras. Accordingly, there will likely be more of an integration of cameras into police work. Police duties will probably require officers to record themselves more often, especially as cameras become a part of police uniforms, producing the kind of cyborgian subjects that surveillance scholars like Steve Mann (2002; 2004; Mann, Nolan and Wellman, 2003) have spoken about in their studies of "sousveillance" and point of view cameras.

This is not to say that police officers will always be comfortable with their visibility. Officers will, at times, feel slightly self-conscious or curious about being recorded, especially by external cameras. However, as police begin to recognize the value of high visibility, police may forgo any attempts to intimidate and punish photographers or destroy cameras. In some cases, they may even invite this surveillance so that if the need arises, video footage is available to examine and assess their police work. This will require officers learn how to be camera-friendly, which will mean learning how to capture clear footage from the best angles and least obstructed position, and how to speak, stand, and communicate in a way which looks good on camera. Police officers will, in short, have to add video director and actor to their long list of other roles.

The resulting influx of imagery will mean that the police will dedicate more resources to its image work (Mawby, 2002). This may involve the creation of more promotional programming such as a contemporary incarnation of COPS using footage from wearable cameras, CCTV cameras and dashcams. Image work will likely also involve producing more crediting images, sometime relying on amateur photographers to supply footage that police can share via social media platforms like Facebook and Twitter. As police learn how to create their own crediting images, we may even begin to see semi-amateur video blogs emerge, which police officers (sometimes sponsored by their departments, sometimes not) use to document their police work, seeing it as an opportunity to use this footage to not only create favourable imagery, but to pre-empt criticisms and complaints via videos which seem to favour the police.

While the police bolster their image work capabilities, social activists will continue to record videos which seem to discredit police behaviours. As a result, debates about police behaviour in a given circumstance will become debates between who has the best, clearest, and most revealing footage.

As for broader understandings of police visibility, particularly those which suggest that cameras can be used to improve accountability, the growth in opportunities to monitor police should will no longer be simplistically accepted as some sort of victory over police, or taken as a sign that surveillance can be used to police the police. We will realize that visibility is too complexity to simplify it to a method for deterring and/or exposing and punishing abuses of power.

Works Cited

Adelman, C., Jenkins, D., & Kemmis, S., 1983. Rethinking case study: Notes from the second Cambridge conference. In Case study: An overview. Case Study Methods 1 (series) Victoria, Australia: Deakin University Press.

Adler, Patricia, and Peter Adler. 1987. Membership Roles in Field Research. Newbury Park: Sage.

Adler, Patricia, and Peter Adler. 1994. Observational Techniques in Handbook of Qualitative Research 1994 edited by Denzin, Norman K and Lincoln, Yvonna. Newbury Park: Sage.

Aghbali, Arman. 2015. Black officer photographed helping Klan supporter. CBC.ca. Available at: http://www.cbc.ca/news/trending/black-officer-photographed-helping-klan-supporter-1.3160796.

Agnew, Robert. 2009. Revitalizing Merton: General Strain Theory In Advances in Criminological Theory: The Origins of American Criminology, Volume 16, ed. F.T. Cullen, F. Adler, C.L. Johnson, and A.J. Meyer. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction.

Albrechtslund, Anders and Glud, Louise Nørgaard. 2010. Empowering Residents: A Theoretical Framework for Negotiating Surveillance Technologies. Surveillance & Society 8(2): 235-250.

Allen, Jonathan. 2014. New York City grand jury to hear police choke-hold case. Yahoo News. Available at http://news.yahoo.com/nyc-prosecutor-grand-jury-police-choke-hold-death-151659034.html.

Allan, Stuart. 2007. Citizen Journalism and the Rise of "Mass Self-Communication": Reporting the London Bombings. Global Media Journal 1(1): 10-25.

Allan, Stuart and Thorsen, Einer. 2009. Citizen Journalism (Global Crises and the Media). Peter Lang Publishing.

Amoore, Louise and De Goede, Marieke. 2006. Governance, risk and dataveillance in the war on terror. Crime, Law and Social Change 43(2-3): 149-173.

Andrejevic, Mark. 2005. The Work of Watching One Another: Lateral Surveillance, Risk, and Governance. Surveillance and Society 2(4): 479-497.

Andrejevic, Mark. 2012. Ubiquitous surveillance. In Kirstie Ball, Kevin D. Haggerty and David Lyon (Ed.), Routledge handbook of surveillance studies, Abingdon, United Kingdom: Routledge

Antony, Mary G. and Thomas, Ryan J. 2010. 'This is Citizen Journalism at Its Finest': YouTube and the Public Sphere in the Oscar Grant Shooting Incident. New Media and Society XX(X): 1–17. doi: 10.1177/1461444810362492.

Apte, Mahadev. 1987. Ethnic Humor versus Sense of Humor. American Behavioral Scientist 31(1): 27-41

Armitage, Rachel. 2002. To CCTV of Not to CCTV: a review of current research into the effectiveness of CCTV systems in reducing crime, NACRO Community Safety Briefing, NACRO London. Available at: http://www.nacro.org.uk/templates/publications/briefingItem.cfm/2002062800-csps.htm.

Aulakh, Raveena. 2010. Somali-Canadians caught in Alberta's deadly drug trade. The Toronto Star. Available at: http://www.thestar.com/news/investigations/2010/03/22/somalicanadians_caught_in_albertas_deadly_drug_trade.html.

Banks, 1998. The Lives and Values of Researchers: Implications for Educating Citizens in a Multicultural Society by James A. Banks Educational Researcher 27(7): 4-17.

Banton, Michael. 1964. The Policeman in the Community. New York: Basic.

Barry, Dan. 2015. Black South Carolina Trooper Explains Why He Helped a White Supremacist. The New York Times. Available at: http://www.nytimes.com/2015/07/26/us/black-south-carolina-trooper-explains-why-he-embraced-a-white-supremacist.html?_r=0.

Becker, Howard. 1963. Outsiders: Studies in the sociology of deviance. New York: Free Press.

Beehr, Terry A., Ivanitskaya, Lana, Glaser, Katherine, Erofeev, Dmitry and Canali, Kris. 2004. Working in a violent environment: The accuracy of police officers' reports about shooting incidents. Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology 77: 217-235.

Bennett, Howard J. 2003. Southern Medical Journal 96(12): 1257-1261.

Billig, Michael. 2001. Humour and Hatred: The racist jokes f the KKK. Discourse & Society 12(3): 267-289

Bittner, Egon. 1972. The Functions of Police In Modern Society. Washington, DC: National Institute of Mental Health.

Bittner, Egon. 1974. Florence Nightingale in pursuit of Willie Sutton: a theory of the police in Policing: key readings, edited by Tim Newburn. 2005. Willan Pub.

Bogard, William. 1996. The Simulation of Surveillance: Hyper control in Telematic Societies. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bogard, William. 2012. Simulation and post-panopticism in Routledge Handbook of Surveillance Studies edited by David Lyon, Kirstie Ball, Kevin D. Haggerty. New York: Routledge.

Bonilla-Silva, Eduardo. 2003. Racism without Racists. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield. University of California Press; New Ed edition.

Bonilla- Silva, Eduardo 2009. The Linguistics of Color Blind Racism: How to Talk Nasty about Blacks Without Sounding "Racist." Critical Sociology 28 (1-2): 41-64

Bolton Jr., Kenneth and Feagin, Joe R. 2004. Black in Blue: African-American Police Officers and Racism. Routledge Press.

Boskin, Joseph and Dorinson, Joseph. 1985. Ethnic Humor: Subversion and survival. American Quarterly 37(1): 81-97.

Bourgois, Philippe and Schonberg, Jeffrey. 2009. Righteous Dopefiend (California Series in Public Anthropology). Oakland: University of California Press.

Boyer, Dave. 2014. Petition for 'Michael Brown law' passes threshold for consideration. The Washington Times. http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2014/aug/27/petition-michael-brown-law-passes-threshold-consid/.

Bradford, Ben, Jackson, Jonathan. and Stanko, Elizabeth. A. 2009. Contact and Confidence: Revisiting the Impact of Public Encounters with the Police. Policing and Society, 19(1): 20–46.

Bradford Ben. 2012. Policing and Social Identity: procedural justice, inclusion, and cooperation between police and public. Policing and Society 24(1): 22-43.

Brighenti, Andrea Mubi. 2010. Visibility in Social Theory and Social Research. Palgrave Macmillan.

Brissett, Dennis and Edgley, Charles. 1990. Life as Theater. New Jersey: Transaction Publishers.

Berger, Peter. 1990. Sociological Perspectives – society as drama by Peter Berger in Life as Theater ed. Dennis Brissett and Charles Edgley. New Jersey: Transaction Publishers.

Hall, Peter, 1990. The presidency and impression management in Life as Theater ed. Dennis Brissett and Charles Edgley. New Jersey: Transaction Publishers.

Watson, Catherine. M. 1990. The presentation of self and the new institutional inmate: an analysis of prisoners' responses to assessment for release in Life as Theater ed. Dennis Brissett and Charles Edgley. New Jersey: Transaction Publishers.

Brown, Gregory R. 2015. The Blue Line on Thin Ice: Police Use of Force Modifications in the Era of Camera phones and YouTube British Journal of Criminology. doi: 10.1093/bjc/azv052.

Brown, Jennifer. M. Campbell, Elizabeth A. 1990. Sources of Occupational Stress in Policing. Work & Stress: An International Journal of Work, Health & Organisations 4(4).

Brucato, Ben. 2015. Policing Made Visible: Mobile Technologies and the Importance of Point of View. Surveillance & Society 13(3/4): 455-473.

Bucerius, Sandra M. 2013. Becoming a "Trusted Outsider" Gender, Ethnicity, and Inequality in Ethnographic Research. Journal of Contemporary Ethnography 42(6): 690-721.

Burgress, Jean and Green, Joshua. 2009. YouTube: Online Video and Participatory Culture. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Burgess, Robert L. and Akers, Robert L. 1966. A Differential Association-Reinforcement Theory of Criminal Behavior. Social Problems 14(2): 128 – 147.

Burke, Ronald J. 1998. Work and Non-Work Stressors and Well-Being Among Police Officers: The role of coping. Anxiety, Stress and Coping 11: 345-362.

Burawoy, Michael. 1998. The Extended Case Study Method. Sociological Theory 16(1): 4-33.

Callanan, Valerie J. and Jared S. Rosenberger. 2011. Media and Public Perceptions of the Police: Examining the Impact of Race and Personal Experience. Policing and Society 21(2): 167-189.

Cameron, Aundreia, Kolodinski, Elke, May, Heather and Williams, Nicholas. 2008. Measuring the Effects of Video Surveillance on Crime in Los Angeles. Prepared for the Californian Research Bureau; University of Southern California: School of Policy Planning and Development.

Caplan, Joel, Kennedy, Leslie, and Petrossian, Gohar. 2011. Police-monitored CCTV cameras in Newark, NJ: A quasi-experimental test of crime deterrence. Journal of exp Criminology 7: 255-274.

Carter, David L. 1991. Theoretical Dimensions in the abuse of authority by police officers in Police Deviance edited by Barker T and Carter, D.L. Cincinatti: Anderson Publishing Co.

Cassell, Paul. 2014. Would a body camera have answered questions about Michael Brown's shooting? The Washington Post. Available at http://www.washingtonpost.com/news/volokh-conspiracy/wp/2014/08/21/would-a-body-camera-have-answered-questions-about-michael-browns-shooting/.

Ceyhan, Ayse. 2008. Technologization of Security: Management of Uncertainty and Risk in the Age of Biometrics. Surveillance & Society 5(2): 102-123.

Cerota, Andy. 2014. Rosenberg Police Department officers' FB post goes viral. Click2houston. Available at http://www.click2houston.com/news/rosenberg-police-department-officers-fb-post-goes-viral/26470146.

Certeau, Michel de 1984: The Practice of Everyday Life. University of California Press, Berkeley.

Chan, Janet. 1999. Governing police practice: limits of the new accountability. British Journal of Sociology 50(2): 251–270.

Chan, Janet. 2008. The New Lateral Surveillance and a Culture of Suspicion Surveillance and Governance: Crime Control and Beyond ed. Mathieu Deflem, Jeffrey T. Ulmer. Emerald Group Publishing Limited p. 223 – 239.

Channing, Iain. 2015. The Police and the Expansion of Public Order Law in Britain, 1829-2014. New York: Routledge.

Charman, Sarah. 2013. Sharing a laugh: the role of humour in relationships between police officers and ambulance staff. International Journal of Sociology and Social Policy 33(3/4): 152-166.

Chermak, Steven and Weiss, Alxander. 2005. Maintaining Legitimacy Using External Communication Strategies: An Analysis of Police–Media Relations. Journal of Criminal Justice, 33(5): 501–512.

Clarke, Richard. 1988. Information technology and dataveillance. Communications of the ACM 31(5): 498-512.

Clarke, Rachel and Lett, Christopher. 2014. What happened when Michael Brown met Officer Darren Wilson. CNN.com. Available at http://edition.cnn.com/interactive/2014/08/us/ferguson-brown-timeline/.

Crenshaw, Kimberle and Peller, Gregory. 1993. Reel Time/Real Justice. Denver University Law Review 70: 283-297.

Creswell, John W., Hanson, William E., Clark Plano, Vicki L. and Morales, Alejandro. 2007. Qualitative Research Designs: Selection and Implementation. The Counseling Psychologist 35(2): 236-264.

Collinson, David L. 1988. 'Engineering Humour': Masculinity, Joking and Conflict in Shop-floor Relations. Organization Studies 9(2): 181-199.

Colton, Kent W. 1979. The impact and use of computer technology by the police. Communications of the ACM 22(1): 10-20.

Conroy, D.L. and Hess, K.M. 1992. Officers at Risk: how to identity and cope with stress. Placerville, CA: Custom Publishing Co.

Cooper, C.L. and Davidson, M.A. 1988. Stress in the police service. Journal of Occupational Medicine 24: 30-36.

Corbin, Juliet M and Strauss, Anselm. 2008. Basics of Qualitative Research: Techniques and Procedures for Developing Grounding Theory. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publishing.

Crank, John P., Regoli, Bob, Hewitt, John D., and Culbertson, Robert G. 1993. An Assessment of Work Stress Among Police Executives. Journal of Criminal Justice 21: 313-324.

Davies, Christie. 1990. Ethnic Humour Around the World: A Comparative Analysis. Bloomington, Indiana University Press.

De Andrade, Lelia Lomba. 2000.'Negotiating from the Insider: Constructing Racial and Ethnic Identity in Qualitative Research', Journal of Contemporary Ethnography 29: 268–90.

Deisman, Wade. 2003. CCTV Literature Review and Bibliography. Research and Evaluation Branch. Ottawa: Community. Contract and Aboriginal Policing Services Doctorate, Royal Canadian Mounted Police.

DeWalt, Kathleen M. and Billie R. DeWalt. 2010. Participant Observation: A Guide for Fieldworkers. Rowman & Littlefield.

Dennis, Kingsley. 2008. Keeping a Close Watch: The Rise of Self-Surveillance & the Threat of Digital Exposure. Sociological Review 56: 347-35.

Denzin, Norman K. 1978. The Research Act, 2nd edition. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Denzin, Norman K. and Lincoln, Yvonna S. 2011. The Sage Handbook of Qualitative Research. Sage Publications.

Flyvbjerg, Bent. 2011. Case Study in The Sage Handbook of Qualitative Research. Sage Publications edited by Denzin, Norman K. and Lincoln, Yvonna S. Sage Publications: 301-316.

Peräkylä, Anssi and Ruusuvuori, Johanna. 2011. Analysing Talk and Text in The Sage Handbook of Qualitative Research. Sage Publications edited by Denzin, Norman K. and Lincoln, Yvonna S. Sage Publications: 529-543.

Yvonna S Lincoln, Lynham Susa A., Guba, Egon G. 2011. Paradigmatic Controversies, Contradictions, and Emerging Confluences, Revisited in The Sage Handbook of Qualitative Research. Sage Publications edited by Denzin, Norman K. and Lincoln, Yvonna S. Sage Publications: 97-127.

Dijck, Jose van. 2014. Datafication, dataism and dataveillance: Big Data between scientific paradigm and ideology. Surveillance & Society 12(2): 197-208.

Ditton, Jason and Short, Emma. 1999. 'Yes, It Works, No, It Doesn't: Comparing the Effects of Open CCTV in Two Adjacent Scottish Town Centres,' in Painter, K. and Tilley, N. (eds) Crime Prevention Studies, Vol 10: 201–224.

Doane, Ashley W. Bonilla-Silva. 2003. White Out: The Continuing Significance of Racism. New York: Routledge.

Dowler, Kenneth. 2002. Media Influence on Citizen Attitudes Toward Police Effectiveness. Policing and Society 12(3): 227-238.

Doyle, Aaron. 2003. Arresting Images: Crime and Policing in Front of the Television Camera. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Doyle, Aaron. 2011. Revisiting the synopticon: Reconsidering Mathiesen's 'The Viewer Society' in the age of Web 2.0. Theoretical Criminology 15(3): 283-299.

Doyle, Aaron, Lippert, Randy and David Lyon. 2012. Eyes Everywhere: The Global Growth of Camera Surveillance ed. Routledge Press.

Norris, Clive. 2012. There's No Success Like Failure and Failure's No Success At All: Reflections On Understanding the Global Growth Of CCTV Surveillance in Eyes Everywhere: The Global Growth of Camera Surveillance edited by Doyle, Aaron, Lippert, Randy and Lyon, David. Routledge Press.

Dupont, Benoit. 2001. Policing in the information age: technological errors of the past in perspective in Policing the Lucky Country edited by Enders, Mike and Dupont Benoit. Hawkins Press.

Eckstein, Harry. 1975. Case study and theory in political science in Handbook of Political Science ed. F.J. Greenstein and N.W. Polsby. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Ericson, Richard. 1982. Reproducing Order: A Study of Police Patrol Work. Toronto, ON: University of Toronto Press.

Ericson, Richard. 1995. The News Media and Account Ability in Accountability for the Criminal Justice System edited by Phillip C. Stenning. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Ericson, Richard. 1995. Making Crime: a study of detective work. Toronto: Univ of Toronto Press.

Ericson, Richard and Haggerty, Kevin. 1997. Policing the Risk Society. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Ericson, Richard and Haggerty, Kevin. 2005. Policing of Risk. Portland: Willan Publishing.

Esposti, Sara Degli. 2014. When big data meets dataveillance: the hidden side of analytics. Surveillance & Society 12(2): 209-225.

Evans, Richard. 2015. 'The footage is decisive:' Applying the thinking of Marshall McLuhan to CCTV and police misconduct. Surveillance and Society 13(2): 218-232.

Farmer, Ashley K., Sun, Ivan Y., and Starks, Brian C. 2015. Willingness to Record Police-Public Encounters The Impact of Race and Social and Legal Consciousness. Race and Justice: 1-22.

Fassin, Didier. 2013. Enforcing Order: An Ethnography of Urban Policing. Cambridge: Polity Publishing

Farrell, Nick. 2013. Apple patents tech to let cops switch off iPhone video, camera and Wi-Fi. Available at http://news.techeye.net/security/apple-patents-tech-to-let-cops-switch-off-iphone-video-camera-and-wi-fi#ixzz2s6yUJpea. (Accessed on February 1st 2014).

Felson, Marcus and Clarke, Ronald V. 1993. "Introduction: Criminology, Routine Activity and Rational Choice." In Routine Activity and Rational Choice: Advances in Criminological Theory, vol. 5, edited by Ronald V. Clarke and Marcus Felson. New Brunswick, N.J.: Transaction Publishers.

Fell, R.D., Richard, W.C., and Wallace, W.L. 1980. Psychological Job Stress and the Police Officer. Journal of Police Science and Administration 8: 139-143.

Fisher, Stanley Z. "Just the Facts, Ma'am": Lying and the Omission of Exculpatory Evidence in Police Reports. New England Law Review 28.

Flyvbjerg, Bent. 2006. Five Misunderstandings About Case-Study Research. Qualitative Inquiry 12(2): 219-245.

Foucault, Michel. 1977. Discipline and Punish: The Birth of a Prison. London: Penguin Books.

Ford, Dana. 2014. #D'oh! NYPD Twitter campaign backfires. CNN. Available at http://www.cnn.com/2014/04/22/tech/nypd-twitter-fail/.

Ford T., Ferguson MA. 2004. Social consequences of disparagement humor: a prejudiced norm theory. Pers Soc Psychol Review 8(1): 79-94

Friedman, Uri. 2014. Do Body Cameras Actually Work. The Atlantic. Available at http://www.theatlantic.com/international/archive/2014/12/do-police-body-cameras-work-ferguson/383323/.

Friedersdorf, Conor. 2014. Video Killed Trust in Police Officers. The Atlantic. http://www.theatlantic.com/national/archive/2014/08/police-officers-havent-earned-our-instinctive-trust/378657/.

Gans, Herbert. 1968. "The Participant Observer as a Human Being." In Institutions and the Person, edited by H. Becker, 300–317. Chicago: Aldine Press.

Garicano, Luis and Heaton, Paul. 2010. Information Technology, Organization, and Productivity in the Public Sector: Evidence from Police Departments. Journal of Labor Economics 28(1).

Garrido, Miguelángel Verde. 2015. Contesting a biopolitics of information and communications: The importance of truth and sousveillance after Snowden. Surveillance and Society 13(2): 153-167.

Gehl, Robert. 2009. YouTube as archive Who will curate this digital Wunderkammer? International Journal of Cultural Studies 12(1): 43-60.

Geist, Michael. Law, Privacy and Surveillance in Canada in the Post-Snowden Era. Ottawa: University of Ottawa Press.

Gerring, John. 2004. What is a case study and what is it good for? The American Political Science Review 98(2): 341-354.

Gersons, Berthold P.R. 1989. Patterns of PTSD among Police Officers following Shooting Incidents: A Two-Dimensional Model and Treatment Implications. Journal of Traumatic Stress 2(3).

Ghitis, Frida. 2012. Shoes a start, but homeless need far more. CNN.com. Available at: http://www.cnn.com/2012/12/04/opinion/ghitis-homeless/index.html

Gill, Martin and Spriggs, Angela. 2005. Assessing the impact of CCTV. Home Office Research, Development and Statistics Directorate February 2005.

Goffman, Erving. 1959. The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life. London: Penguin

Goffman, Alice. 2009. On the Run: Wanted Men in a Philadelphia Ghetto. American Sociological Review 74: 339-357.

Gold, R.L. 1958. Roles in Sociological Field Observations. Social Forces 36: 217.

Goldsmith, Andrew and Lewis, Colleen. 2000. Civilian Oversight of Policing: Governance, Democracy and Human Rights. Oxford: Hart Publishing.

Goldsmith, Andrew. 2010. Policing's New Visibility. British Journal of Criminology 50(5): 914-934.

Goldsmith, Andrew. 2013. Disgracebook policing: social media and the rise of police indiscretion. Policing and Society.

Goldstein, Joseph and Santora, Marc. 2014. Staten Island Man Died from Chokehold During Arrest, Autopsy Finds. The New York Times. Available at http://www.nytimes.com/2014/08/02/nyregion/staten-island-man-died-from-officers-chokehold-autopsy-finds.html?_r=0.

Goldstein, Joseph and Schweber, Nate. 2014. Man's Death After Chokehold Raises Old Issue for the Police. The New York Times. http://www.nytimes.com/2014/07/19/nyregion/staten-island-man-dies-after-he-is-put-in-chokehold-during-arrest.html.

Goode, Luke. 2009. Social news, citizen journalism and democracy. New Media and Society 11(8):1-19.

Goodman, J. David. 2014. Lesson for the Police: Be Careful What You Tweet For. The New York Times. Available at http://www.nytimes.com/2014/04/23/nyregion/new-york-police-reach-out-on-twitter-but-receive-a-slap-in-the-face.html?_r=0.

Goold, Benjamin, 2002. Privacy rights and public spaces: CCTV and the problem of the "unobservable observer." Criminal Justice Ethics 21(1): 21-27.

Goold, Benjamin. 2003a. CCTV and Policing: Public Area Surveillance and Police Practices in Britain. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Goold, Benjamin. 2003b. Public Area Surveillance and Police Work: The Impact of CCTV on Police Behaviour and Autonomy. Journal of Surveillance and Society 1(2).

Goold, Benjamin, Loader, Ian and Thumala, Angelica. 2013. The Banality of Security: The Curious Case of Surveillance Cameras. British Journal of Criminology.

Goombridge, N. 2003. Crime Control or Crime Culture TV? Surveillance & Society 1(1): 30-46.

Greer, Chris and McLaughlin, Eugene. 2010. We Predict a Riot? Public Order Policing, New Media Environments and the Rise of the Citizen Journalist. British Journal of Criminology 50(6): 1041-1059.

Greer, Chris and McLaughlin, Eugene. 2011.'Trial by media': Policing, the 24-7 news mediasphere and the 'politics of outrage'. Theoretical Criminology 15(1): 23-46.

Greer, Chris and McLaughlin, Eugene. 2012. 'This is not Justice' Ian Tomlinson, Institutional Failure and the Press Politics of Outrage. British Journal of Criminology 52(2).

Hart, Peter M., Wearing, Alexander J., and Headley, Bruce. 1995.Police stress and well-being: Integrating personality, coping and daily work experiences Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology 68, 133-156.

Haggerty, Kevin. 2006. Tear down the walls: on demolishing the panopticon. In Theorizing Surveillance: The panopticon and beyond, ed. David Lyon, Cullompton: Willan Publishing.

Haggerty, Kevin and Richard Ericson. 2006. The New Politics of Surveillance and Visibility. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Haggerty, Kevin D. and Sandhu, Ajay. 2014. Policing's Crisis of Visibility. IEEE Technology and Society Summer 2014: 9-12.

Hall, Stuart. 1980. "Encoding/decoding." Pp. 128-138 in Culture, Media, Language: Working Papers in Cultural Studies, edited by S. Hall. New York: Routledge.

Hallett, Michael and Powell, Dennis. 1995. Backstage with Cops: the dramaturgical reification of police subculture in American crime info-tainment. American Journal of Police 14(1): 101 – 129.

Hamilton, 2014. Atlanta Cops Want You to Know How 'Happy' They Are. Time.com Available at http://time.com/2954291/atlanta-cops-want-you-to-know-how-happy-they-are/.

Heck, William P. 1992. Police who snitch: Deviant actors in a secret society. Deviant Behavior, 13 (3): 253-270.

Herbert, Steve. 2001. 'Hard Charger' or 'Station Queen'? Policing and the Masculinist State. Gender, Place & Culture: A Journal of Feminist Geography 8(1).

Hess, Aaron. 2009. Resistance Up in Smoke: Analyzing the Limitations of Deliberation on YouTube. Critical Studies in Media Communication 26(5): 411- 434.

Holmes, Janet and Marra Meredith. 2011. Having a laugh at work: how humour contributes to workplace culture. Journal of Pragmatics 34(12): 1683-1710.

Hood, Lindsay. 2011. Officer Jeremy Henwood's Final Act of Kindness. NBC San Diego. Available at http://www.nbcsandiego.com/news/local/Officer-Henwoods-Final-Act-of-Kindness-127886453.html.

Howitt, Dennis and Owusu-Bempah, Kwame. 2005. Race and ethnicity in popular humour in Beyond a Joke: The Limits of Humour edited by Sharon Lockyer & Michael Pickering. Palgrave Macmillan Publishing: 45-62.

Huey, Laura, Kevin Walby and Aaron Doyle. 2006. 'Cop Watching in the Downtown Eastside: Exploring the Use of (Counter) Surveillance as a Tool of Resistance' in Surveillance and Security: Technological Politics in Everyday Life edited by Torin Monahan. pp. 149–65. London: Routledge.

Huey, Laura. 2010. 'I've seen this on CSI': Criminal investigators' perceptions about the management of public expectations in the field. Crime Media Culture 6(1): 49-68.

Huey, Laura and Broll, Ryan. 2012. 'All it takes is one TV show to ruin it': a police perspective on police-media relations in the era of expanding prime time crime markets. Policing and Society 22(4): 384-396.

Huey, Laura and Broll, Ryan. 2013. 'I don't find it sexy at all': criminal investigators' views of media glamorization of police 'dirty work.' Policing and Society 25(2): 236-247.

Jenkins, Henry. 2009. What Happened Before YouTube in YouTube: Online Video and Participatory Culture. Polity Press.

Jick, Todd. D. 1979. Mixed Qualitative and Quantitate Methods: Triangulation in Action. Administrative Science Quarterly 24(4): 602-611.

Jorgensen, Danny L. 1989. Participant Observation: A Methodology for Human Studies. SAGE Publications.

Katz, Jack. 1988. Seductions Of Crime: Moral And Sensual Attractions In Doing Evil. Basic Books.

Khazan, Olga. 2014. Any American Can Take Any Police Officer's Photo. The Atlantic. Available at http://www.theatlantic.com/national/archive/2014/08/you-can-take-any-police-officers-photo/376064/

Keiber, Jason. 2015. Surveillance Hegemony. Surveillance & Society 13(2): 168-181.

Keyily, Mary Jane and Nayak, Anoop. 1997. 'Lads and Laughter': Humour and the production of heterosexual hierarchies. Gender and education 9(1): 69-88.

King, Jennifer. Mulligan, Deirdre K. and Raphael, Steven. 2008. Citris Report: The San Francisco Community Safety Camera Porgram, California: Berkeley School of Law. Available online at: http://www.wired.com/images_blogs/threatlevel/files/sfsurveillancestudy.pdf.

Koskela, Hille. 2003. 'Cam Era' – the contemporary urban Panopticon. Surveillance and Society 1: 292–313.

Koskela, Hille. 2004. Webcams, TV Shows and Mobile phones: Empowering Exhibitionism, Surveillance & Society 2(2/3): 199-215.

Ku, Alan Kato. 2004. Talk Is Cheap, but a Picture Is Worth a Thousand Words: Privacy Rights in the Era of Camera Phone Technology. Santa Clara Law Review 45: 679-706.

Kuhlman, T. 1988. Gallows humour for a scaffold setting: managing aggressive patients in a maximum-security forensic unit. Hospital and Community Psychiatry 39: 1085-1090.

Labaree, Robert V. 2002. The risk of 'going observationalist': negotiating the hidden dilemmas of being an insider participant observer. Qualitative Research 2(1): 97-122.

Lange, Patricia G. 2008. Publicly Private and Privately Public: Social Networking on YouTube. Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication 13: 361–380.

Lasley, J.R. 1994. The Impact of the Rodney King Incident On Citizen Attitudes Toward Police. Policing and Society 3(4): 245-255.

Lawrence, Regina. 2000. The Politics of Force: Media and the Construction of Police Brutality. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Leighton, Barry. 1991. Visions of Community Policing: Rhetoric and Reality in Canada. Canadian Journal of Criminology 33: 485-522.

Lewis, Seth C., Kaufhold, Kelly and Lasorsa, Dominic L. 2009. Thinking about citizen journalism: The philosophical and practical challenges of user-generated content for community newspapers. Journalism Practice 4(2): 163-179.

Linder, Doug. 2001. The Trials of Los Angeles Police Officers' in Connection with the Beating of Rodney King. http://law2.umkc.edu/faculty/projects/ftrials/lapd/lapdaccount.html.

Lockyer, Sharon and Pickering, Michael. 2008. You Must Be Joking: The sociological critique of humour and comic media. Sociology Compass 2/3: 808-820

Loftus, Bethan. 2009. Policing Culture in Changing World. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Lombroso, Cesare. 2006. Criminal man (M. Gibson, ed., & N. H. Rafter, Eds.). Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Lowe, John. 1986. Theories of Ethnic Humor: how to enter, laughing. American Quarterly 38(3): 439-460

Lum, Aimee Jodoi. 2004. Don't Smile, Your Image Has Just Been Recorded on a Camera-Phone: The Need for Privacy in the Public Sphere. University of Hawai'i Law Review 27: 377-416.

Lyon, David. 1994. The Electronic Eye: The Rise of Surveillance Society-Computers and Social Control in Context. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Lyon, David. 2001 Surveillance Society: Surveillance in Everyday Life. Buckingham: Open University Press.

Lyon, David. 2002. Surveillance as Social Sorting: Privacy, Risk and Digital Discrimination. London: Routledge.

Lyon, David. 2003. Surveillance After September 11. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Lyon, David. 2007. Surveillance Studies: An Overview. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Lyon, David. 2015a. Surveillance, Snowden, and Big Data: Capacities, consequences, critique. Big Data and Society. DOI: 10.1177/2053951714541861.

Lyon, David. 2015b. The Snowden Stakes: Challenges for Understanding Surveillance Today. Surveillance & Society. 13(2): 139-152.

MacCharles, Tonda. 2009. RCMP deputy issues outright apology for Dziekanski death. The Toronto Star. Available at http://www.thestar.com/news/canada/2009/05/11/rcmp_deputy_issues_outright_apology_for_dziekanski_death.html.

Mac Donald, Heather. 2015. The New National Crime Wave. The Wall Street Journal Opinion. Available at: http://www.wsj.com/articles/the-new-nationwide-crime-wave-1432938425.

Mann, Steve. 2002. ‘Reflectionism and Diffusionism’. In CTRL [space]: Rhetorics of Surveillance from Bentham to Big Brother, edited by T. Y. Levin, U. Frohne and P. Weibel. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

Mann, Steve, Nolan, Jason, and Wellman, Barry. 2003. Sousveillance: Inventing and Using Wearable Computing Devices for Data Collection in Surveillance Environments* Surveillance and Society 1(3): 331-355.

Mann, Steve. 2004. Shooting Back. Available from http://eyetap.org/wearcam/shootingback/.

Madrigal, Alexis C. 2011. Policing the Police: The Apps That Let You Spy on the Cops. The Atlantic. http://www.theatlantic.com/technology/archive/2011/06/policing-the-police-the-apps-that-let-you-spy-on-the-cops/240916/.

Manning, Peter and Van Maanen, J. 1978. Policing: A View from the Street. Santa Monica: Goodyear Publishing.

Manning, Peter. 1988. Symbolic Communication: Signifying Calls and the Police Response. MIT Press.

Manning, Peter. 1996 Information Technology and the Police. Crime and Justice 15: 349-398.

Manning, Peter. 1996 Information Technology in the Police Context: The "Sailor" Phone. Information Systems Reseach 7(1): 52-62.

Manning, Peter. 1997. Police Work: The Social Organization of Policing. Waveland Press Inc.

Manning, Peter. 2003. Police Contingencies. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Manning, Peter. 2005. The Study of Policing. Police Quarterly, 8: 23–43.

Manning, Peter. 2008. The Technology of Policing—Crime Mapping, Information Technology, and the Rationality of Crime Control. New York: New York University Press.

Manning, Peter. 2012. Drama, the Police and the Sacred in Policing: Politics, Culture And Control ed. Tim Newburn and Jill Peay. Oxford and Portland.

Marks, Monique. 2004. Researching Police Transformation: The Ethnographic Imperative. British Journal of Criminology 44(6).

Martin, Susan. 1980. Breaking and entering: Police women on patrol. Berkley: University of California Press.

Martin, Susan. 1994. "Outsider within" the Station House: The Impact of Race and Gender on Black Women Police. Social Problems 41(3): 383-400.

Martin, Susan. 1999. Police Force or Police Service? Gender and Emotional Labor. The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science 561: 111-126.

Marx, Gary. 2003. A Tack in the Shoe: Neutralizing and Resisting the New Surveillance. Journal of Social Issues 59(2): 294-306.

Mathiesen, Thomas. 1997. The Viewer Society: Michel Foucault's "Panopticon" Revisited. Theoretical Criminology 1(2): 215-234.

Mawby, Robert. 2002. Policing Images: policing, communication and legitimacy, Cullompton: Willan Publishing.

Meyer, Andrew. 2014. NJ Cops Intimidate, Threaten to Arrest Man for Recording Violent Arrest. Photography Is Not A Crime. Available at: https://photographyisnotacrime.com/2014/08/nj-cops-intimidate-threaten-arrest-man-recording-violent-arrest/

Mayer-Schönberger, Viktor. 2009. Delete: The Virtue of Forgetting in the Digital Age. Princeton University Press.

McCombs, Maxwell. 2004. Setting the Agenda: Mass Media and Public Opinion. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Merton, Robert K. 1957. Social Theory and Social Structure, rev. ed. New York: Free Press.

Merton, Robert. 1972. 'Insiders and Outsiders: A Chapter in the Sociology o Knowledge', American Journal of Sociology 78: 9–47.

McDonald, William. F. and Paromchik, Sergei. 1996. Transparency and the Police: External Research, Policing and Democracy. Available at https://www.ncjrs.gov/policing/trans17.htm.

Mecija, Melissa. 2013. Film honors life of slain San Diego police Officer Jeremy Henwood, others killed on duty. 10 News. Available at http://www.10news.com/news/film-honors-life-of-slain-san-diego-police-officer-jeremy-henwood-others-killed-on-duty-080613.

Merriam, Sharan B. 1998. Qualitative Research and Case Study Applications in Education. Revised and Expanded from "Case Study Research in Education. A joint publication of the Jossey-Bass education series and the Jossey-Bass higher and adult education series.

Merriam, Sharan B., Johnson-Bailey, Juanita, Lee, Ming-Yeh, Kee, Youngwha, Ntseane, Gabo, Muhamad, Mazanad. 2001. Power and Positionality: negotiating insider/outsider status within and across cultures. International Journal of Lifelong Education 20(5): 405-416.

Meyer, Robinson. 2014. Seen It All Before: 10 Predictions About Police Body Cameras. The Atlantic. Available at http://www.theatlantic.com/technology/archive/2014/12/seen-it-all-before-10-predictions-about-police-body-cameras/383456/.

McLaughlin, Eugene. 2007. The New Policing. SAGE Publications Ltd.

Miller, Carlos. 2013. South Florida Cops Confiscate Camera and Delete Footage, Claiming They Feared it was a Gun. Photographyisnotacrime.com. Available at: https://photographyisnotacrime.com/2013/03/south-florida-cops-confiscate-camera-and-delete-footage-claiming-they-feared-it-was-a-gun/

Miller, Carlos. 2014. A Study in Contrasts Between Rialto Police and Albuquerque Police in Regards to Body-Mounted Cameras. Photographyisnotacrime.com. Available at:

https://photographyisnotacrime.com/2014/03/study-contrasts-rialto-police-albuquerque-police-regards-body-mounted-cameras/

Miller, Carlos. 2015a. Ohio Police Assault Man for Recording, Who Then Tells Them, "Say Hello to YouTube, Motherfuckers". Photographyisnotacrime.com. Available at: https://photographyisnotacrime.com/2015/10/ohio-police-assault-man-for-recording-who-then-tells-them-say-hello-to-youtube-motherfuckers/

Miller, Carlos. 2015b. Canadian Cops Intimidate Videographer by Crowding His Personal Space, Claiming it is Their Right. Photography Is Not A Crime. Available at: https://photographyisnotacrime.com/2015/10/canadian-cops-intimidate-videographer-by-crowding-his-personal-space-claiming-it-is-their-right/

Miller, Carlos. 2015c. Arkansas Family Tasered and Beaten While Walking Dog Settles for $225,000. Photography Is Not A Crime. Available at: https://photographyisnotacrime.com/2015/10/arkansas-family-awarded-225000-brutality-police/

Miller, Carlos. 2015d. Oklahoma Cop With History of Violence Charged for Beating Suspect With Shotgun. Photography Is Not A Crime. Available at: https://photographyisnotacrime.com/2015/10/oklahoma-cop-with-history-of-violence-charged-for-beating-suspect-with-shotgun/

Miller, Carlos. 2015e. Louisiana Cops Shoot Man in Back, then Confiscate Video Witness Says Contradicts Police Version. Photography Is Not A Crime. Available at: https://photographyisnotacrime.com/2015/10/louisiana-cops-shoot-man-in-back-then-confiscate-video-witness-says-contradicts-police-version/

Miller, Carlos. 2015f. NYPD Cop Convicted of Falsifying Arrest Report on New York Times Photographer. Photography Is Not A Crime. Available at: https://photographyisnotacrime.com/2015/10/nypd-cop-convicted-of-falsifying-arrest-report-on-new-york-times-photographer/

Miller, Carlos. 2015g. North Carolina Police Arrest Man for Recording Before Trying to Destroy Phone. Photography Is Not A Crime. Available at: https://photographyisnotacrime.com/2015/05/north-carolina-police-arrest-man-for-recording-before-trying-to-destroy-phone/

Mitchell, J.C. 1983. Case and situation analysis. The Sociological Review 31: 187-211.

Monahan, Torin. 2006. Questioning Surveillance and Security in Surveillance and Security: Technological Politics and Power in Everyday Life edited by Monahan, Torin. London and New York: Routledge.

Morreall, John. 2009. Comic Relief: A Comprehensive Philosophy of Humor. Blackwell Publishing.

Mulkey, Michael. 1988. On Humor: Its Nature and Its Place in Modern Society. Blackwell Publishing.

Mullings, Beverley. 1999. Insider or outsider, both or neither: some dilemmas of interviewing in a cross-cultural setting. Geoforum 30(4): 337-350.

Mydans, Seth. 1992. THE POLICE VERDICT; Los Angeles Policemen Acquitted in Taped Beating. The New York Times. Available at http://www.nytimes.com/books/98/02/08/home/rodney-verdict.html.

Newburn, Tim. 2003. Handbook of policing. 1st, Willan Publishing, Cullompton, UK.

Newburn, Tim. 2004. Policing: Key Readings. 1st, Willan Publishing, Cullompton UK.

Bayley, David H. 2004. What Do Police Do? in Policing: Key Readings edited by Newburn, Tim. Willan Publishing, Cullompton UK.

Bittner, Egon. 2004. Florence Nightingale in pursuit of Willie Sutton: a theory of the police in Policing: Key Readings edited by Newburn, Tim. Willan Publishing, Cullompton UK.

Ericson, Richard V. 2004. The Police as Reproducers of Order in Policing: Key Readings edited by Newburn, Tim. Willan Publishing, Cullompton UK.

Ericson, Richard V., and Haggerty, Kevin, D. 2004. The Policing of Risk in Policing: Key Readings edited by Newburn, Tim. Willan Publishing, Cullompton UK.

Ignatieff, Michael. 2004. Police and people: the birth of Mr. Peel's 'blue locusts' in Policing: Key Readings edited by Newburn, Tim. Willan Publishing, Cullompton UK
Jones, Trevor. 2004. The Accountability of Policing in Policing: Key Readings edited by Newburn, Tim. Willan Publishing, Cullompton UK.

Kelling, George L. and Moore, Mark H. 2004. The Evolving Strategy of Policing. in Policing: Key Readings edited by, Newburn, Tim. Willan Publishing, Cullompton UK.

Manning, Peter K. 2004. The Police: mandate, strategies, and appearances in Policing: Key Readings ed, Newburn, Tim. Willan Publishing, Cullompton UK.

Muir Jr., William Ker. 2004. The paradox of dispossession: skid row at night in Policing: Key Readings edited by Newburn, Tim. Willan Publishing, Cullompton UK.

Shearing and Ericson, Richard. 2004. Culture as Figurative Action in Policing: Key. Readings edited by Newburn, Tim. Willan Publishing, Cullompton UK.

Tilley, Nick. 2004. Modern Approaches to Policing: Community, Porlbem-Oriented and Intelligence-led in Policing: Key Readings edited by Newburn, Tim. Willan Publishing, Cullompton UK.

Williams, Hubert and Murphy, Patrick V. 2004.The Evolving Strategy of Policing: A minority View in Policing: Key Readings edited by Newburn, Tim. Willan Publishing, Cullompton UK.

Near, Janet P. and Miceli, Marcia P. 1996. Whistle-Blowing: Myth and Reality. Journal of Management 22(3): 507-526.

Norris, Clive, and Gary Armstrong. 1995. CCTV and the Social Structuring of Surveillance. Crime Prevention Studies 10.

Norris, Clive, and Gary Armstrong. 1999. The Maximum Surveillance Society: The Rise of CCTV. Oxford: Berg.

Northrop, Alana, Kraemer, Kenneth L., King, John Leslie. 1995. Police use of computers. Journal of Criminal Justice 23(3): 259–275.

Nunn, Samuel. 2001. Police Information Technology: Assessing the Effects of Computerization on Urban Police Functions. Public Administration Review 61(2): 222-234.

Nye, F Ivan. 1958. Family relationships and delinquent behavior. Praeger; New edition of 1958 edition

Ogbu, John U., Sato, Nancy E., & Kim, Eum Y. 1997. Anthropological inquiry in Educational research, methodology and measurement: An international handbook (2nd ed.) ed, J. P. Keeves. Cambridge: Pergamon Press.

O'Neil, Peter. 2012. Canadians' faith in police has plunged, poll finds. Canada.com. Available at http://www.canada.com/news/Canadians+faith+police+plunged+poll+finds/6518673/story.html?__federated=1.

Ortutay, Barbara. Calls for police 'body cameras' grow following Michael Brown's death. Globalnews.ca. Available at http://globalnews.ca/news/1523267/calls-for-police-body-cameras-grow-following-michael-browns-death/.

Oved, Marco Chown. 2014. Second charge laid against Toronto cop in Sammy Yatim shooting. Toronto Star. Available at http://www.thestar.com/news/crime/2014/07/30/toronto_cop_charged_with_attempted_murder_in_sammy_yatim_shooting.html.

Paperman, Patricia. 2003. Surveillance Underground: The Uniform as an Interaction Device Ethnography 2003 4: 397.

Pérez Raúl. 2013. Learning to make racism funny in the 'color-blind' era: Stand-up comedy students, performance strategies, and the (re)production of racist jokes in public. Discourse & Society 24(4): 1–26

Parnaby, Patrick F. and Leyden, Myra. 2011. Dirty Harry and the Station Queens: A Mertonian Analysis of Police Deviance. Policing and Society 21(3): 249-264.

Patton, M. Q. 1990. Qualitative evaluation and research methods (2nd ed.). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Pickering, Michael and Lockyer, Sharon. 2009. Beyond a Joke: The Limits of Humour. Palgrave Macmillan Publishing.

Pogrebin, Mark R. and Poole, Eric D. 1988. HUMOR IN THE BRIEFING ROOM: A Study of the Strategic Uses of Humor Among Police. Journal of Contemporary Ethnography 17(2): 183-210.

Pogrebin, Mark R. and Poole, Eric D. 1991. Police and tragic events: the management of emotions. Journal of Criminal Justice 19(4): 395- 403.

Pogrebin, Mark R. and Eric D. Poole.1995. Emotion Management: A Study of Police Response to Tragic Events. Social Perspectives on Emotion. Vol. 3.Greenwich, CT: JAI.

Poster, M. 1990. The Mode of Information: Poststructuralism and Social Context. Chicago University Press.

Rabe-Hemp, Cara. 2009. POLICEwomen or policeWOMEN? Doing gender and police work. Feminist Criminology 4(2): 114-129.

Rafter, Nicole Hahn. 2006. Shots in the Mirror: Crime Films and Society. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ragin, Charles C. 1989. The Comparative Method: Moving Beyond Qualitative and Quantitate Strategies. University of California Press.

Ragin, Charles C. and Becker, Howard. 1991. What is a case? Exploring the Foundations of Social Inquiry. Cambridge University Press.

Rankin, Jim. 2013. Toronto police arrest man, take phone after attempt to film takedown at Sheraton. Torontostar.ca. Available at http://www.thestar.com/news/gta/2013/05/26/exclusive_toronto_police_arrest_man_take_phone_after_attempt_to_film_takedown_at_sheraton.html.

Ratcliffe, Jerry H. 2006. Video surveillance of public places (Problem-oriented guides for police, Response guides series no. 4. Washington DC: Center for Problem Oriented Policing.

Ratcliffe, Jerry H, Taniguchi, Travis, and Taylor, Ralph B. 2009. The Crime Reduction Effects of Public CCTV Cameras: A Multi-Method Spatial Approach. Justice Quarterly 26(4): 746-770.

Reeves, Joshua. 2012. If You See Something, Say Something: Lateral Surveillance and the Uses of Responsibility. Surveillance and Society 10(3/4): 235-248.

Reiner, Robert. 1997. Chapter 12: Media Made Criminality: the representation of crime in the media. Oxford: Oxford University Press the The Oxford Handbook of Criminology edited by

Reiner, Robert, Maguire, Mike and Morgan, Rod. Oxford: Oxford University Press: 302-34.

Reiner, Robert. 2010. The Politics of the Police 4th edition. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Reiser, Martin and Geiger, Steven P. 1984. Police officer as victim. Professional Psychology: Research and Practice 15: 315-323.

Reiss, Albert J. 1951. Delinquency as the Failure of Personal and Social Controls. American Sociological Review 16(2): 196-207.

Rodrigues, Suzana B. Having Fun? Humour as Resistance in Brazil. Organizational Studies 16(5): 739-768.

Rogan, Mary. 2014. The Killing of Sammy Yatim. Toronto Life. http://www.torontolife.com/informer/features/2014/08/14/the-killing-sammy-yatim/.

Rothwell, Gary R and Baldwin, J Norman. 2007. Whistle-Blowing and the Code of Silence in Police Agencies Policy and Structural Predictors. Crime & Delinquency 53(4): 605-632.

Roubini, Sonia. 2014. Police Need to Make Body-Camera Policies Transparent. ACLU.org. Available at https://www.aclu.org/blog/criminal-law-reform-immigrants-rights-technology-and-liberty-national-security/what-do-police-b.

Rusnell, Charles. 2008. Is The The Most Hated Lawyer in Town? Avenue Edmonton November 2008. Available at http://www.avenueedmonton.com/November-2008/Is-This-the-Most-Hated-Lawyer-in-Town/.

Sandhu, Ajay and Haggerty, Kevin D. 2015. High-Visibility Policing: Policing on Camera and the Crisis of Police Legitimacy. Oxford Handbooks Online.DOI: 10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199935383.013.80.

Salter, Michael. 2013. Justice and revenge in online counter-publics: Emerging responses to sexual violence in the age of social media. Crime Media Culture. doi: 10.1177/1741659013493918.

Sanburn, Josh. 2014. Why Cops in Ferguson Don't Have Body Cameras. Time. Available at http://time.com/3114329/ferguson-michael-brown-police-body-cameras/.

Schaefer, Brian and Steinmetz Kevin. 2014. Watching the Watchers and McLuhan's Tetrad: The Limits of Cop-Watching in the Internet Age. Surveillance and Society 12(4): 501-515.

Schaible, Lonnie M. and Gecas, Viktor. 2010. The Impact of Emotional Labor and Value Dissonance on Burnout Among Police Officers. Police Quarterly 13(3): 316-341.

Schlesinger, Philip and Tumber, Howard. 1996. Reporting Crime: The Media Politics of Criminal Justice. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Schlesinger, Philip, Tumber, Howard, and Murdick, Graham. 1991. The Media Politics of Crime and Criminal Justice. British Journal of Criminology 42(3): 397-420.

Sharp, Arthur G. 2005. Quota by Any Other Name. Law and Order 52(12): 14-20.

Shaw, Clifford R. and McKay, Henry D. 1969. Juvenile Delinquency and Urban Areas. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Shilton, Katie. 2010. Participatory Sensing: Building Empowering Surveillance. Surveillance & Society 8(2): 131-150.

Shum, David. 2013. Hamilton police officers get high praise after video of arrest goes viral. Global News. Available at http://globalnews.ca/news/1028288/hamilton-police-officers-get-high-praise-after-video-of-arrest-goes-viral/.

Sigelman, L., Welch, S., Bledsoe, T., & Combs, M. 1997. Police brutality and public perceptions of racial discrimination: A tale of two beatings. Political Research Quarterly 50(4): 777–791.

Singer Jane B. and Ashman, Ian. 2009. User-generated content and Journalistic values In Ed. Stuart Allen and Einer Thorsen Citizen Journalism (Global Crises and the Media). Peter Lang Publishing.

Simon Stephanie. 2012. Suspicious encounters: Ordinary preemption and the securitization of photography. Security Dialogue 43: 157–173.

Skogan, Wesley. and Hartnett, Susan. 1997. Community Policing: Chicago Style. Oxford University Press.

Skolnick, Jerome. 1966. Justice Without Trial: Law Enforcement in Democratic Society. Macmillan Coll Div; 3rd edition edition.

Skolnick, Jerome H and Fyfe, James J. 1993. Above the law: police and the excessive use of force. New York: Free Press.

Skolnick, Jerome H, and Fyfe, James J. 2004. The Beating Of Rodney King. In Policing: Key Readings, ed. Tim Newburn. Willan Publishing.

Skolnick, Jerome H. 2008. Enduring issues of police culture and demographics. Policing and Culture. Policing and Society 18(1): 35-45.

Snow, David, Robert Benford, and Leon Anderson. 1986. Fieldwork Roles and Informational Yield. Journal of Contemporary Ethnography 14: 377–408.

Souhami, Anna. 2014. Institutional Racism and Police Reform: An Empirical Critique. Policing and Society 24(1): 1-21.

Saint-Cyr, Yosie. 2013. The State of Whistleblowing in Canada. Slaw magazine. Available at: http://www.slaw.ca/2013/06/06/the-state-of-whistleblowing-in-canada/

Singer Jane B. and Ashman, Ian. 2009. User-generated content and Journalistic values In Ed. Stuart Allen and Einer Thorsen Citizen Journalism (Global Crises and the Media). Peter Lang Publishing.

Spradley, J.P. 1980. Participant Observation. New York: Sage Publishing.

Stake, Robert. 1995. The Art of Case Study Research. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publication.

Storch Jerome E. and Panzarella, Robert. 1996. Police Stress: state-trait anxiety in relation to occupational and personal stressors. Journal of Criminal Justice 24(2): 99-107.

Stotland, E. 1991. The Effects of Police Work and Professional Relationships on Health. Journal of Criminal Justice 19: 371-379.

Strangelove, Michael 2010. Watching YouTube: Extraordinary Videos by Ordinary People. University of Toronto Press.

Stross, Randall. 2013. Wearing a Badge, and a Video Camera. NY Times. Available at http://www.nytimes.com/2013/04/07/business/wearable-video-cameras-for-police-officers.html?pagewanted=all&_r=0.

Stuart, Forrest. 2011. Constructing Police Abuse after Rodney King: How Skid Row Residents and the Los Angeles Police Department Contest Video Evidence. Law and Social Inquiry 36(2): 327-353.

Suler John. 2004. The Online Dishibition Effect. Cyber Psychology and Behavior 7(3): 321-326.

Taylor, Nick. 2002. State Surveillance and the Right to Privacy. Surveillance & Society 1(1): 66-85.

Terry W.C. 1981. Police Stress: The Empirical Evidence. Journal of Police Science and Administration 9(1).

Territo L. and Vetter H.J. 1981. Stress and Police Personnel. Journal of Police Science and Administration 9(2).

Thompson, John B. 2005. The New Visibility. Theory, Culture and Society 22: 31-51.

Thompson, Derek. 2014. Forcing America's Weaponized Police to Wear Cameras. The Atlantic. Available at http://www.theatlantic.com/national/archive/2014/08/americas-weaponized-police-force-could-benefit-from-one-more-weapon-cameras/376063/

Timan, Tjerk. and Oudshoorn, Nelly. 2012. Mobile Cameras as New Technologies of Surveillance? How Citizens Experience the Use of Mobile Cameras in Public Nightscapes. Surveillance & Society 10(2): 167-181.

Toch, Hans. 2012. Cop Watch: Spectators, Social Media, and Police Reform. Washington DC: American Psychological Association.

Tierney, W.G. 1997. Lost in translation: time and voice in qualitative research in Representation and the text: Re-framing the narrative voice edited by W.G. Tierney and Yvonne S. Lincoln. Albany: SUNY Press.

van der Velden, Lonneke. 2015. Leaky Apps and Data Shots: Technologies of Leakage and Insertion in NSA-Surveillance. Surveillance & Society 13(2): 182-196.

Van Hulst, Merlijn. 2013. Storytelling at the Police Station. British Journal of Criminology doi:10.1093/bjc/azt014.

Van Maanen, John. 1978. The asshole. In (Peter K. Manning and John Van Maanen, eds.), Policing: A view from the street. Santa Monica, CA: Goodyear Publishing.

Verschuren, Piet J.M. 2001. Case study as a research strategy: some ambiguities and opportunities. Social Research Methodology 6(2): 121-139.

Verschuren, Piet J.M. and Doorewaard, Hans. 1999. Designing a Research Project. Utrecht Netherlands: Lemma.

Violanti, John M., Marshall, James R., Howe, Barbara. 1985. Stress, coping, and alcohol use: The police connection. Journal of Police Science & Administration 13(2): 106-110.

Vivona, Brian Daniel. 2014. Humor Functions Within Crime Scene Investigations: Group Dynamics, Stress, and the Negotiation of Emotions. Police Quarterly 17(2): 127-149.

Waddinton, P.A.J. 1999. Police (Canteen) Culture. British Journal of Criminology 39: 287-309.

Wakefield, Rebecca. 2007. Urban Squall. Available at http://photographyisnotacrime.com/wp-content/uploads/2013/02/MiamiPoliceArrestCarlosMillerCM1.pdf via Photography is not a crime.com.

Walker, Samuel. 2003. New Paradigm of Police Accountability: The U.S. Justice Department Pattern or Practice Suits in Context, The Symposium: New Approaches to Ensuring the Legitimacy of Police Conduct. Saint Louis University Public Law Review 22: 3-50.

Walker, Samuel. 2006. Police Accountability: Current Issues and Research Needs. Available at: https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/nij/grants/218583.pdf.

Walker, Samuel and Archbold, Carol A. 2014. The New World of Police Accountability. London: Sage Publications.

Wall, Tyler and Linnemann, Travis. 2014. Staring Down the State: Police power, visual economies, and the “war on cameras.” Crime Media and Culture. doi: 10.1177/1741659014531424.

Wanzer, Melissa, Booth-Butterfield, Melanie, Booth-Butterfield, Steve. 2005. "If We Didn't Use Humor, We'd Cry": Humorous Coping Communication in Health Care Settings 10(2): 105-125.

Wapes, Sam, Gill, Martin and Fisher, Peter. 2009. Does CCTV Displace Crime. Criminology and Criminal Justice 9(2): 207-224.

Weaver, Simon. 2010. The 'Other' Laughs Back: Humour and Resistance in Anti-racist Comedy. Sociology February 44(1): 31-48.

Weaver, Simon. 2011. Jokes, Rhetoric, and Embodied Racism: a rhetorical discourse analysis of the logics of racist jokes on the internet. Ethnicities 0(0): 1-21

Weitzer, Ronald and Tuch, Steven A. 2004. Race and Perceptions of Police Misconduct. Social Problems 51(3): 305-325.

Weitzer, Ronald and Tuch, Steven A. 2005. Determinants of Public Satisfaction With The Police. Police Quarterly 8(30): 279-297.

Welsh, Brandon and Farrington, David. 2004. 'Surveillance for Crime Prevention in Public Space: Results and Police Choices in Britain and America. Criminology and Public Policy 3(3): 497-526.

Westmarland, Louise. 2003. Police Cultures in Handbook of Policing ed. Tim Newburn. 1st, Willan Publishing, Cullompton, UK.

White, Patrick. 2014. Hamilton's 'Honest Cops' video helps renew faith in police. The Globe and Mail. Available at http://www.theglobeandmail.com/news/national/hamiltons-honest-cops-video-helps-renew-faith-in-police/article16403040/.

Whitson, Jennifer. 2013. Gaming the Quantified Self. Surveillance & Society 11(1/2): 163-176.

Wilson, Dean and Tanya Serisier. 2010. Video Activism and the Ambiguities of Counter-Surveillance. Surveillance & Society 8(2): 166-180.

Wolcott, Harry F. (1985). On ethnographic intent. Educational Administration Quarterly 21: 187-203.

Wormer, Katherine and Boes, Mary. 1997. Humour in the Emergency Room: a social work perspective by Katherine van Wormer and Mary Boes. Health and Social Work 22(2): 87-92.

Wortley, Scot and Owusu-Bempah, Akwasi. 2011. The Usual Suspects: police stop and search practices in Canada. Policing and Society 21(4).

Wright, Mason, Jill Mahoney, Brodie Fenlon and Rebecca Lindell. Timeline: Robert Dziekanski and the Mounties. The Globe and Mail. Available at http://www.theglobeandmail.com/news/british-columbia/searching-for-answers-in-dziekanski-case/article14387528/.

Young, Jacob T.N. and Ready, Justin. 2014. Diffusion of Ideas and Technology: The Role of Networks in Influencing the Endorsement and Use of On-Officer Video Cameras. Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice. doi: 10.1177/1043986214553380.

Yar Majid. 2012. Crime, media and the will-to-representation: Reconsidering relationships in the new media age. Crime, Media, and Culture 8(3): 245-260.

Yin, Robert. 2013. Case Study Research: Design and Methods. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publishing.

Ziegler, John B. 1998. Use of humour in medical teaching. Medical Teacher 20(4): 341-348.

Zureik, Elia and Hindle, Karen. 2004. Governance, Security and Technology: The Case of Biometrics. Studies in Political Economy 73: 113-137.