Senior Project
Spring 2019
SUNY Purchase
Advisor: Professor Kristen Karlberg
Second Reader: Professor Alexis Silver

Brian Cunningham:

Studying the Outcomes of the Installment of Body Worn Cameras in Police Departments

Table of Contents

Abstract

This is a detailed project regarding the effect of the implementation of body worn cameras in police departments. Police departments throughout the nation have been scrutinized by the public in recent years. Police officers have been accused of police brutality, police misconduct and performing their jobs with racism many times. There have been tragic killings, beatings and wrongful arrests. The headliner in responses to this epidemic? Body worn cameras. Body worn cameras were implemented to hold police officers accountable for their actions leading to better job performance. I set out to find the deeper effects that body worn cameras have left on police departments thus far. Do the positives outweigh the negatives? Do body worn cameras realistically do more harm than good? I review literature from well respected authors regarding the implementation of body worn cameras in police departments such as Barak Ariel and many more. I draw data from major city police departments as well as smaller low scale police departments. Some data trends were recognized and supported by my fellow researchers while some were refuted.

1. Introduction

Police brutality has become a very common and well known problem in the United States. People everywhere throughout the United States are accusing police officers of acting with unnecessary violence (use of force when not needed), at times racism, and doing their jobs without following protocol. There have been riots, protests and much more to try to change how police officers conduct their jobs. One of the biggest responses to these challenges and protests was making police officers do their jobs under video surveillance. I chose this topic because I felt that it was and still is a very prevalent issue in our country. Police misconduct and police brutality are under scrutiny in the public eye and body worn cameras were the response. I want to see if there are any noticeable trends or changes that appeared in police departments after BWC implementation. After the murder of Michael Brown in Ferguson, Missouri, President Obama stated that the federal government would purchase 50,000 body cameras for police officers to wear in order to track what they do. How does police surveillance, such as the implementation of body worn cameras, influence the way police officers do their jobs? I interrogate this question through conducting an in depth content analysis. I looked at data from various police departments, articles written by fellow researchers on this topic and police department statements. I pulled data from the 2014-2019 time frame and looked at the change in statistics since the implementation of body worn cameras to determine their effect.

I also studied previous research and literature to help my understanding of the topic. Hedberg et al. (2016) and Barak (2017) conducted research finding that the rates of arrest have changed since body-worn cameras have been implemented. They also found that the amount and

probability of citizen complaints against police officers have lowered since the installment of BWCs. Smylka et al. (2016) found that police officers understand that BWCs were implemented due to lack of trust by the surrounding community. Goetschel et al. (2017) found that as a whole police officer support for BWC installment was low but officers with experience using it support it more. The purpose for these previous studies and my future research is to study the effectiveness of body worn cameras and to determine if there is a more effective way to conduct police surveillance. I will conduct a content analysis, obtaining information from various sources and pulling out data from each separate source to come up with my own conclusion regarding police surveillance.

2. Literature Review

Michel Foucault was one of the most influential sociological thinkers of the century. His theory of surveillance and crime control applies to my field of study. He basically stated that the world has gone from fearing the threat of violence or punishment to controlling through surveillance. People are now worried about being seen while doing something wrong instead. Due to this, Foucault has claimed we have moved from "sovereign power" to "disciplinary power". This applies directly to this project because Foucault explains that disciplinary power is everywhere in society, not just against the criminals. This applies to my project because this type of control through surveillance is being used against both criminals and cops. This effort to improve police departments are having direct effects on both police officers and criminals. My goal is to point out whether it is for the better or worse.

In his text Discipline and Punish: the Birth of the Prison Michel Foucault talks about his theory of the panopticon. The panopticon is a theory regarding surveillance and punishment. The panopticon is basically a dungeon surrounded by a ring of cells and a tower. The goal of the panopticon is to make criminals think that they could always be under surveillance but have them not consciously know when they are due to the tower. This applies to body worn cameras on police officers. Perhaps implementing body worn cameras is an effort to give the police officers or criminals more power. In his text, Foucault writes

"So to arrange things that the surveillance is permanent in its effects, even if it is discontinuous in its action; that the perfection of power should tend to render its actual exercise unnecessary; that this architectural apparatus should be a machine for creating and sustaining a power relation independent of the person who exercises it; in short, that the inmates should be

caught up in a power situation of which they are themselves the bearers. To achieve this, it is at once too much and too little that the prisoner should be constantly observed by an inspector: too little, for what matters is that he knows himself to be observed; too much, because he has no need in fact of being so"

(Foucault: 201). This applies to the implementation of body worn cameras because it can apply to both police officers and detainees. Police officers now know they are being observed and it can impact how effectively they do their job and the question is whether or not this is truly necessary. Then the same thing can be said for detainees. Is it necessary for these cameras to be implemented to prove the wrongful doings of the police department? Because they know they are under even more surveillance as well.

There has not been much research aimed towards studying the effectiveness of body worn cameras (BWCs). In the past decade there has been rising tension between police officers and their communities. This tension is evident through the various police protests that have taken place such as in Ferguson, Missouri; Sanford, Florida; Chicago, Illinois; Staten Island, NY. The Black Lives Matter movement was started in part due to the perceived racist acts of police officers against people of color. In reality hate crimes happen throughout the whole nation and resentment for police departments is present in practically every state. Body worn cameras were only implemented in 2014. They were implemented to improve these prevalent issues of hate crimes and unnecessary use of force. However, little research has gone into studying the results. BWCs are wearable, audio, video or photographic recording programs. I set out to study whether or not the usage of body worn cameras on police officers has been effective. I want to see the effects on the rates of arrests, the rates of the use of force and the perspectives of BWCs by those

directly involved in the usage of them. Previous literature suggests that the usage of body worn cameras has been effective in some ways and has not been effective in others. It has increased

the rates of arrests but has not increased the rate of safety. Below is a picture of a police BWC.

I begin with an overview on body worn cameras' effects on the rates of arrest. Next, I will dive into how body worn cameras affect the rate of complaints against police officers. Following this, I will summarize police officer and detainee perceptions of body worn cameras. Lastly, I will discuss how body worn cameras affect the rate of force used by and against police officers.

Arrests on Tape (BWCs effect on the rates of arrest)

One of the many possible effects resulting from the installment of BWCs are the rates of arrests changing. Perhaps the police knowing they are under video surveillance may affect their rates of arrests made. The use of BWCs could result in fewer arrests due to the suspect cooperating more with the police officer under surveillance. On the other hand, the decision to arrest may be altered when BWCs are used as well (Barak 2017). Previous studies (Barak 2017, Hedberg et. al 2016 and Ready et. al 2015) obtained data from specific police departments in the United States in order to study BWCs effect on arrests. These studies used a control group, departments without BWCs, and an experimental group, departments with BWCs. I focused in

on three studies that had conflicting data. In a study conducted in Denver, arrest rates were significantly reduced in treatment conditions compared to controls. The odds of an arrest were eighteen percent higher in control conditions compared to treatment areas (Barak 2017). In a study in Phoenix (Hedberg et. al 2016), conflicting data was found when comparing it to the study conducted in Denver (Barak 2017). As expected, violent, drug and property incidents were more likely to lead to arrests. However, no other effects on the rates of arrests due to BWCs were found. The results were comparable in both the control and experimental group (Hedberg et al. 2016). However, when an arrest occurred, resistance was present in the control group (8.2%) more often than the treatment group (7.4%) (Hedberg et al. 2016). In a study conducted on the Mesa Police Department in Arizona, 3,698 total field reports concluded that officers assigned to wear a camera were less likely to perform stop-and-frisks and make arrests but were more likely to give citations and initiate encounters (Ready et. al 2015).

There are other factors to consider when studying the effect of BWCs on the rates of arrests. The extent of the crime, the setting of the crime and the suspect or police officer can all play a role in whether or not there is an arrest. It is hard to directly prove causation of BWCs effect on the rates of arrests. Findings from the three studies focused in this area were contradictory. Barak (2017) and Ready et. al (2015) found that the rate of arrests significantly dropped while Hedberg et al. (2016) did not find a change in the rates of arrests. The three studies were conducted in different areas and under different circumstances. Hedberg et al. (2016) took into consideration that arrests were going to increase in violence, drug and/or property circumstances due to surveillance. Also taken into effect was the decrease in the rate of resistance against arrest. One can hypothesize that this may lead to an increase in the rates of

arrests. Barak (2017) did not mention the decreasing rate of resistance against arrest in his research however he found the opposite, a significant decrease in the rates of arrests. Ready et. al (2015) focused on the decrease in the rate of stop-and-frisks and arrests compared to the increased rate of citations and encounters. It is clear that there can be conflicting data found in any part of the country as crime rates and circumstances are different everywhere. However, there was no data found that body worn cameras cause an increase in the rates of arrests; only either no effect or a decrease was found. One conclusion that can be taken out of both studies is that there are outside factors that affect the rates of arrest causing different data to be found in different places. More research needs to be done in different areas of the country to try and find whether or not body worn cameras play a role in affecting the rates of arrests.

Lights Cameras Complaints? (Body Worn Cameras effect on the rate of complaints against police officers)

Citizen complaints against police officers are one of the main reasons BWCs were installed. There have been plenty of protests against police and complaints against police officer procedures. The type of complaints I am referring to are those filed after police officer encounters and/or arrests. Complaints are generally used to critique the system and the rules that police officers adhere to. There is plenty to consider when studying the rates of complaints because they can be filed due to many circumstances. People may file complaints because they think a certain law or policy is unjust, or if a police officer's actions were not appropriate or simply out of spite (Barak 2017). In Denver, the odds of a complaint filed for misconduct against officers was fourteen percent higher in the control area than in the treatment area. In addition, the odds for a complaint filed for use of force was thirty five percent higher in the control area than

the treatment area (Barak 2017). In Phoenix, there was a sixty two percent reduction in the chance of complaints. In total there was a ninety six percent reduction in complaints (Hedberg et al. 2016).

The previous literature suggests that body worn cameras cause a decrease in the rates of complaints. Both studies found a significant decrease in the amount of complaints against police officers when body worn cameras are present. These studies suggest that if BWCs are used correctly, a majority of complaints against police officers would be eliminated (Hedberg et al. 2016). When studying the effectiveness of BWCs the rates of complaints should definitely be taken into effect, as it is one of its main goals. Complaints mean trouble and unhappiness for both police departments and communities. If complaints are eliminated that means everyone is more happy than they previously were. However it is necessary to take into consideration the circumstances surrounding complaints. As previously mentioned, complaints can be filed solely out of spite (Barak 2017). If a citizen is arrested for something, he/she may just feel the need to cause problems for that police department. This sense of spite can represent the amount of complaints that body worn cameras had no effect on. As a whole, there is a clear decrease in the amount of complaints since the installment of BWCs. Within the field of complaints, BWCs can be considered effective.

Those Behind the Camera (Police Officer and Detainee Perceptions on Body Worn Cameras)

When studying the effectiveness of body worn cameras I felt it was necessary to focus on previous literature regarding police officer and detainee perceptions of BWCs. Police officers are the ones using the body worn cameras and their perceptions of them are valuable. I focused on

studies that included data from 48 different states and Alberta, Canada. Five of the eight studies focused on either surveys or conducted interviews with officers who have used body worn cameras and those who have not. The other three studies were two content analyses on a police department in Mesa, Arizona and 823 different agencies from 48 different states, and controlled experiment testing body camera perspective bias. Police officers throughout the nation were asked questions regarding their experiences with them and whether or not they support the deployment of them. Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania and Sunshine County, Florida police officers as a whole strongly believe BWCs can reduce citizen complaints and maintain police-community relations (Goetschel et al. 2017; Smylka et al. 2017). However, overall support for deploying them is low (Goetschel et al. 2017; Smylka et al. 2017). In 2 different studies, data stated police officers with experience using BWCs showed higher support for their deployment (Goetschel et al. 2017 and Ready et. al 2015). A majority of police officers feel that BWCs impact the usage of force by police officers when necessary and are installed due to lack of trust by the community (Smylka et al. 2016). Data found by Gramagila et. al (2018) agrees that BWCs impact the usage of force by police officers when necessary. Data found through interviews with the Rochester Police Department suggests that they think BWCs put them in more danger due to resistance to use force on camera when necessary (Gramagila et. al 2018). Also due to lack of trust by the community, many police officers try to alter how they act on camera to affect how they are perceived by the public (Sandhu 2016). I also focused on two content analysis' that researched the relationship between organizational justice and officers perspectives on BWCs. Kyle et. al (2017) stated officer perceptions of organizational justice had a significant impact on their attitudes regarding BWCs. Officers coming from agencies who already installed them seem to

have a higher approval rate. There was also a positive relationship between rank and BWC perspective. Lastly, female police officers generally supported them more than males (Kyle et. al 2017). The other content analysis concluded that agencies that were further technologically developed had less trouble adapting to using body worn cameras. Many police departments do not want to use technology that could hurt or take away police discretion (Nowacki et. al 2018). The controlled experiment testing the body worn camera perspective bias had 2 groups, one watching a video with a BWC perspective and another one from a camera in the corner of the room (Boivin et al. 2017). The group who watched from the BWC perspective reported that the perceived criminal was further away from the police officer. Those who watched the surveillance footage did not report the perceived criminal as far away from the officer (Boivin et al. 2017). The results suggest that the more training someone has in analyzing police interventions the more perspective bias they might be subject to (Boivin et al. 2017). Detainees are also the ones being filmed by body worn cameras and being directly affected by them, making their opinion on them valuable. A majority of detainees feel that the installment of body worn cameras has been effective. They feel that it gives them a sense of protection, police officers a sense of accountability, and provides evidence in terms of arrests (Taylor et al. 2017).

Police officers are the ones being most affected by the installment of body worn cameras. They are under constant surveillance their whole day and put under the public microscope. The data obtained from content analysis', surveys and interviews conducted with them should be considered extremely valuable. If they feel that BWCs are effective and helping the system as a whole, despite being surveillanced all day, that speaks volumes. Previous research indicated that body worn cameras can be effective but also non-effective in certain areas. Police officers felt

that they are effective in terms of reducing complaints and maintaining good relations with the community. This is perhaps one of the main goals of BWCs as they were installed due to bad relations between the police and the community. However, officers felt that it impacted their decision-making on when to use force if necessary. This data trend showed up in multiple studies and suggests police officers feel that in order to protect themselves from danger they put their jobs on the line using force when they feel necessary. They are hesitant to use force due to being under surveillance. Police officers that have experience with BWCs support the installment of them more than those who have no experience. These results suggest that police officers do not even give body worn cameras a chance until required to and overlook the great possibilities it offers. Those with experience tend to realize how valuable they are. In addition, higher rank within the department has a positive relationship with support of BWCs. The higher in power they are the more they support them.

In terms of detainees, a large majority were unaware that body worn cameras were even present at the crime scene. As a whole, it seemed that detainees were in favor of body worn cameras because it provides evidence of what actually happens at the crime scene. This can deem body worn cameras as being effective. One of the main goals of body worn cameras were to provide concrete evidence of what actually happens at crime scenes. As intended, detainees feel that it provides a sense of safety and accountability which should be deemed effective.

Behavior on Tape (The Effect of Body Worn Cameras on Police Use of Force)

One of the major issues within police-community relations has been the usage of unnecessary force. Society as a whole seems to think that the police officers use force when it is

not necessary and as an act of violence. One of the main goals of BWCs is to fix this problem, to lower the rate of force used by and against police officers. I focused on four studies to gain insight on this subtopic; one study focused on the usage of force both by and against police officers (Ariel et al. 2016), while the others focused on the usage of force solely by police officers (Jennings et. al 2016, Henstock et al. 2017 and Ariel et al. 2016). The study that focused on both ends of the spectrum was a prospective meta-analysis of multi-site, multi-national randomised controlled trials from 10 different locations combining for a population of 2 million people and over 2 million police officer hours (Ariel et al. 2016). They found that body worn videos had no found effect on the use of force by police, but caused an increase in the rate of assault against police officers wearing cameras (Ariel et al. 2016). Detainees try to provoke police officers more knowing that they are wearing body worn cameras. They may try to get the officer to use force to help them out with whatever trouble they are in. Another study took place over a twenty four month period and had a sample of seven hundred and sixty one Tampa Bay police officers (Jennings et al. 2016). Results indicated that the frequency of police officers responding to resistance with force dropped by 8.4 percent post BWC installment (Jennings et al. 2016). Another study conducted a content analysis in eight police departments with over 2,000 police officer shifts (Ariel et al. 2016). Whenever the officers were on shift and were not aware if the BWC was on or off the use of force rate was 37 percent lower. When officers were aware if it was on or off, use of force rate were 71 percent higher (Ariel et al. 2016). The final study was a 6 month randomized controlled trial on a British police force (Henstock et al. 2017). Data suggested that there was a 50 percent reductions in the odds of force used when BWCs are present compared to not being present (Henstock et al. 2017).

I feel that focusing on the effect of the rate of force used by and against police officers is essential in determining whether or not BWCs are effective. A common belief about BWCs is that they make both the police officer and the perceived criminal safer and reduce violence as a whole. The studies I focused on had similar findings (Ariel et. al 2016; Jennings et. al 2016; Ariel et al. 2016; Henstock et al. 2017). One study that included many different locations found that there was no found effect on the usage of force by police (Ariel et. al 2016) while the others found that the rate of police responding to resistance with force dropped by 8.4 percent, 37 percent and 50 percent. (Jennings et al. 2016; Ariel et al. 2016; Henstock et al. 2017). This contradiction between the studies could be due to the fact that they were conducted in different locations under different circumstances. In some areas police usage of force may be more common than in others. Regardless, there was no found increase in the rate of force used by police post BWC installment (Ariel et. al 2016). In three different studies there was a found decrease in the rate of use of force by police with BWCs present (Jennings et al. 2016; Ariel et al. 2016; Henstock et al. 2017). Police officers are actually subject to a higher rate of force against them (Jennings et. al 2016). This could be due to the perceived criminal trying to get them to respond with violence on camera and use it against them. Although BWCs may be decreasing the rate of force used by police officers, existing research shows (Jennings et. al 2016) it has increased the rate of force used against them.

Where It All Began (How did we get here?)

One of the main questions around all of this research is how did we end up here as a society? What has brought us to be researching the effectiveness of body worn cameras? I was

able to find 4 articles that touch on this subject. Each of them have 4 different themes. One study is a content analysis, a total of 490 comments offered by respondents to a post regarding the Michael Brown killing were read and analyzed (Chaney 2015). Chaney found a couple reoccuring themes throughout the comments; a high regard for law enforcement, disgust with the police and government in Ferguson, disregard for the Department of Justice and its report on Ferguson and police corruption also occurring outside of Ferguson (Chaney 2015). This high regard for law enforcement even when they are in the wrong and reoccuring comments of people reporting police corruption outside of Ferguson are two main reasons our society is at this stage. Another main reason our society is at this stage is the minority threat perspective, perceiving people of ethnicities other than the dominant one (white) to be more of a threat to society. Through a content analysis, the researchers suggested that the minority threat perspective is in fact a thing (Morrow et al. 2018). Black latino Americans in New York city were more likely to be subject to force used by police (Morrow et al. 2018). This increased rate of force due to racial backgrounds is a huge problem in our society that has led us down this path. Carter et al. (2016) sets out to find out how beliefs about race and racial inequality influence whites' attitudes toward the use of force by the police since the mid-1980s. They conducted a content analysis on the "Police Force Index", data suggests that beliefs about race do indeed significantly predict whites' attitudes towards the use of force by police (Carter et al. 2016). White people who had stronger opinions about racial inequality were more likely to support greater use of force (Carter et al. 2016). Culhane et al. (2017) contributes to how we have taken this route as a society by identifying how body worn camera footage was always viewed positively but then negative immediately following the media coverage of the shooting of Michael Brown. The research

suggests that body worn camera footage was viewed as positive again 1 year after the Michael Brown shooting (Culhane et al. 2017). The data suggests that the media coverage of the shooting of Michael Brown may have changed how we viewed body worn footage.

Throughout the past decade our country has had several tragedies happen that have led us to the implementation of body worn cameras. The killings of Michael Brown, Freddy Gray, Trayvon Martin and more are all tragedies that make us question our police forces and their policies. Surrounding all of these killings were racial inequalities and the minority threat perspective. Each of the three killings included a black man being killed by a white police officer. Racial inequalities were present and the minority threat perspective was too. It can be concluded that black men are in more danger of having force used against them then a white man. Both Morrow et al. (2018) and Carter et al. (2016) research supports this claim. It is also evident that police corruption is everywhere in our country (Chaney 2015) but as a whole there is a general high regard for law enforcement (Chaney 2015). This is clearly an issue that has contributed to the implementation of body worn cameras. How are police departments ever supposed to be fixed if there is a high regard for them but there is also corruption? It seems like a never ending cycle between being corrupt or being held in high regard. Hopefully the implementation of body worn cameras can fix this problem as it was the most recent step taken towards trying to do so.

The biggest problem that has led us to where we are today as a society with body worn cameras, is media coverage. The way the media portrays these tragedies and cover them is no benefit to our society. They can portray whatever they want how they want, they are able to twist some perspectives and views (Culhane et al. 2017). This leads to many problems for us as a

society because we are too reliant on the media. A concrete example of this is the usage of CNN and Fox News. CNN is more liberal sided while Fox News is more conservative sided. They both cover the same news breakings but portray them in different ways and point fingers at different people. We are split as a society because of the different portrayals of our countries news and issues. They have freedom in how they want to portray a certain story and often times we do not know which facts are right and it is a never ending debate.

Summary

There is very little research on the effectiveness of body worn cameras because they are a relatively new technology. There have been studies researching its impact on the rates of arrests, complaints and how police officers perceive them. There is conflicting data within the rate of arrests field. Different studies offer different data in terms of whether arrests increase or decrease with body worn cameras. These results may be due to the area that the study was conducted in or the circumstances being studied. There was strong data on the reduction of complaints since the installment of body worn cameras and strong data obtained from interviews with police officers. However, I found little research studying the person that interacts with police perceptions of body worn cameras. This is a gap in the literature I would like to fill, future research can include surveys and interviews with criminals who have been arrested in the presence of BWCs. As a whole more research needs to be dedicated to police-community relations post BWC installment.

3. Methods

I studied the effectiveness of body worn cameras through a content analysis. I analyze the statistics from different police departments in order to determine effectiveness. A content analysis is completed by finding outside sources (newspaper articles, journal articles, statistics, etc.) that directly relate to your topic of study and noticing data trends to form a conclusion. In my project I found various newspaper and journal articles on body worn cameras and noticed data trends and also contradicting data. I put together my findings to draw a conclusion on my topic of study. I mainly obtained data from three specific police departments using different newspaper articles and journal articles: Chicago, New York and Ferguson. I chose the articles based off of trying to find arguments for both sides. Some articles were clearly pro body worn cameras while some were against it. I did not want my data to be biased so I used both types of articles. I focused in on articles that also called upon direct statistics to provide some transparency in my data. In terms of geological location, I chose to focus on Chicago and New York for similar reasons. Both are major cities in the United States that have a very large police department, making data more generalizable to other big city police departments. Both have fairly high rates of crime and data trends were more noticeable and generalizable. They are also well connected with this topic due to their police departments problems with police racism, misconduct and violence issues. They were two of the more scrutinized police departments when it came to the news and other public outlets. I drew data from Ferguson's police department because it is the shooting of Michael Brown that sparked this whole movement. I felt that there was no better place to notice trends and immediate effects of BWC implementation than

Ferguson, Missouri. In addition to this Ferguson also has a smaller police department which could make my findings more generalizable to other small police departments. Data trends found in New York and Chicago do not apply to smaller departments as well as Ferguson does. For this reason, I also withdrew data from journal articles and newspaper articles that focused on experiments conducted in other smaller police departments throughout the country (Nebraska, Virginia, Wisconsin, California, Arizona). Different trends in the data were revealed and I found any changes in those trends since the implementation of BWCs. I also examined data from the media and different documents/clips regarding the effectiveness of BWCs.

I used the convenience sampling method when choosing what police departments to draw data from. I used whatever statistics I am able to get a hold of from major cities police departments. Data was not easy to obtain because of the fact that body worn cameras are a recent implementation. Some police departments installed them in 2014 but majority never implemented them before 2017. Due to this I focused on areas where I found I can find the most reliable data with the best chances at direct correlation in such a short period of time.

4. Content Analysis

Body Worn Cameras are a recently implemented system and little research has been done on them. I set out to find different news articles, statistics and views regarding BWCs to try and notice trends and reoccuring themes since they have been implemented. BWCs were implemented for the most part in between 2016-2017 in many police departments. This was in answer to various police protests due to fatal police shootings or police brutality. I drew some data from Ferguson, Missouri because this is where Officer Darren Wilson shot and killed black teenager Michael Brown. I also drew data from Chicago, Illinois and New York, New York due to their relevance in police brutality as well. I have picked up on trends regarding where Body Worn Cameras have been implemented, what benefits they have driven and what harms they have done as well. I also recognized BWCs have been discontinued in many police departments due to high costs.

Why were they implemented? What is the intended outcome of the implementation of BWCs?

For years there was a problem in our country regarding police brutality. Has this problem gone away? I would say no. However, our country is making attempts to eliminate this problem and one of the steps behind this is implementing body worn cameras. There have been numerous protests, some violent, throughout the nation regarding the behavior of police officers. People accuse them of acting with violence when unnecessary, for being racist, and for not being held accountable for their wrong doings. The public was demanding change and body worn cameras was the solution proposed to them. How do BWCs rebuild this trust problem between the

community and the police? They bring answers to the table. BWCs have potential to benefit many aspects of policing.

Author Amanda Ripley (New York Times) stated "After the public uprising in response to the 2014 police shooting of Michael Brown in Ferguson, Mo., advocates and many police officials turned to cameras as a way to reduce violent encounters and build trust."[1] This is one of the main focus points of BWCs, to rebuild relations between the community and their police departments. A common misconception regarding the implementation of BWCs is that they are not as needed in smaller communities compared to larger communities. Kimberly Kindy (Chicago Tribune) writes "Though urban areas with high crime rates are often viewed as having the greatest need for police body cameras, a Washington Post database that tracks fatal shootings by police shows that such occurrences are more statistically prevalent in small communities."[2] However as expected, larger departments have a higher adoption rate of BWCs. The Police Forum states "Departments with 500 or more sworn officers have the highest rate of adoption, with 46% of the departments deploying BWCs… Among departments with 100 to 499 officers, 33.9% have deployed BWCs. Among departments with 11 to 99 sworn officers, 27.5% have deployed BWCs."[3] Regardless, police departments everywhere are implementing these cameras

---

[1] https://www.nytimes.com/2017/10/20/upshot/a-big-test-of-police-body-cameras-defies-expectations.html

[2] https://www.chicagotribune.com/news/nationworld/ct-police-body-camera-costs-20190122-story.html

[3] https://www.policeforum.org/assets/BWCCostBenefit.pdf

to try and regain the public's trust. According to Brett Chapman (NIJ Gov) body worn cameras bring ""*Better transparency.* First, body-worn cameras may result in better transparency and accountability and thus may improve law enforcement legitimacy… *Increased civility.* Body-worn cameras may also result in higher rates of citizen compliance to officer commands during encounters and fewer complaints lodged against law enforcement… *Quicker resolution.* Body-worn cameras may lead to a faster resolution of citizen complaints and lawsuits that allege excessive use of force and other forms of officer misconduct… and *Corroborating evidence.* Footage captured may also be used as evidence in arrests or prosecutions."[4] Amanda Ripley of the New York Times also cited that body worn cameras will be effective in cities that lack police accountability. The Police Forum also states "Such benefits may include reductions in police use-of-force incidents, fewer complaints against officers, improvements in citizens' satisfaction with the police, and increased public perceptions of the legitimacy of police agencies."[5]

Every piece of literature that I read regarding why BWCs were implemented and what their desired effects were stated the same things. They were implemented due to lack of trust and a bad relationship between the community and their police. They were implemented to increase a sense of accountability, lower the rate of force used by police when unnecessary, provide transparency and lessen complaints.

[4] https://www.nij.gov/journals/280/Pages/body-worn-cameras-what-evidence-tells-us.aspx

[5] https://www.policeforum.org/assets/BWCCostBenefit.pdf

Police Departments Views on BWCs

When studying the implementation of BWCs and whether or not they do more good than harm I felt it was essential to study police officers opinions of them. They are the ones wearing the camera and performing their jobs under surveillance. Their opinions should be viewed as very useful. The fact that many police agencies plan to use body worn cameras at some point is definite.

The Police Forum states "Police agencies have very high interest in BWCs: More than 35% of respondents indicated that their agencies currently use BWCs, and almost 47% of respondents said they have plans to deploy cameras in the future. So more than eight out of 10 agencies either are using BWCs or are planning to do so."[6] Police Departments clearly see the potential benefits that they bring to the table. The Police Forum also states "Nearly 92% of respondents indicated that their primary reason for deploying BWCs was to promote accountability, transparency, and legitimacy. All of those goals have to do with increasing the public's trust in their police departments." The Police Forum also states "More than 85% of agencies that have adopted BWCs said they would "recommend" (19.3%) or "strongly recommend" (65.9%) that other agencies adopt BWCs."

Police Departments want what is best for the communities, they believe body worn cameras will provide accountability for police officers who do not perform their jobs correctly, transparency and legitimacy in terms of what actually happens at crime scenes. Police Departments who have adopted body worn cameras seem to be recognizing the good that it has

[6] https://www.policeforum.org/assets/BWCCostBenefit.pdf

done to their communities. This trend of responses from various police departments gives a strong supporting case to continue the implementation of BWCs. Most of the departments that have adopted them feel that they have done more good than harm and could be very beneficial in terms of police-community interactions, accountability and transparency.

BWCs Effects on Arrests, Force and Complaints

Equipping police officers with a camera at all times will have a direct effect on their job performance. It is hard to negate the fact that the rate of arrests, the rate of force being used in an altercation and the amount of complaints filed against police will change due to the implementation of body worn cameras. The question is whether or not they will change for the better or for the worse? One can argue that having an officer wear a body worn camera at all times can only decrease police altercations because it is being filmed. However, one can argue that the detainee may try to provoke the police officer more and try to get him or her to lash out while on camera. This could be putting the police officer in danger as well as the detainee. In terms of arrests, now more footage is out there and more arrests are being made leading to more people pleading guilty to crimes. I feel that it is all about perspective when looking at the change in these statistics. One can say that police officers make too many arrests that are based off racial aspects and unfair judgement. However, smaller crimes that police officers may have just let go back in the day now will be on video camera and this can cause a fairly large increase in the number of arrests.

Mike Miciag (Governing) states “In one study, 93 percent of prosecutors’ offices used camera footage primarily in prosecutions of civilians. Findings from three British studies

similarly suggest cameras might play a role in raising clearance rates and producing more guilty pleas."[7] Brett Chapman (NIJ) cited 4 different research experiments that had the same outcome. In 2014, researchers at Arizona State University found that officers with body-worn cameras were more productive in terms of making arrests, were subject to less complaints and had higher number of complaints resolved in their favor compared to officers who were not wearing cameras. Another study conducted with the Rialto (California) Police Department provided similar results, decrease in complaints and use of force incidents by the police officers wearing the camera. Chapman then went on to cite a 2016 global, multisite randomized controlled trial conducted by Barak Ariel and colleagues. Results states a decrease in the use of force when police were required to turn their cameras on arrival to the scene compared to an increase of use of force when officers used their discretion as to when to activate their cameras. Lastly, Chapman cited the 2017 experiment in Las Vegas in which data stated officers with body worn cameras generated fewer use of force reports and drew less complaints from citizens compared to officers without body worn cameras. Officers wearing the cameras also had a higher number of arrests made and citation completed.[8] The UNLV News Center also posted an article breaking down the same Las Vegas research experiment.[9] Both of these sources drew comparable claims and pointed out similar trends. Body worn cameras on police officers seem to lead to less force

---

7 https://www.governing.com/topics/public-justice-safety/gov-body-camera-effects-research-gmu-study.html

8 https://www.nij.gov/journals/280/Pages/body-worn-cameras-what-evidence-tells-us.aspx

9 *https://www.unlv.edu/news/release/study-police-body-worn-cameras-reduce-reports-misconduct-use-force*

being used, more arrests being made and less complaints being filed. However, according to Amanda Ripley (New York Times) this is not the claim that should be made: "Researchers tracked use-of-force incidents, civilian complaints, charging decisions and other outcomes to see if the cameras changed behavior. But on every metric, the effects were too small to be statistically significant. Officers with cameras used force and faced civilian complaints at about the same rates as officers without cameras."[10] Mike Maciag (Governing) agrees with Amanda Ripley. He writes "One of the top-cited reasons behind the push for body cameras has been the potential to limit officers' use of force. Six of the reviewed studies suggested officers wearing cameras were less likely to use force, but another eight studies found no statistically significant effects."[11] Agreeing with the two previous authors, Michael Ottavio (71 Republic) agrees that also states "While using physical or lethal force is never the optimal outcome for any police officer, some situations do require it. However, the study that found body cameras increase an officer's likelihood of being assaulted, also found that body cameras generally have no effect on the officer's use of force. This is most likely because of the number of cameras in modern society. Most people already assume they're already being videotaped, whether it be via cellphone or CCTV."[12] All of these authors refute the claims made by Chapman and the UNLV News Center.

---

10 https://www.nytimes.com/2017/10/20/upshot/a-big-test-of-police-body-cameras-defies-expectations.html

11 https://www.governing.com/topics/public-justice-safety/gov-body-camera-effects-research-gmu-study.html

12 *https://71republic.com/2019/03/08/police-body-cameras/*

While reading into this topic I found some conflicting data and it is clear to me that more research needs to be done to make assertions regarding BWCs effect on arrests, force and complaints. It is unclear whether or not BWCs have had a direct impact of the rate of force used, arrests made, and complaints filed. More research has to be done to come to a definite conclusion in this area. Some research points out trends that supports the raise in arrests, decrease in usage of force by police and complaints filed against them. While some point out that the change in statistics, if any, has been way too insignificant to point out a trend and make a claim regarding it.

Each Author Statement on BWC Effect on Rate of Forces, Complaints and Arrests

	Article #1 Mike Maciag	Article #2 Brett Chapman	Article #3 Amanda Ripley	Article #4 UNLV News Center	Article #5 Michael Ottavio
Force	-	<	-	<	-
Complaints	N/A	<	N/A	<	N/A
Arrests	N/A	>	N/A	>	N/A

Chicago Annual Crime Stats 2015-2019 (home.chicagopolice.org) *Implemented BWC in 2017

Chicago Crime Stats	2019	2018	2017 *BWC Implemented	2016	2015	% Change 2019-2018	% Change 2019-2017	% Change 2019-2016	% Change 2019-2015
Murder	38	64	81	85	43	-41%	-53%	-55%	-12%

Crim Sexual Asslt	294	241	244	199	177	22%	20%	48%	66%
Robbery	961	1301	1598	1455	1086	-26%	-40%	-34%	-12%
Agg Battery	644	656	721	726	569	-2%	-11%	-11%	13%
Burglary	1266	1400	1957	1712	1500	-10%	-35%	-26%	-16%
Theft	1780	1616	1914	1485	1508	10%	-7%	20%	18%
MTR Vehicle Theft	1148	1410	1754	1486	1184	-19%	-35%	-23%	-3%
Total	6131	6688	8269	7148	6067	-8%	-26%	-14%	1%

This table covers the major crime statistics of Chicago, Illinois. In relation to my study Chicago implemented body worn cameras in 2017. Total crime is down 14% since the implementation of body worn cameras. 6 of the 7 major crimes in Chicago have gone down percentage wise since the implementation of body worn cameras, Criminal Sexual Assault is the sole crime that has gone up.

New York City Crime Stats 2016-2018 (via www.nyc.gov) *Implemented BWC in 2017

	2016	**2017** ***BWC Implemented**	**2018**	% Change 2018-2016	% Change 2018-2017
Murder & Non-Negl. Manslaughter	**335**	**292**	**295**	-13%	1%
Rape	**1438**	**1449**	**1794**	22%	21%

Robbery	**15500**	**13956**	**12912**	-18%	-8%
Felony Assault	**20847**	**20052**	**20208**	-3%	1%
Burglary	**12990**	**12083**	**11687**	-11%	-3%
Grand Larceny	**44279**	**43150**	**43558**	-2%	1%
Grand Larceny of Motor Vehicle	**6327**	**5676**	**5428**	-15%	-4%
Total Seven Major Felony Offenses	**101,716**	**96,658**	**95,883**	-6%	-1%

The table above shows the annual crime statistics of New York City for the past 3 years. Body worn cameras were implemented in 2017 in New York City. Since the implementation of them, total crime has gone down 1 percent. Body worn cameras have not had a direct effect on the crime rate of New York City. The only crime that saw a spike statistically since the implementation was rape (21%).

Ferguson, Missouri Annual Crime Stats 2014-2016 (via www.city-data.com) *Implemented BWC in 2014

	2014 *BWC Implemented	2015	2016	% Change 2016-2014	% Change 2016-2015
Murders	2	5	9	127%	57%
Rapes	2	8	7	111%	-13%
Robberies	51	82	68	29%	-19%
Assaults	60	95	86	35%	-10%

Burglaries	326	366	292	-11%	-25%
Thefts	628	520	684	8%	22%
Auto Thefts	73	119	115	45%	-3%
Arson	12	6	1	-169%	-143%
Crime Index (U.S. average = 278.2	411.0	550.5	562.0	31%	2%

The table above shows the annual crime statistics from 2014-2016 in Ferguson, Missouri. I chose this time frame because body worn cameras were installed in 2014 in Ferguson. Ferguson was one of the leading cities in this movement for body worn cameras after the tragic shooting of Michael Brown. The total crime index (U.S. average=278.2) has risen a significant 31%. 6 of the 8 major crimes have increased percentage wise since body worn cameras were introduced, Arson and Burglary being the two that have gone down.

The three charts pictured above are crime statistics from three major cities focused on in this data analysis: Chicago, New York and Ferguson. Chicago and New York implemented body worn cameras in 2017, while Ferguson did so in 2014 following the shooting of Michael Brown. I am focusing mainly on the percentage change from the year BWCs were implemented in each city to the most current year. When taking this data into account, it is necessary to recognize the difference between these three cities which may contribute to the data trends. Ferguson, Missouri is a significantly smaller city than New York City and Chicago. The percentage increases and decreases are much more drastic compared to the other two because of this. Ferguson, Missouri also was filled with crime following the shooting of Michael Brown in 2014. This was also the

same year that body worn cameras were implemented therefore I drew data from this year. This crime filled response to the shooting of Michael Brown may have also affected data trends. In terms of murder, there was no trend found: Ferguson's rate of murder skyrocketed, New York City's stayed roughly the same while Chicago's drastically decreased. A potential impact of body worn cameras regarding murder is to give more evidence in terms of arresting the criminal. Video footage of the murder, witness testimonies or detainee testimonies all could contribute to this. There was a trend in the percentage change of rape and sexual assault. Chicago and New York both went up by roughly 20 percent and Ferguson by 111 percent. As previously mentioned in the data analysis body worn cameras were a concern when getting victims to come forward regarding rape and sexual assault. The data begs to differ as more and more people were being indicted for these crimes. In terms of robberies no trend was found but it could be argued that there has been less in recent years. Ferguson did not see as significant of a rise in robberies compared to other crimes while New York and Chicago actually saw a decrease. One would think that body worn cameras would lead to a higher arrest rate in terms of robberies because perhaps they are caught in the act on video. In terms of burglaries all 3 cities saw a decrease. This can be due to the fact that less people are committing the crime in fear of being caught on camera by a patrol officer or body worn cameras could not have an impact on this and the crime rate is just dropping. Both Chicago and Ferguson saw an increase in theft, which means more people are being arrested for it. Similar to murder, body worn cameras can attribute video footage and testimonies to support this rising arrest rate. When looking at this data it can be confusing because one would think body worn cameras were implemented to help lower crime rate but at the same time provide more transparency leading to more arrests. I was not able to

draw a conclusion or trend regarding crime as a whole from this short time table. Some crime rose while some crime decreased.

Privacy Issues

There are many potential benefits that body worn cameras bring to the table but there are also potential harms as well. One of the biggest areas where it could pose some harm is privacy. Some cases require privacy if they are going to work out. For example, in sexual assault cases people may not want anything to be recorded or may not want to come forward due to fear of them going on record for coming forward about their aggressor. Another example could be witness reluctance to testify against someone. People may fear retaliation from this criminal if they go on camera testifying against them. Body worn cameras changes the ball game in terms of privacy, it takes away a good majority of it. Even if complete discretion is promised, people still notice the camera and it might affect the decisions they make that could determine a case. Police officer privacy is also affected, they are required to wear them around all day and this could arguably be an invasion of privacy. One may think that it is hard for a civilian to gain access to these films however,

Dawn Kawamoto (GovTech) delivers the data: "In a 2017 scorecard report[13] from the Leadership Conference and Upturn, 67 of 75 law enforcement agencies had a personal privacy policy in place. But only 18 of the agencies had privacy policies that the two organizations deemed acceptable, meaning they specifically protected categories of vulnerable individuals, such as sex crime victims, from undergoing a recorded interaction without their expressed

[13] https://www.bwcscorecard.org

consent."[14] Kawamoto also adds "The privacy issues that have surfaced range from protesters' images captured on BWCs for later identification by law enforcement agencies to victims of crime, such as in rape cases or domestic violence disputes, recorded in vulnerable states, say civil rights groups." Amanda Ripley (New York Times) writes "The cameras also have a cost in terms of privacy violations. In a report on the policies governing police body cams in 50 major departments, Upturn and the Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights found that many cities have weak rules in place. Those rules can allow departments to refuse to share footage with civilians who want to file complaints, for example."[15] Is this necessarily a problem? No, it provides more accountability. Could it be a proposed invasion of privacy? Arguably, yes. Michael Ottavio (71 Republic) agrees, "Police often talk with victims and witnesses. More often than not, these people do not want their interactions with police filmed. Much less made public information… Public access to the footage can be very problematic in several ways. This includes hinderance with a police investigation… Not all witnesses want to be videotaped and exposed while actively taking part in an active investigation. Even more so in an area where the public is allowed access to the footage. One study found that people were less likely to talk to the

---

14 https://www.govtech.com/biz/Cops-Wearing-Cameras-What-Happens-When-Privacy-and-Accountability-Collide.html

15 https://www.nytimes.com/2017/10/20/upshot/a-big-test-of-police-body-cameras-defies-expectations.html

police if they knew they were being videotaped. Especially if they fear it may put themselves in danger of retribution from criminals."[16]

All of these authors pointed out the same potential problems. It is fair to call this a trend; body worn cameras may be an invasion of privacy in terms of witnesses, the detainees themselves and police officers. This could be a potential harm and setback for body worn cameras. Witnesses play vital parts to investigations and their testimonies are needed. If cameras scare them away from doing so, investigations could be affected and more criminals could get away with more crimes.

Cost Issues

While researching various sources and articles regarding body worn cameras this is the most prevalent issue that comes up in nearly every one of them. There is a severe cost issue regarding body worn cameras. These cost issues could wind up running body worn cameras into the ground as police departments simply cannot afford them. Not only can police departments not afford them, prosecutor offices also struggle with the costs. Good defense attorneys may shy away from taking cases involving footage because the amount of work, money and time it takes to do so.

Kimberly Kindy (Chicago Tribune) stated "Axon, a body-camera manufacturer, said every one of its clients that has canceled contracts cited costs."[17] Kindy went onto point out how

---

[16] *https://71republic.com/2019/03/08/police-body-cameras/*

[17] https://www.chicagotribune.com/news/nationworld/ct-police-body-camera-costs-20190122-story.html

3 different police departments in specific (Wahoo, Nebraska, Arlington County, Virginia and Madison, Wisconsin) each cancelled body worn cameras due to projected annual costs. Wahoo had 5 police officers on the force and the cameras cost 15,000 dollars. Arlington County, a bigger department, had an annual cost of 300,000 dollars. Madison, an averaged sized police department, had an 104,000 dollar annual cost. Kindy also answered why these costs were so high "Costs have spiked in recent years in some regions of the country because of new state laws that require long-term storage of video footage." This spike in cost and new policy regarding storage does not only take a hit on police departments but on prosecutor offices too. Kindy writes an example "Virginia legislators created a group to examine the rising costs, estimating in December that prosecutors' offices across the state collectively would need to hire 101 assistant commonwealth's attorneys and 57 paralegal and administrative positions to keep up with the extra work. These conclusions are based on the group's findings that an extra position needs to be added for every 75 body cameras, at a total cost of about $6.4 million a year." Kindy also touches on how prosecutors are worried about detainees not getting proper representation due to the amount of time and work it takes to go through the footage.[18] Similar to Kindy, Jason Katowski (GovTech) also breaks down how annual costs of body worn cameras are extremely high and problematic. He breaks down Bakersfield Police Departments cost issues with body worn cameras in specific. ""With 200 cameras, that adds up to $20,000 a month — or $240,000 a year — in storage costs. Between the purchasing and storage costs, the BPD would be spending

---

18 https://www.chicagotribune.com/news/nationworld/ct-police-body-camera-costs-20190122-story.html

about $440,000 in its first year of using body-cameras, plus an additional $240,000 every year afterward." Katowski (GovTech) also writes ""Officer Robert Rodriguez, spokesman for the Bakersfield California Highway Patrol office, said there's no doubt the CHP will eventually have body-cameras, but he doesn't believe it will be anytime soon. He said securing funding and researching the best product will take time." It is clear that half a million dollars in costs for body worn cameras is a huge obstacle for the implementation of body worn cameras. This is only the number for a smaller scale department in Bakersfield, Katowski offers some insight on one of the nation's biggest cities as well: "And departments in larger cities, the article says, can generate more than 10,000 hours of video a week, requiring some agencies to turn to cloud-based high-volume storage facilities. Storing that much data comes at a steep price. The New Orleans Police Department, according to the article, plans to pay $1.2 million for body-cameras, with much of the cost going toward storage."[19] There is no denying the fact that the cost of these cameras is extremely high, all data supports this. It is now up to police departments to decide whether or not the benefits of body worn cameras outweigh this huge con.

There is clearly a trend that this cost issue is severe. Video storage is what is actually driving up the costs of body worn cameras, not the camera themselves. These cameras bring in loads of footage and each piece of footage is required to be stored 90 days. This costs police departments massive amounts of money and some as we have already seen can not swing it. Police departments are discontinuing body worn cameras because of it and prosecutors offices

[19] https://www.govtech.com/em/safety/Police-Body-Cam-Installation.html

are taking a hit as well. It is clear that these cost issues have a big impact on all parties involved: the police departments, the prosecutor's office and the detainee themselves.

5. Conclusion

There was loads and loads of compelling literature that I was fortunate enough to go through regarding this topic. It appears to be such an epidemic in our country. Police officers seem to be under scrutiny throughout the entire nation. They are being accused of acting inexcusably while performing their job. There was no denying this fact, what I set out to accomplish was to see the deeper impacts left behind by the response to this police scrutiny. Body worn cameras purpose is to hold police officers more accountable, but its effects ripples through police departments. It is a completely new way of policing, officers now are being watched whenever they wear their uniform. This can affect police officers will to work, arrest rates, force used, complaints filed and so much more. As proven in my research the effects go so far as prosecutor offices. It is clear to me that body worn cameras are a recently implemented and unfinished product. Police departments everywhere and state governments are still trying to figure out how to perfect this new policy. Funds has been a major problem, there has been privacy concerns, storage concerns and police officer safety concerns. However, once our nation figures out how to properly handle these problems and concerns data trends suggest that body worn cameras are serving as beneficial in many aspects. At the same time data also suggests that body worn cameras have not caused a statistical change in other aspects. What I take from this is that more research needs to be done when body worn cameras are not so recently implemented.

More data trends will come up and the trends in data can become more generalizable to the nations police departments as a whole.

It was very interesting comparing the data I pulled out of my content analysis and the literature I reviewed. I looked at twenty different articles and ten different sources of content in order to draw data and notice trends regarding the implementation of body worn cameras. Some claims made by authors in the literature were supported by the data I produced while some claims were refuted. It was back and forth, this was due to the fact that body worn cameras are such a new policy in the United States. If I had the opportunity, I would look at data five years from now in order to continue to study the data and see if the smaller trends I noticed continue. Regardless, there was a definite trend in the amount of force used by police. Both the literature and the data I drew support that since the implementation of body worn cameras police use of force has gone down. In many of the cases, the use of force went down by a significant percent. This was clearly one of the desired impacts of body worn cameras, reading the literature and my data support that it was beneficial in this area. It was also evident that complaints filed against police did not increase. Majority of the literature read claimed that complaints filed against police dropped significantly but data I withdrew from my content analysis stated that there was not a significant enough impact to make a claim. It was hard to come up with a direct correlation between body worn cameras and complaints because complaints are dependant upon so much more outside factors. However, neither the data or the literature stated an increase in the amount of complaints filed against police. Both the literature and my data support that there has not been a significant enough impact to the arrests rate in police departments. It could not be pointed out if there was a direct impact on this after the implementation of body worn cameras. Both the

literature and my data support that majority of police officers are in favor of the implementation of body worn cameras. Majority of them view it as beneficial and realize that it can help build more trust between themselves and the communities.

I contributed a good amount to this topic. I continued previous literature by setting out to find trends in data. Since this is such a newly implemented policy, previous data has been very conflicting. Simply put, there just is not a lot of data to look at and draw from. This policy has only been around for half of a decade. I looked at all different types of data: statistics, police officer statements, research experiments conducted and other experts opinions. I was able to support many claims made by many other authors. This contributes to these claims being more validated by the public. As more and more data is looked at and similar trends are noticed, they become more validated. I also touched on the negatives of body worn cameras which many authors did not do. I pointed out some major concerns in terms of cost and privacy. I accomplished my goal of pointing out both the positives and negatives of body worn cameras. It is clear to me that more research needs to be done on body worn cameras. Regardless, it is transparent that body worn cameras have a lot of upside to them once they eliminate the cost concerns and privacy issues.

6. References

(Literature Review)

Ariel Barak. 2017. "Police Body Cameras In Large Police Departments." *The Journal of Criminal Law & Criminology 106*(4): 730-767.

Ariel Barak, Alex Sutherland, Darren Hanstock, Josh Young, Paul Drover, Jayne Sykes, Simon Megicks and Ryan Henderson. 2016. "Wearing Body Cameras Increases Assaults Against Officers and Does Not Reduce Police Use of Force: Results from a Global Multi-site Experiment" *European Journal of Criminology 13* (6) 744-755.

Ariel Barak, Alex Sutherland, Darren Henstock, Josh Young, Paul Drover, Jayne Sykes, Simon Megicks and Ryan Henderson. 2016. "Report: increases in police use of force in the presence of body-worn cameras are driven by officer discretion: a protocol-based subgroup analysis of ten randomized experiments." *J Exp Criminol* 12:453–463.

Boivin et al. 2017. "The Body Worn Camera Perspective Bias." *J Exp Criminol* (13) 125-42.

Carter, Scott J. and Corra Mamadi. 2016. "Racial Resentment and Attitudes Toward the Use of Force by Police: An Over-Time Trend Analysis." *Sociology Inquiry* 86(4) 492-511.

Chaney Cassandra, 2015. "Institutional Racism." *The Western Journal of Black Studies* 39(4) 312-330.

Darren Henstock and Barak Ariel. 2017. "Testing the effects of police body-worn cameras on use of force during arrests: A randomised controlled trial in a large British police force." *European Journal of Criminology* 14(6).

Goetschel Max and Jon M. Peha. 2017. "Police Perceptions of Body-Worn Cameras" *CrossMark 42*: 698-726.

Gramagila et al. 2018. "Police Officers' Perceptions of Body-Worn Cameras in Buffalo and Rochester." *American Journal of Criminal Justice* 43 (2).

Hedberg E. C., Charles M. Katz, and David E. Choate. 2016. "Body-Worn Cameras and Citizen Interactions with Police Officers: Estimating Plausible Effects Given Varying Compliance Levels". *Justice Quarterly 34* (4). 627-651.

Jennings G. Wesley, Lorie A. Fridell, Mathew Lynch, Katelyn K. Jetelina, and Jennifer M. Reingle Gonzalez. 2016. "A Quasi-Experimental Evaluation of the Effects of Police Body-Worn Cameras (BWCs) on Response-to-Resistance in a Large Metropolitan Police Department." *Deviant Behavior* 38 (11):1332-1339.

Kyle J. Michael and David R. White. 2017. "The impact of law enforcement officer perceptions of organizational justice on their attitudes regarding body-worn cameras." *Journal of Crime and Justice* 40 (1) 68-83.

Michael Foucault. 1975. "Discipline and Punish: the Birth of the Prison". *Gallimard*. 200.

Morrow J. Weston et al. 2018. "Police use of force: an examination of minority threat perspective." *Criminal Justice Studies* 31(4) 368-387.

Nowacki S. Jeffrey and Willits Dale. 2018. "Adoption of body cameras by United States police agencies: an organisational analysis." *Policing and Society* 28 (7) 841-853.

Ready T., Justin and Jacob T.N. Young. 2015. "The impact of on-officer video cameras on police–citizen contacts: findings from a controlled experiment in Mesa, AZ." *J Exp Criminol* 11:445-458.

Sandhu Ajay. 2016. "Camera-friendly Policing: How the Police Respond to Cameras and Photographers." *Surveillance & Society* 14(1). 78-89.

Scott E. Culhane and Kimberly Schweitzer. 2017 "Police shootings and body cameras one year post Ferguson". *Policing and Society* 28(9) 1038-1049.

Smylka Ortiz John, Matthew S. Crow, Vaughn J. Crichlow, and Jamie A. Snyder. 2016. "Police Body-Worn Cameras: Perceptions of Law Enforcement Leadership". *Am J Crim Just* (41) 424-443.

Taylor Emmeline, Lee Murray, Matthew Willis, and Alexandra Gannoni. 2017. "Police detainee perspectives on police body-worn cameras." *Trends and Issues in Crime and Criminal Justice* 537.

(Content Analysis)

Chapman, Brett. "NIJ Journal Issue No. 280." *National Institute of Justice*, National Institute of Justice, 15 Nov. 2018, nij.gov/journals/280/Pages/welcome.aspx.

Katowski, Jason. "Money, Storage Primary Obstacles in Police Body Camera Implementation." *Government Technology State & Local Articles - E.Republic*, GovTech, 8 Mar. 2016, www.govtech.com/em/safety/Police-Body-Cam-Installation.html.

Kawamoto, Dawn. "Cops Wearing Cameras: What Happens When Privacy and Accountability Collide?" *Government Technology State & Local Articles - E.Republic*,

GovTech, 3 Aug. 2018, www.govtech.com/biz/Cops-Wearing-Cameras-What-Happens-When-Privacy-and-Accountability-Collide.html.

Kindy, Kimberly. "Some U.S. Police Departments Dump Body-Camera Programs amid High Costs." *Chicagotribune.com*, Chicago Tribune, 22 Mar. 2019, www.chicagotribune.com/news/nationworld/ct-police-body-camera-costs-20190122-story.html.

Maciag, Mike. "Police Body Cameras Aren't Having the Effects Many Expected". *Governing*, Governing, 25 March 2019, https://www.governing.com/topics/public-justice-safety/gov-body-camera-effects-research-gmu-study.html

News Center, UNLV. "Study: Police Body-Worn Cameras Reduce Reports of Misconduct, Use of Force." *University of Nevada, Las Vegas*, UNLV, 27 Nov. 2017, www.unlv.edu/news/release/study-police-body-worn-cameras-reduce-reports-misconduct-use-force.

Ottavio, Michael. "Body Cameras May Do More Harm Than Good." *71 Republic*, 71 Republic Media, 8 March 2019, *https://71republic.com/2019/03/08/police-body-cameras/*

Police Executive Research Forum. 2018. "Cost and Benefits Of Body-Worn Camera Deployments." *Police Forum*

Ripley, Amanda. "A Big Test of Police Body Cameras Defies Expectations." *The New York Times*, The New York Times, 20 Oct. 2017, www.nytimes.com/2017/10/20/upshot/a-big-test-of-police-body-cameras-defies-expectations.html.