

Community supervision officers' perspective on body worn cameras

by

Mari-Esther Edwards

B.A., University of New Mexico, 2005
M.S., New Mexico State University, 2008

AN ABSTRACT OF A DISSERTATION

submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Department of Sociology, Anthropology, and Social Work
College of Arts and Sciences

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY
Manhattan, Kansas

2022

Abstract

The purpose of this dissertation is to examine how community supervision officers (CSO) and administrators perceive the use of body-worn cameras (BWCs) by a community supervision agency. Community supervision agencies provide supervision to criminal offenders in lieu of them being incarcerated in a prison or jail. The two main types of community supervision are probation and parole. A CSO's role involves using both punitive (control) and rehabilitative resources (referring clients to treatment programs) in the provision of case management services (Healey, 1999). This was a qualitative exploratory study. Seventeen (17) semi-structured interviews were conducted over Zoom with a community supervision department in the southern region of the United States to answer the two overarching research questions: (1) *How do CSOs and administrators view the potential impacts of BWCs on behavior, intra-departmental relations, and public relations?* and (2) *How do CSOs and administrators perceive the use of BWCs will shape the execution of their day-to-day work duties?* Based on the results of this dissertation, respondents indicated that BWCs may facilitate the fulfillment of various case management duties, officer training, and client and officer accountability; however, they were concerned that these devices may hinder rapport between the client and CSO, create privacy issues, present technological problems, and incur a financial burden. Agencies may want to reconsider implementing BWCs until greater clarity is gained regarding the impact of such devices on the department's legitimacy within the community, accountability among officers, and prevalence of citizen complaints. Further, it is recommended that a cost benefit analysis be conducted prior to implementing BWCs within community supervision agencies.

Community supervision officers' perspective on body worn cameras

by

Mari-Esther Edwards

B.A., University of New Mexico, 2005
M.S., New Mexico State University, 2008

A DISSERTATION

submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Department of Sociology, Anthropology, and Social Work
College of Arts and Sciences

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY
Manhattan, Kansas

2022

Approved by:

Major Professor
Kevin Steinmetz

Copyright

© Mari-Esther Edwards 2022.

Abstract

The purpose of this dissertation is to examine how community supervision officers (CSO) and administrators perceive the use of body-worn cameras (BWCs) by a community supervision agency. Community supervision agencies provide supervision to criminal offenders in lieu of them being incarcerated in a prison or jail. The two main types of community supervision are probation and parole. A CSO's role involves using both punitive (control) and rehabilitative resources (referring clients to treatment programs) in the provision of case management services (Healey, 1999). This was a qualitative exploratory study. Seventeen (17) semi-structured interviews were conducted over Zoom with a community supervision department in the southern region of the United States to answer the two overarching research questions: (1) *How do CSOs and administrators view the potential impacts of BWCs on behavior, intra-departmental relations, and public relations?* and (2) *How do CSOs and administrators perceive the use of BWCs will shape the execution of their day-to-day work duties?* Based on the results of this dissertation, respondents indicated that BWCs may facilitate the fulfillment of various case management duties, officer training, and client and officer accountability; however, they were concerned that these devices may hinder rapport between the client and CSO, create privacy issues, present technological problems, and incur a financial burden. Agencies may want to reconsider implementing BWCs until greater clarity is gained regarding the impact of such devices on the department's legitimacy within the community, accountability among officers, and prevalence of citizen complaints. Further, it is recommended that a cost benefit analysis be conducted prior to implementing BWCs within community supervision agencies.

Table of Contents

List of Tables	vii
Acknowledgements.....	viii
Dedication	ix
Preface.....	x
Chapter 1 - Introduction.....	1
Chapter 2 - Literature Review.....	7
Chapter 3 - Current Study	23
Chapter 4 - Methods.....	33
Chapter 5 - Potential Impacts of BWCs in Community Supervision	42
Chapter 6 - BWCs in Day-To-Day Operations	59
Chapter 7 - Correlating Results with Established Theories	80
Chapter 8 - Conclusion	95
Bibliography	100
Appendix A - IRB Approval.....	109
Appendix B - Project Summary	110
Appendix C - Interview Schedule.....	112
Appendix D - Dual Community Supervision States	114

List of Tables

Table 1.1 Descriptive Demographics of Sample Population (n=17)	36
--	----

Acknowledgements

I would like to acknowledge my dissertation committee and all professors who have mentored and trained me in my academic journey. First and foremost, Dr. Steinmetz stepped in, without any hesitation, to provide guidance, support, and the push needed to complete this dissertation. Dr. Goe aided in the primary stages of this dissertation journey and continued to support me even after his retirement. I am forever grateful for the continuous words of encouragement, speediness of proofreading drafts, and re-directing when needed. Third, Dr. Williams who gave me the opportunity to work on a federal grant from beginning to end – the lessons learned, and knowledge gained is truly appreciated. To the faculty at Kansas State University who always provided a listening ear and encouragement for all students. Lastly, to my doctoral cohort – thank you for providing a safe environment where we would lean on one another, grow with each other, and holding each other accountable.

I would like to share my appreciation to my family who aided in supporting, motivating, and caring for me throughout this process. To my daughters for understanding the time I had to set aside to complete my studies. To my siblings (Waldo, Jessica, and David) for encouraging me, listening to me, taking care of my girls, and pampering me (especially when I was neglecting myself). A special thanks to Tina Winborn for the assistance you gave me throughout my whole doctoral program – words cannot describe how grateful I am for you. Thank you, Renee Winborn, for always listening to my rants, loving me for me, and being a voice of reason. I am forever grateful for everyone who continued to believe in me, even when I did not.

Dedication

Dedicated to my daughters Helena Esperanza Villegas and Briana Marie Edwards, who were my motivation throughout this journey.

Preface

Throughout this dissertation, some of the information provided is based on academic research and personal field experience -from approximately seven years of personal experience working under community corrections in two different states in the United States. I was the lead Graduate Research Assistant for the Kansas Juvenile Justice Coalition, a 2-year grant-funded project aimed at: 1) increasing knowledge and awareness of juvenile justice issues, 2) evaluating local strengths and challenges in addressing needs for at-risk youth through study circles, 3) data collection and analysis, and 4) aiding in the creation and distribution of a comprehensive final report and toolkit. The knowledge I gained from working and researching juvenile community supervision remains relevant when evaluating a perspective based on either employees or clients with a background in the juvenile justice system. The different titles I held while working for a community corrections agency were: 1) Adult Probation and Parole Officer under the Department of Corrections, 2) Juvenile Probation and Parole Supervisor under the Department of Juvenile Justice, 3) Juvenile Program Manager under the Department of Juvenile Justice, 4) Community Supervision Officer under the Department of Community Supervision, and currently 5) Corrections Department Academy Instructor, Screener, and Recruiter. It is important to point out my own experience, as this continues to shape my own lens and personal bias of the issue. Recognizing my personal bias helps me be as objective as possible when analyzing the data. My hope is that this dissertation begins the discussion about the utilization of body-worn cameras within community supervision by bringing the voice of community supervision employees to the table.

Chapter 1 - Introduction

A new era of uncertainty and unrest has arisen due to a combination of elements: the Covid-19 pandemic, the Capitol Hill riot (2021), and many county-wide protests after the tragic deaths of Ahmaud Arbery (2020), Breonna Taylor (2020), George Floyd Jr. (2020), and Rayshard Brooks (2020), among others. Tensions between minority communities and law enforcement have increased, highlighted by the hesitance to charge past and/or current police officers for their involvement in the deaths of Arbery, Taylor, and Floyd Jr.¹ Video footage that was captured by both citizens and by an officer's body-worn camera (BWC) has spread throughout various social media outlets, leaving individuals to piece together a picture of what transpired that led to the deaths of the aforementioned individuals.

In 2014, President Obama created a task force on policing due to the media coverage of police brutality that resulted in the deaths of Tamir Rice in Cleveland (2014), Michael Brown in Ferguson (2014), Eric Garner in New York City (2014), Walter Scott in North Charleston (2015), and Freddie Gray in Baltimore (2015); it was also created because police departments' legitimacy and trust within their communities were suffering (Coudert, Butin, & Le Metayer, 2015; Stalcup & Hahn, 2016; Hedberg, Katz, & Choate, 2017). One recommendation that came out of this task force was the implementation of body-worn cameras (BWCs) in law enforcement (President's Task Force on 21st Century Policing, 2015). Federal grants were created to implement BWCs to increase a police department's legitimacy, accountability, and transparency

¹ Travis McMichael, Greg McMichael, and William Bryan were convicted of murdering Ahmaud Arbery in Brunswick, Georgia. The defendants were sentenced to life in prison without the possibility of parole for federal hate crime charges by Superior Court Judge Timothy Walmsley on January 7, 2022 (Chappell, Hernandez, & Diaz, 2022). One former Louisville detective was indicted for wanton endangerment of the neighbor's apartment in September 2021; however, Breonna Taylor's death became a tragic incident that occurred while officers were doing their job. Derek Chauvin was found guilty of second-degree murder, third-degree murder, and second-degree manslaughter for the murder of George Floyd, Jr. (Oppel, Jr., Taylor, & Bogel-Burroughs, April 26, 2021).

within the community. As of 2016, 47 percent of law enforcement agencies who responded to a national survey had implemented BWCs, according to the Bureau of Justice Statistics (BJS) (Hyland, 2018). In 2016, about 80 percent of the police departments that employ 500 or more full-time sworn officers either acquired or implemented BWCs within their department (Hyland, 2018). BWCs have been utilized in various police departments around the United States as a risk aversion technique. Some police departments embraced the mentality that BWCs would: (1) increase their legitimacy within the community (Crow, Snyder, Crichlow & Smykla, 2017; Goodison & Wilson, 2017; Wright & Headley, 2020), (2) increase accountability among the officers (Hyatt, Mitchell & Ariel, 2017; Newell & Greidanus, 2018), (3) decrease citizen complaints (Goetschel & Peha, 2017; Smykla, Crow, Crichlow & Snyder, 2016; Goodison & Wilson, 2017), and (4) be used for officer training purposes (Pelfrey & Keener, 2018).

Like police departments, community corrections (also called community supervision) agencies have adopted the use of BWCs to increase legitimacy and accountability among the officers and their clientele (American Probation and Parole Association, 2020).² Thus, there is the potential that a significant proportion of the corrections population will be subjected to BWC monitoring. According to the Bureau of Justice Statistics (BJS), an estimated 1 in 58 adults in the United States was being supervised through community corrections in 2018, and approximately 4,399,000 persons were under “the jurisdiction of an adult court or correctional agency” (Kaeble & Alper, 2020, pp. 1-2).

² According to the BJS, community corrections, probation, and parole are defined as follows: **Community corrections** is the supervision of criminal offenders in the resident population, as opposed to confining offenders in secure correctional facilities. The two main types of community corrections supervision are probation and parole. Community corrections is also referred to as community supervision. **Probation** is a court-ordered period of correctional supervision in the community, generally as an alternative to incarceration. In some cases, probation may be a combined sentence involving incarceration followed by a period of community supervision. **Parole** is a period of conditional supervised release in the community following a term in state or federal prison. Parolees include persons released through discretionary or mandatory supervised release from prison (BJS, n.d.).

A community supervision officer's (CSO's) role involves using both punitive (control) and rehabilitative resources (referring clients to treatment programs) in the provision of case management services (Healey, 1999). The punitive approach focuses on surveillance and control of the client, displayed through the enforcement of rules and sanctioning of the client (Healey, 1999; Schaefer & Williamson, 2018). The client is under constant observation by the community, law enforcement, and mental health treatment providers in conjunction with the community supervision agency. The CSO may be required to complete field visits and collateral contacts to observe and denote the client's progress in following supervision guidelines and their reintegration into society. A collateral contact consists of speaking with a third-party person who has knowledge of the client. The rehabilitative approach focuses on social and psychological aspects of criminality through a more supportive role that incorporates rehabilitative services and treatment programs (Healey, 1999; Schaefer & Williamson, 2018).

Community supervision agencies are part of an invisible population that is mainly discussed among criminal justice practitioners, certain academic fields that examine social or human behaviors, and the clientele or special population that they serve. Consequently, the amount of academic research discussing BWC usage by CSOs is minimal. Upon examination of the relevant BWC literature, it appears that the only extant empirical research focuses on the perceptions, policy implications, and the implementation of BWCs in police departments and correctional facilities. There is a sparse amount of research completed examining the utilization of BWCs within community supervision agencies. It is important to study the implementation of BWCs in community supervision agencies because such devices may affect a CSO's ability to perform their job duties, causing adverse effects on their clients and the community. Like public safety departments, the adverse effects could be use of excessive force, abuse of authority, and

mistreatment of clients. Community supervision agencies are a hybrid of both law enforcement and social worker attributes, responsible for the supervision and reintegration of individuals who are placed under their jurisdiction; thus, the implementation of BWCs is unique.

This study examines the perceptions of CSOs and administrators regarding the utilization of BWCs within community supervision agencies through a qualitative approach. This study is exploratory in nature and leans heavily on qualitative methodology and analysis to provide a glimpse of how BWCs are perceived within a community supervision agency. This study explores a variety of issues regarding CSO perceptions of and concerns with BWC technologies, in community supervision agencies, corresponding to two keystone research questions:

- 1) *How do CSOs and administrators view the potential impacts of BWCs on behavior, intra-departmental relations, and public relations?*
- 2) *How do CSOs and administrators perceive the use of BWCs will shape the execution of their day-to-day work duties?*
- 3) *How can we make sense of these findings through established theories?*

Organization of Dissertation

Chapter Two of this study provides a literature review regarding the usage of BWCs within policing and community supervision, based on the recommendation from the President's Task Force on 21st Century Policing (2015) to implement new technology (e.g., BWCs) and utilize social media. Chapter Three situates the current study within the empirical literature and explains its relevance for community supervision. In addition, the study explains the basis for the current study, establishing its central research questions. Chapter Four discusses the methodology used to study CSOs' and administrators' perceptions of BWCs. This is a qualitative exploratory study that used active interviewing techniques. Using this method

allowed for a more flexible interview structure to be used that created a more welcoming environment to provide for richer content. It is recommended to complete interviews in-person to capture all verbal and non-verbal response to questions; however, proximity to research site, COVID-19 restrictions, and tropical storms hindered my ability to complete the interviews in-person. Interviews were conducted using video conferencing technology. Active listening, positive body language, and an environment clear of distractions was used to reduce any potential loss of information the participants wanted to divulge. Seventeen (17) semi-structured interviews were conducted with a community supervision department in the southern region of the United States.

The second half of the dissertation discusses the results of the study and concludes implications and ideas for future research. Chapter Five explores the results of the analysis regarding the potential impacts BWCs have on behavior of clients and CSOs, intra-departmental relations, and public relations, as established in the policing literature. The respondents indicated that BWCs would have some sort of effect on the behavior of clients and CSOs. In examining intra-departmental relations, this study considers the roles of organizational and procedural justice. Organizational justice was examined through participant responses regarding their communications with supervisors and executive staff. Most of the respondents indicated that they speak freely with their direct supervisors, and they would view the BWC footage objectively, whereas their ability to communicate freely with the executive staff is inhibited by a few factors. Procedural justice was assessed by the respondents' perception of executive staff and supervisors' ability to view BWC footage objectively. Most of the respondents perceived that the executive staff and supervisors would view BWC footage objectively. The results of the analysis also indicate that officers thought BWCs could impact public relations, specifically how

the public views the department's level of transparency, accountability, and legitimacy in the community. Most of the respondents indicated that BWCs may increase accountability among CSOs and clients. Many of the respondents stated that BWCs would not affect the legitimacy and transparency of the department with the community.

Chapter Six discusses the perceptions of CSOs and administrators regarding the potential impact of BWCs on their basic day-to-day job duties. Overall, the respondents indicated that BWCs may be useful in completing various case management duties, as an aid in officer training, and increasing officer and client accountability. However, there are potentially multiple disadvantages to implementing BWCs within community supervision, such as: hindering rapport between the client and CSO, privacy considerations, technological limitations, and the financial cost. Chapter Seven addresses the third research question which provides a brief discussion applying the results to established theories. The results are applicable to Foucauldian logic, specifically disciplinary power, Ritzer's McDonaldization, and resource dependency theory. Finally, Chapter Eight provides a summary of the results of this dissertation, as well as the limitations of the study and concludes with suggestions for future research.

Chapter 2 - Literature Review

There is limited academic literature on BWCs within community supervision departments. For instance, the American Probation and Parole Association (APPA) conducted a survey in 2017 regarding the use of BWCs among their membership. The survey indicated that five departments/agencies within their membership group used BWCs, while one state community supervision agency, four county probation departments, and 23 other agencies used a similar recording device (e.g., smartphone, tablet) (APPA, 2020). The survey confirmed the need for further academic research regarding the effect of BWCs in community corrections (APPA, 2020). Further, CSOs' job duties consist of a hybrid of social work and law enforcement. The law enforcement aspect of the CSOs job provides them with arresting authority and capability to carry a firearm as part of their uniform. At times, the public may confuse CSOs with that of a police officer due to the similarities in uniform. Thus, the academic literature on BWCs and law enforcement is applicable to this study. This academic literature review provides a summary of BWCs within law enforcement. The research is separated into five main themes: (1) community relations, (2) discretion and privacy, (3) occupational device, (4) additional considerations, and (5) theoretical explanations.

Community Relations

According to the final report of the 2015 President's Task Force on 21st Century Policing, BWCs were implemented to increase police legitimacy, increase accountability, and build mutual trust between the police department and the community. Two studies interviewed external stakeholders, officers, and citizens regarding their perceptions and experiences about implementing BWCs in the local police department (Todak, Gaub, & White, 2018; White, Todak, & Gaub, 2018). The department's transparency regarding their BWC policy with their

officers and external stakeholders increased the positive support for and integration and acceptance of BWCs by all parties involved (White et al., 2018). There should be different BWC policies to take into consideration the mission-specific duties of the officers (e.g., executing a warrant, speaking with a confidential informant, interviewing a victim of human trafficking) (Gaub, Todak, & White, 2020). Further, it becomes imperative for police departments to discuss the benefits and shortcomings of BWCs to avoid any confusion among both the officers and the community members (Todak et al., 2018; White et al., 2018).

For the most part, the public has a positive perception regarding the use of BWCs within law enforcement departments (Crow et al., 2017; McClure, Vigne, Lynch, Golian, Lawrence, & Malm, 2017; Taylor & Lee, 2019a; Taylor & Lee, 2019b; White, Todak, & Gaub, 2017; Sousa, Miethe, & Sakiyama, 2018; White, Todak et al., 2018; Wright & Headley, 2020). Community members who had positive perceptions of the police held positive perceptions toward the use of BWCs (Crow et al., 2017; Sousa et al., 2018). On the other hand, community members who were skeptical of the police, and who were concerned about being treated fairly by the police, were neutral in their perception of the effectiveness of the BWC; from their point of view, BWCs would not improve how they are treated by the police (Crow et al., 2017). Another study used vignettes to examine how the presence of a BWC or smartphone affected the participant's willingness to comply with police instruction provided in the vignette (Roche, 2019). The study concluded that the presence of a BWC provided a "comforting" effect but was uncorrelated with the citizen's "intent to comply" with police officer directives (Roche, 2019). Being wrongfully accused of criminal activities increased the emotional reaction of fear and anger, reducing the participant's willingness to comply with the police officer (Roche, 2019, p. 1117).

Another study conducted an experiment gauging community perception regarding their support for the utilization of BWCs within law enforcement by testing both their overt and true support (Bromberg & Charbonneau, 2018, p. 883). Overt support occurs when a participant overly expresses their support due to hesitance in responding to sensitive type questions (Bromberg & Charbonneau, 2018). In contrast, true support occurs when a participant can express themselves anonymously to reduce the hesitance of answering sensitive questions that may bring social repercussions (Bromberg & Charbonneau, 2018). The methodology to test overt and true support aids in reducing the amount of social bias when conducting surveys that ask questions that are socially sensitive or cover controversial issues. The researchers discovered that the use of BWCs in low-income urban neighborhoods had a low overt support of 20%, but true support increased to 37% (Bromberg & Charbonneau, 2018). The 17% decrease in support for the use of BWCs within racial minority neighborhoods shows the real perception of how the utilization of BWCs within policing would help in increasing the legitimacy, accountability, and transparency of law enforcement. The results showed there was overt support for BWCs, but true support decreased regarding police accountability and transparency issues (Bromberg & Charbonneau, 2018, p. 889).

White et al. (2017) conducted a phone survey with individuals who had a BWC-recorded police encounter to examine their perceptions and awareness of BWCs and if their behavior was affected by the presence of a BWC during the encounter. Most citizens reported high satisfaction with how they were treated during the encounter (White et al., 2017). For instance, the “white respondents reported higher levels of procedural justice than minority citizens” (White et al., 2017, p. 696), indicating that more than the implementation of BWCs is needed to improve law enforcement and community relations, specifically with racial minorities.

Another emerging area of study concerns the use of BWCs in conjunction with facial recognition technology. A survey examined the “public’s support for the adoption of facial recognition technology utilized through BWCs” (Bromberg, Charbonneau, & Smith, 2020, p. 1). The study found that there was a social desirability for police discretion regarding real-time facial recognition technology of BWCs in New Hampshire specifically, and in the United States more generally (Bromberg et al., 2020). True support was lower than the overt support provided, indicating concern among some citizens regarding the use of facial recognition through BWCs in policing (Bromberg et al., 2020). Citizens indicated that the officers should use facial recognition technology on a discretionary basis, such as during official police encounters (Bromberg et al., 2020). Citizens also expressed concern over the possibility of facial recognition misidentification and further disenfranchisement of racial minorities (Bromberg et al., 2020). Based on the results of Bromberg and Charbonneau (2018) and White and associates (2017) studies unjust treatment of racial minorities by law enforcement has created a level of generational mistrust that will take restructuring of policing operations and changing of policing culture versus the implementation of BWCs to affect lasting change.

Accountability

Accountability was measured through the effectiveness of BWCs on citizen complaints and officer behavior. Research has found mixed results concerning BWCs’ impact (either directly or indirectly) on officer and/or citizen behavior, measured through citizen complaints, internal complaints, use of force incident reports, arrest rates, and amount of officer discretion (Lum, Stoltz, Koper, & Scherer, 2019). Most BWC studies concluded that BWCs reduced the amount of citizen complaints or impacted citizen behavior when the BWC was present (Katz,

Choate, Ready, & Nuno, 2014; Ready & Young, 2015; Ariel, Farrar, & Sutherland, 2015; Sutherland, Ariel, Farrar, & De Anda, 2017).

There were mixed findings regarding the effectiveness of BWCs in reducing officer use of force, which was one of the main premises for nationwide funding through the President's Task Force on 21st Century Policing (2015). Early studies that examined BWCs and officers' use of force and citizen resistance toward officers found promising results based on the reduction in use of force incidents (Ariel et al., 2015; Braga, Sousa, Coldren Jr., & Rodriguez, 2018) and citizen resistance (Jennings, Lynch, & Fridell, 2015; Braga, Sousa et al., 2018) when the officer was wearing a BWC. For example, Ariel et al. (2015) examined the effect of BWCs on officers' use of force and found a reduction within the Rialto Police Department (California). In a follow-up study three years after the conclusion of the experiment, the reduction in citizen complaints and use of force incidents remained (Sutherland et al., 2017). The effect of BWCs within the Rialto Police Department provided in the follow-up study three years later cannot be generalized to all police departments. BWCs may be correlated within the reduction of citizen complaints and use of force incidents, as one statistical saying goes, "correlation does not imply causation." Within the Rialto Police Department, BWCs were implemented alongside a "renewed focus on police-citizen encounters," which may also contribute to the reduction of citizen complaints and use of force incidents (Sutherland et al., 2017, p.114).

Secondly, officers may have less resistance towards using BWCs as Sutherland and colleagues (2017) found that BWCs worn over an extended period become viewed as part of the uniform—a tool of the trade. Other studies found no statistically significant results among officers who wore a BWC and those who did not, when comparing the officer's use of force incidents (Peterson, Yu, La Vigne, & Lawrence, 2018), officer injury (White, Gaub, & Todak,

2018), or rate of arrest or resistance (Hedberg et al., 2017). For instance, Yokum, Ravishankar, and Coppock, (2019) conducted a randomized control trial to evaluate the effectiveness of BWCs through comparing departmental records of police officers' use of force and citizen complaints. Yokum et al. (2019) found no statistically significant effects between the comparison groups consisting of officers with a BWC and those without. Similarly, another study found no statistical reductions in the use of force or citizen complaints during the 6-month randomized controlled trial period between the two groups (White et al., 2018). Thus, there may be other reasons why the department had a reduction in citizen complaints and officer use of force incidents, such as citizens being desensitized to constant surveillance (Yokum et al., 2019). Another reason is the police department had low levels of citizen complaints and use of force incidents to begin with; thus, the implementation of BWCs for this purpose was unwarranted (White et al., 2018). Overall, BWCs are beneficial due to evidence indicating a reduction of "spurious complaints" and police misconduct (Thomsen, 2020). However, there are disparities and limitations across studies regarding the true effectiveness of BWCs' in improving community relations and increasing police departments' legitimacy, transparency, and accountability (Bromberg et al., 2018; Lum et al., 2019; White et al., 2017; White et al., 2018; Wright & Headley, 2020).

Discretion and Privacy

An element that may affect officer behavior is the departmental BWC policy, specifically the amount of the officer's discretion regarding BWC activation. For instance, Young and Ready (2016) conducted a longitudinal analysis examining officers' activation of BWCs, depending on mandatory versus discretionary BWC activation policy, and officer preference measured through officers volunteering to wear a BWC or being mandated to wear a BWC

(Young & Ready, 2016). They concluded that BWC activation occurred more often through the implementation of a mandatory activation policy over a discretionary activation policy; officers who volunteered to wear a BWC had higher activation rates than officers who were mandated to wear a BWC (Young & Ready, 2016).

From an officer's perspective, the amount of discretion they can use regarding the activation of their BWC recording depends on the circumstances of the situation, e.g., speaking with confidential informants, victims of sexually related crimes, or private conversations (Smykla et al., 2016; Newell & Greidanus, 2018). For instance, one study examined officers' perceptions before and after the implementation of BWCs across two divisions of the Los Angeles Police Department (Wooditch, Uchida, Solomon, Revier, Connor, Shutinya, McCluskey, & Swatt, 2020). The results indicated that officers' concerns regarding the invasion of citizen privacy diminished following implementation among certain populations (homeless, private residence, severe traffic accidents, mentally or physically challenged), whereas concerns over privacy issues increased with victims of domestic violence and sexual assault (Wooditch et al., 2020).

Officers held mixed perceptions regarding a BWC's ability to affect an officer's decision to use force in a situation (Jennings et al., 2014; Smykla et al., 2016). One study concluded that officers believe that the usage of BWCs with citizen-officer encounters would reduce citizen complaints (Jennings et al., 2014; Pelfrey & Keener, 2018; Lawshe, Burruss, Giblin, & Schafer, 2019), whereas other studies held mixed findings (Smykla et al., 2016; Headley, Guerette, & Shariati, 2017). Some officers believe that they should have discretion regarding the activation of their BWCs; however, there are mixed findings concerning the amount of discretion the

officer should have (Gramagila & Phillips, 2018; Smykla et al., 2016; Newell & Greidanus, 2018; Wooditch et al., 2020).

Some of the unintended consequences that may arise from mandatory BWC activation is officers hesitating to use any type of force, physical or verbal, within an interaction, which can increase the likelihood of officers being injured by citizens (Smykla et al., 2016; Ariel, Sutherland, Henstock, Young, Drover, Sykes, Megicks, & Henderson, 2018; Ariel, Sutherland, Henstock, Young & Sosinski, 2018; Rowe, Pearson, & Turner, 2018). An officer being under constant surveillance through mandatory BWC activation leads to an increase of self-awareness, coupled with public scrutiny. In turn, this increases the likelihood of the officer acting less aggressively and displaying more “socially desirable” behaviors (Ariel, Sutherland, Henstock, Young, Drover et al., 2018). The officer may use less force than the situation calls for, increasing the chance for the officer to get hurt from the encounter (Ariel, Sutherland, Henstock, Young, Drover et al., 2018). Officers use emotional regulation as part of their encounters and use counteractions to try and keep the emotions of the other person from escalating (Makin, Willits, Koslicki, Brooks, Dietrich & Bailey, 2019). To aid in reducing these unintended consequences created by mandatory BWC activation, prior research recommends police departments to solicit buy-in from the officers before and during the implementation process of BWCs to achieve a higher level of acceptance, coupled with a mandatory activation policy (Huff, Katz, Webb & Hedberg, 2020; Jennings et al., 2014; Kyle & White, 2017; Wooditch et al., 2020).

Another unintended consequence of BWC implementation is the possible encroachment of citizens’ privacy whether they are a bystander captured on BWC footage or a victim of sexual and domestic violence (Adams & Mastracci, 2017). Bystanders of a police-citizen encounter

have a chance of being captured on BWC footage without their knowledge or permission (Braga et al., 2018; Coudert et al., 2015; Harvard Law Review Association, 2015). Further, victims of sexual and domestic violence can be re-victimized through the BWC footage being used as primary evidence within the criminal justice system, which creates a basis for the victim to be scrutinized. The possibility of being revictimized through the criminal justice system can lead to victims of sexual and domestic violence avoiding any police encounter, leaving the most vulnerable populations without police protection (Adams & Mastracci, 2017). A point of discussion within this research is law enforcement's ability to use the BWC's facial recognition abilities while on patrol; the implications regarding privacy and misidentification issues lead to possible constitutional violations (Bromberg et al., 2020; Ringrose, 2019). Thus, it is important for a police department to be transparent with the encompassing community regarding their BWC policy that should incorporate safeguards to protect the identities of any bystanders and victims captured on video. An ethical consideration that must be considered regarding the implementation of BWCs within a police department is citizens' and officers' right to privacy, which can affect the legitimacy of the department. However, Thomsen (2020) argues that BWCs should be conditionally accepted, as the encroachment of citizen privacy is smaller in cost than the benefits that the community receives (i.e., the benefits reduced citizen complaints and reduced police misconduct, outweighing the cost of bystanders and citizen interactions being filmed).

Occupational Device

BWCs were positively viewed and used as a work device to aid in training, writing reports, and as internal and external evidence (Gramagila & Phillips, 2018; Koen & Willis, 2020; Newell & Greidanus, 2018; Pelfrey & Keener, 2018; Smykla et al., 2016). One intended use of

BWCs is as an internal training tool for things such as performance reviews and self and peer training, based on real scenarios (Koen & Willis, 2020). In one study, management decided to use scenarios instead of officer BWC footage as a training tool for the department to avoid public shaming and provided officers with the ability to watch their own BWC footage for self-training and reflection (Koen & Willis, 2020). Officers can also use BWC footage as an aid to write their reports (Gramagila & Phillips, 2018; Pelfrey & Keener, 2018; Koen & Willis, 2020). There were mixed perceptions regarding BWC footage used within the courtroom as either internal, departmental, or as external evidence. Koen & Willis (2020) post-surveys found a reduction in fear of BWC footage being used as evidence for internal disciplinary action(s) after the implementation of BWCs, based on the officers gaining a better understanding of departmental protocols of exactly how the footage was being used. Within two experimental studies, officers indicated that they were concerned with BWC footage being used against them, either by their department's internal affairs or by their supervisors prior to the implementation of BWCs (Pelfrey & Keener, 2018; Koen & Willis, 2020). Pelfrey and Keener (2018) discussed the dismissal of a couple of officers due to misconduct, based on BWC footage. This dismissal increased the positive perceptions of BWCs among the other officers within the department (Pelfrey & Keener, 2018).

Officers were more supportive of using footage from BWCs as evidence within the criminal justice system but cautioned that citizens and courtroom actors should understand the limitations of the footage (Koen & Willis, 2020; Newell & Greidanus, 2018; Smykla et al., 2016). Officers worried that an overreliance on BWC footage as evidence may reduce their own testimony within the courts (Koen & Willis, 2020; Newell & Greidanus, 2018). Officers voiced concern regarding the strength of their testimony being questioned when there is no BWC

footage of the incident (Newell & Greidanus, 2018; Pelfrey & Keener, 2018). Further, one study found variation between observer judgment when watching both BWC and dash-camera footage, where the observer judgment is partially impacted by visual salience (Turner, Caruso, Dilich, & Roese, 2019). Thus, BWC footage may affect citizen judgments with a more lenient bias toward the wearer of the BWC, creating the opportunity for tunnel vision (Turner et al., 2019).

According to prior research, officers worried that an overreliance on BWC footage as evidence may reduce their own testimony within the courts (Koen & Willis, 2020; Newell & Greidanus, 2018). An overreliance on BWC footage indicates that if the interaction was not recorded, then the ambiguity of the incident remains (Coudert et al., 2015; Harvard Law Review Association, 2015) and may deter community members from taking their own footage of a public incident, which then leaves an incomplete picture of what occurred (Harvard Law Review Association, 2015). For instance, the “objectivity” of the video evidence provides only the perspective of the officer, whereas an interaction has multiple dimensions and interpretations (Harvard Law Review Association, 2015, p. 1812). Again, “ambiguity” remains, which aids in continued racial disparities regarding police use of force, which is one of the main reasons the 2015 President’s Task Force recommended the implementation of BWCs (Harvard Law Review Association, 2015; President Task Force on 21st Century Policing, 2015).

Additional Considerations

One limitation of BWC technologies that was not discussed within the prior sections were the financial costs to utilize BWCs within law enforcement agencies, as there are recurring fees such as video storage, training costs, programming, technical assistance, and BWC technology updates (Adams & Mastracci, 2017; Braunstein & Erickson, 2019; Coudert et al., 2015; Harvard Law Review Association, 2015). Some of the questions that need to be answered

by an agency's administration prior to the implementation of BWCs are: 1) Who will have access to reviewing the footage? (Adams & Mastracci, 2017; Harvard Law Review Association, 2015; Ringrose, 2019), 2) Who will redact and edit the footage to comply with open-records policies and evidence used within the legal system? (Harvard Law Review Association, 2015) and 3) What is the protocol in deciding which encounters to keep footage of and for how long? (Adams & Mastracci, 2017; Coudert et al., 2015; Harvard Law Review Association, 2015; Newell & Greidanus, 2018; Pelfrey & Keener, 2018; Wooditch et al., 2020).

Theoretical Frameworks Used Within BWC Research

The two main theoretical frameworks that appear within academic literature are versions of: (1) organizational justice with a focus on procedural justice, and (2) deterrence.

Organizational justice refers to employee perceptions regarding fairness of treatment within the workplace based on inequity theory which addresses workplace tension based on perceived inequities in effort expended and benefits gained (Greenberg, 1987).³ One main assumption of organizational justice indicates that how the organization is perceived internally and externally affects both the organization and the employees. According to Wolfe and Lawson's (2020, p. 7) meta-analysis, "organizational justice is an important predictor of beneficial, harmful, and counterproductive work attitudes and behaviors among criminal justice employees." This is especially true within the criminal justice system, where employees are under constant threat for civil and criminal wrongdoing (Wolfe & Lawson, 2020). Due to the amount of uncertainty in

³ Inequity theory assumes that: 1) inequity within an exchange process creates tension, 2) the tension is proportional to the tension created, and 3) the tension created serves as a motivation force for the individual to ease the tension (Adams, 1965, p. 283). Inequity theory first emerged through the Roethlisberger and Dickson (1939) study examining the Western Electric Company employees. One of the main findings indicated that the input and output should be equivalent. In other words, different factors affect a worker's perspective regarding their relationship with their job and work position (Adams, 1965). Equity theory indicates a worker's motivation to complete their job duties or satisfaction with their job will decrease if they perceive they are giving more of themselves (both mental and physical labor, and time) than the benefits they receive from the job.

law enforcement and corrections jobs (e.g., fear of civil or criminal wrongdoing, public scrutiny, and “bureaucratic decision-making”), organizational justice and management treatment were highly correlated within this meta-analysis (Wolfe & Lawson, 2020). Thus, how BWCs are introduced to an officer by the organization can affect the implementation and officer’s perception of BWCs (Kyle & White, 2017; Huff et al., 2020; Koen & Willis, 2020). Providing information regarding the limitations and benefits of BWCs prior to deployment increases the likelihood of officer acceptance and support of incorporating the BWC as another tool (Huff et al., 2020).

There are two main branches under organizational justice: distributive and procedural justice. Research has analyzed BWCs and law enforcement through a procedural justice framework (St. Louis, Saulnier & Walby, 2019; McCluskey, Uchida, Solomon, Wooditch, Connor, & Revier, 2019; Roche, 2019; Taylor & Lee, 2019b; White et al., 2017; Braunstein & Erickson, 2019; Demir, Braga & Apel, 2020; Huff, Katz & Webb, 2018; Huff et al., 2020; Demir, Apel, Braga, Brunson & Ariel, 2018). Procedural justice refers to the fairness of the process used to reach specific outcomes or decisions by those in positions of authority, based on Thibaut and Walker’s 1975 research on “dispute resolution procedures” within the courtroom (Greenberg, 1987, p. 13). The research on “dispute resolution procedures” within the courtroom contends that the higher the level of trust in and legitimacy of a law enforcement agency, the stronger the relationship will be between procedural justice and fairness in decision making. The two separate tenets of procedural justice --the quality of decision-making procedures and the quality of treatment-- are seen through four pillars: (1) being fair in processes, (2) being transparent in actions, (3) providing opportunity for voice, and (4) being impartial in decision making (Blader & Tyler, 2003).

Thus, implementing procedural justice within law enforcement will aid in building trust and legitimacy, which strengthens community and law enforcement relations. McCluskey et al. (2019) tested the impact of BWCs on procedural justice through systematic social observation, measuring the quality of decision-making, and the quality of treatment during a police-citizen interaction pre- and post BWC implementation. Procedural justice was found to increase after the implementation of BWCs (McCluskey et al., 2019). Another set of research studies examined occupational burnout within law enforcement, which created the basis for Adams and Mastracci (2019) to examine the impact that BWCs may have on officers regarding police burnout and the amount of organizational support. They found that officers' perception of their department's organizational justice or their perception of being treated fairly by their department's administration reduces an officer's negative perception of BWCs (Adams & Mastracci, 2019).

Another study examined whether police officers using BWCs during a traffic stop mediated the citizen's behavior through cooperation and compliance with the officer; a follow-up study using a quasi-randomized controlled experimental design (Demir, 2019; Demir et al., 2020). Demir et al., (2020) found that BWCs indirectly affected the citizens' perceptions regarding the quality of treatment during their encounter with the officer, increasing police legitimacy. Deterrence also had an indirect effect through procedural justice (through the officer displaying behavior that was fair, transparent, impartial, and provided the citizen an opportunity to have a voice within the interaction). This indirect effect created a direct effect on the citizen's cooperation and compliance with the officer wearing the BWC (Demir et al., 2020). Citizens' perception of procedural justice implemented within the local law enforcement agency directly impacts the level of cooperation and compliance the citizen would have while engaging in an

interaction with an officer from the agency (Demir et al., 2020). Further, the deterrent self-awareness effect was stronger in citizen-officer interactions where the use of a BWC was announced, thereby making the citizen aware of the BWC (Demir et al., 2020).

Another study analyzing arrestees' perceptions of BWCs in Australia found a "civilizing effect" between the citizen and officer due to the presence of the BWC, which, in turn, reduced officers' use of excessive force and citizens' use of violence against officers (Taylor & Lee, 2019b). Thus, procedural and operational policies can be seen as mitigating factors regarding the use of violence by either citizens or officers (Taylor & Lee, 2019b). Testing for the "civilizing effect" is hard to complete due to two pre-conditions that need to be met: 1) the citizen must be aware of the BWCs, and 2) the "citizen must be able to process the implications of being recorded, and then make a rational decision to change his or her behavior as a consequence of the BWC" (White et al., 2017, p. 697).

Further, BWCs can influence the officer and/or the citizen that is being captured on the BWC through an "intrinsic effect (self-awareness) and extrinsic effect (deterrence)" (Demir, 2019, p. 131). An individual being sentenced or placed on supervision under a community supervision agency is based on the premise that supervision would deter future criminal deviance. As society makes technological advances, the criminal justice system continues to implement additional surveillance measures, such as BWCs, in the spirit of deterring individuals from committing deviance.

In 2014, a quasi-randomized controlled trial in Turkey concluded that BWCs had a "deterrent self-awareness effect" on the citizens who were aware of the BWCs during the citizen-police interaction (Demir, 2019). Further, there are inconsistent results within BWC literature regarding the effectiveness of BWCs to alter either citizens' or officers' behavior. There is a

lack of consensus concerning whether “self-awareness” or “civilizing behavior” can be measured accurately and whether study results are valid (Demir, 2019; Demir et al., 2020; Lum, et al., 2019; Roche, 2019; White et al., 2017). Both deterrence and organizational justice theoretical frameworks are used to test the impact of BWCs used by law enforcement, within both the community and the criminal justice system.

Conclusion

This chapter has reviewed empirical literature on BWCs in law enforcement through five main themes: (1) community relations, (2) discretion and privacy, (3) occupational device, (4) additional considerations, and (5) theoretical explanations. Overall, community and officer perceptions of BWCs tend to be neutral and positive. BWCs have an effect, either directly or indirectly, on an individual's behavior during a police-citizen encounter. BWCs are viewed as effective when used as an occupational tool to assist in training, self-reflection, writing reports, and evidence for either departmental or criminal justice proceedings. However, the amount of reliance that the criminal justice system places on BWC footage as evidence is concerning. Visual salience becomes an issue, as explained in Turner's et al., (2019) study that compared BWC and dash-camera footage. Further, citizen-police encounters are dynamic and multi-dimensional in perspective, which cannot be fully examined through BWC footage alone. The true effectiveness of BWCs implemented in law enforcement depends upon the integration, acceptance, policy, and understanding of limitations across officers, citizens, and external stakeholders (White et al., 2018).

Chapter 3 - Current Study

The preceding chapter reviewed literature on BWCs in law enforcement, which was organized based on the following subjects: (1) community relations, (2) discretion and privacy, (3) occupational device, (4) limitations, and (4) theoretical frameworks used (deterrence and organizational justice). This chapter is divided into two sections which discuss the two overarching research questions that this dissertation seeks to answer. The first section applies the BWC policing literature to community supervision agencies. The second section provides a discussion regarding the distinctiveness of community supervision agencies using BWCs.

Part 1: BWCs Literature in Policing Applied to Community Supervision

The first overarching question that this dissertation seeks to answer is: *How do CSOs and administrators view the potential impacts of BWCs on behavior, intra-departmental relations, and public relations?* Three main sub-questions addressed examine: (1) if BWCs have a behavioral effect within community supervision, (2) organizational and procedural justice within community supervision, and (3) the three main reasons BWCs were implemented within law enforcement (transparency, accountability, and legitimacy).

Behavioral effects

The first sub-question examines the perceived behavioral effect that BWCs may have on CSOs and individuals they come across, such as probationers, parolees, and associates. Demir's (2019) study regarding citizen-police encounters examined the deterrent self-awareness effect, like the Hawthorne effect.⁴ Generally, the Hawthorne effect indicates that an individual's

⁴ There was a series of studies conducted at the Hawthorne plant - the Western Electric Company- in Chicago, Illinois by the management group (Wickstrom & Bendix, 2000). The main purposes of the studies were to examine workplace productivity through various variables. These studies serve as foundational studies that examine variables such as productivity, burn-out, and retention (Wickstrom & Bendix, 2000).

production or response is related to the social position and social treatment that they receive within the social interaction (Wickstrom & Bendix, 2000). CSOs or administrators may modify their behavior, upon the activation of their BWC, depending on the type of interaction or to act in a way that is “socially acceptable,” similarly to Ariel, Sutherland, Henstock, Young, Drover and colleagues’ (2018) study. Policing studies provided mixed results when analyzing if there is an awareness effect between citizen’s behavior and the police officer utilizing their BWC (Ariel, Sutherland, Henstock, Young, Drover et al., 2018; Taylor & Lee, 2019a; Demir 2019; Demir et al., 2020); similarly, CSOs may perceive the same when interacting with their clientele, associates, and other citizens. Thus, this dissertation will examine if BWCs provide this deterrent self-awareness effect through asking CSOs and administrators open-ended questions regarding behavior effects. The second and third sub-questions address the CSOs’ and administrators’ perception on organizational and procedural justice in their department.

Organizational and procedural justice

The second sub-question examines how the BWCs may impact CSO’s and/or supervisors’ perceptions of organizational and procedural justice. Organizational justice refers to an individual’s perception of the degree to which workers are treated fairly in their workplace (Greenberg, 1987). Research indicates that if an agency implements the following, then the officer’s perception of organizational justice in the department increases: (1) gaining an officer’s buy-in through the discussion of the benefits and limitations of BWCs, and (2) discussing the BWC policy before and during the implementation process of BWCs (Huff et al., 2020; Kyle & White, 2017). Thus, this dissertation examines if CSOs and administrators perceive that BWCs will affect their perception of organizational justice within the department through asking open-ended questions regarding the department’s legitimacy and the amount of trust they have in the

department. This study was unable to test the officer's perception of organizational justice prior to and during the implementation process, due to BWCs not being implemented within the department of community supervision at the time of this research. Procedural justice looks deeper into the CSO's perceptions of the department's quality of the decision-making process and treatment. Hence, this dissertation examines if CSOs and administrators felt that BWCs would affect their perception of procedural justice through asking open-ended questions regarding the four tenets of procedural justice: fairness, transparency in actions, voice, and impartiality.

Transparency, legitimacy, and accountability

The last sub-question examines CSOs and administrators' perceptions regarding the effect BWCs may have on transparency, legitimacy, and accountability between the community and community supervision agencies. The policing task force recommended that police departments implement BWCs to help repair the relationship between the police departments and the community in which they serve. The thought process of implementing BWCs was based on increasing three things: (1) transparency, by recording the police-citizen interactions, (2) accountability, by holding the police department, police officer(s) and citizen(s) responsible for their actions, and (3) legitimacy, through being transparent and holding both the department and individuals responsible for unjust actions. One community supervision agency implemented BWCs based on the premise of accountability, transparency, and training purposes (Georgia Department of Community Supervision Press Release, 2016). Thus, I will examine if CSOs and administrators perceive that the BWCs will increase the legitimacy of the community supervision agencies by holding officers accountable and being transparent.

One way of measuring accountability is to examine citizen complaints. Past literature indicated that BWCs were effective in reducing citizen complaints (Katz et al., 2014; Ariel et al., 2015; Jennings et al., 2015; Hedberg et al., 2016; Sutherland et al., 2017; Braga, Weisburd, & Turchan, 2018; Owens & Finn, 2018; Peterson et al., 2018; Braunstein & Erickson, 2019; Koen, Willis & Mastrofski, 2018; Koen & Willis, 2020). Further, police officers indicated that they felt that their department was using the BWC footage appropriately through disciplining officers who were considered corrupt (Pelfrey & Keener, 2018) and providing the officers access to their footage for training purposes instead of penalizing them (Koen & Willis, 2020). Thus, accountability of clients and CSOs may occur by using BWC footage to validate or invalidate complaints and for disciplinary actions.

Secondly, BWC footage may be used to increase departmental transparency between law enforcement departments and the community. BWC footage would be considered part of a client's case file, which are kept internally and exempt from open records acts, within community supervision agencies. The public may request agency records prompting the agency to respond within a certain time frame in accordance with the 1967 Freedom of Information Act (FOIA).⁵ There are certain elements of the client's case file that are open to the public that may be found online through the community supervision agency's website. For example, most Department of Corrections agencies provide an online service to look up the location of an inmate, convictions, and/or community supervision status as either: active, absconder, or

⁵ The 1967 Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) provides the public with the right to request records from any federal agency; however, the records may not be available to the public in case of national security, ongoing criminal investigations, and other exemptions that protect the individual's constitutional rights to privacy (FOIA.gov, 2021). Based on FOIA, states have their own open records policy and procedures that the public can use to request government records.

inactive.⁶ From my personal experience, little information is provided to the public from the case file, and departmental policies restrict the type of records brought into court proceedings to keep the CSO's case notes as internal documents. Thus, questions regarding how BWC footage may be utilized as well as if BWCs would increase transparency between the department and community will be addressed.

Part 1 of this dissertation seeks to answer the overarching research question: *How do CSOs and administrators view the potential impacts of BWCs on behavior, intra-departmental relations, and public relations?* To answer this question, answers provided by the participants are compared to the empirical research completed that focused on BWCs within the police department. Part 2 of this dissertation explores the uniqueness of BWCs within community supervision.

Part 2: BWCs and Community Supervision Agencies

The first part of this chapter reviewed how police officers perceived BWCs within their line of work; thus, it is fitting to ask what CSOs' thoughts are on the subject. Therefore, the second overarching question that this dissertation seeks to answer is: *How do CSOs and administrators perceive the use of BWCs will shape the execution of their day-to-day work duties?* Three sub-questions were addressed to gain an understanding of: (1) the different ways CSOs would use BWCs for their work duties, (2) the impact BWCs may have on CSOs everyday

⁶ An active status indicates that they are currently being supervised on probation and/or parole. An inactive status implies that they are not currently being actively supervised on probation and/or parole. This includes individuals for whom the criminal court instructed the community supervision agency to complete an administrative task or courtesy supervision for pending criminal charges (e.g., pre-sentence report, background check, or electronic monitoring), or when the parole board requests parole plans to be completed prior to releasing an inmate from prison. Lastly, absconder status refers to individuals who cannot be located by the community supervision agency; the individual failed to report as instructed and was labeled as an absconder or fugitive from justice.

work duties, and (3) the advantages and disadvantages of using BWCs within community supervision departments.

The first two sub-questions examine how CSOs and administrators perceive they would utilize BWCs and the impact BWCs may have on their everyday job duties. Prior literature in policing found that BWCs were utilized for: (1) evidentiary and training purposes (Gramagila & Phillips, 2017; Newell & Greidanus, 2018; Pelfrey & Keener, 2018; Huff et al., 2020; Braga et al., 2018; Phelps, Strype, Le Bellu, Lahlou & Aandal, 2018; Richards, Roberts, Britton & Roberts, 2018), and (2) to reduce citizen complaints (Katz et al., 2014; Ariel et al., 2015; Jennings et al., 2015; Hedberg et al., 2017; Sutherland et al., 2017; Braga et al., 2018; Owens & Finn, 2017; Peterson et al., 2018; Braunstein, 2019; Koen et al., 2018; Koen & Willis, 2020).

Each community supervision agency has their own mission and values, which encompass a mixture of both punitive and rehabilitative approaches to supervision and case management. The approach that the CSO uses with their clients varies between each encounter, due to “unknown” variables, such as the client being under the influence of drugs or alcohol, client’s and/or CSO’s emotional and mental state, and individual versus group interaction. BWC footage can be used in addition to case notes within the agency’s case management system, which encompasses either a paper and/or electronic file to document the client’s supervision records. The BWC footage may aid in providing a better understanding of the client’s case when a client requests a transfer from one geographical location to another within the same state. Usually, CSOs have access to review any client’s case file that was entered into the case management database. CSOs often read case notes to understand what supervision conditions the client is under, what services the client was referred to, the progress provided by said services or referrals, any violations on the client’s record, and instructions provided to the client by any CSO

or supervisor who entered a case note or case summary in the file. Another emerging area of research is integrating face recognition technology with BWC software. Bromberg et al., (2020) cautioned that misidentification can lead to further disenfranchisement of individuals. However, facial recognition can be an administrative tool that aids the CSO by identifying and filing the correct encounter under the correct client in their case management database.

Another way officers indicated that BWC footage could be useful is when it is viewed as evidence for either court proceedings or internal complaints (Pelfrey & Keener, 2018; Koen & Willis, 2020). BWC footage can be logged as evidentiary evidence for either criminal or civil court proceedings if the footage is provided by the department or obtained under the state's open records act (Koen & Willis, 2020; Newell & Greidanus, 2018; Smykla et al., 2016). CSOs may be able to use the BWC footage during parole disciplinary hearings since they can be viewed as an internal administrative function. However, submitting BWC footage to the courts for a probation revocation hearing is a more complicated matter, since multiple agencies (e.g., district attorney's office, defense attorney, social welfare agencies) may be involved and the proceedings are open to the public.

Lastly, a few questions were asked to aid in deeper thought and the ability to reaffirm any comments said prior, such as discussing the advantages and disadvantages of utilizing BWCs in community supervision agencies. Two of the main concerns brought up by BWC and policing literature were privacy considerations (Adams & Mastracci, 2017; Harvard Law Review Association, 2015; Braga et al., 2018; Coudert et al., 2015; Bromberg et al., 2020; Ringrose, 2019) and officer discretion to activate the camera (Smykla et al., 2016; Newell & Greidanus, 2018; Wooditch et al., 2020). Gaining the perspective of the CSO and/or administrator regarding the amount of discretion that should be warranted when activating or deactivating their BWC

during an interaction aid in providing a piece of the puzzle regarding the unique aspects of community supervision when compared to law enforcement. One situation that is unique to CSOs is having to witness the collection, testing, and reporting of urine specimens for drug testing purposes. The actual observation of the urine collection process does not necessitate the activation of the BWC. This provides a good example of when the CSO may deactivate the BWC and reactivate it during the packaging, testing, and reporting of the urinary drug testing analysis.

Secondly, most community supervision agencies conduct field visits at the client's residence, place of employment, treatment facility, or any location outside of the agency's office within the community. A probationer/ parolee is part of a specialized subset within the United States population whose 2nd Amendment and/or 4th Amendment of the United States Constitution rights are either limited or suspended while the individual is under the supervision of the agency.⁷ For example, below are three conditions that the client must agree to follow while under federal probation:

- 1) You must not own, possess, or have access to a firearm, ammunition, destructive device, or dangerous weapon (i.e., anything that was designed or was modified for the specific purpose of causing bodily injury or death to another person, such as nunchakus or tasers).
- 2) You must submit your person, property, house, residence, vehicle, papers, computers (as defined in 18 U.S.C. § 1030(e)(1)), other electronic communications

⁷ 2nd Amendment to the United States Constitution states "a well-regulated militia, being necessary to the security of a free State, the right of the people to keep and bear Arms, shall not be infringed" whereas the 4th Amendment to the United States Constitution states, "the right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures, shall not be violated, and no Warrants shall issue, but upon probable cause, supported by Oath or affirmation, and particularly describing the place to be searched, and the persons or things to be seized" (National Archives, n.d.).

or data storage devices or media, or office, to a search conducted by a United States probation officer. Failure to submit to a search may be grounds for revocation of release. You must warn any other occupants that the premises may be subject to searches pursuant to this condition.

- 3) The probation officer may conduct a search under this condition only when reasonable suspicion exists that you have violated a condition of supervision and that the areas to be searched contain evidence of this violation. Any search must be conducted at a reasonable time and in a reasonable manner (Administration Office of the United States Courts Probation and Pretrial Services Office, 2016).

These conditions indicate that the client's right to bear arms is suspended, and probation officers are allowed to search the client's place of residence, personal items, vehicle, and property while they are under these supervision conditions. Generally speaking, community supervision agencies have adopted similar conditions and language within their standard conditions of supervision. In this manner, the state has significant leeway to monitor and otherwise invade the privacy of those under its penal authority.

In addition to wide latitude for monitoring supervisees, a collateral consequence is that community supervision officers may encroach upon the privacy of those who reside or correspond with the offender. For instance, most community supervision agencies conduct field visits at the client's residence, place of employment, treatment facility, or any location outside of the agency's office within the community. During the interaction between the CSO and client, any bystander or associate that is with the client may be captured on a BWC without consent or any expectations of privacy.

Another concern brought up in prior literature was the financial costs associated with the utilization of BWCs. The agency would have to consider expanded technological abilities that have the capacity for the department to utilize BWC software. Further, additional internet safe keeping practices need to be put in place, such as encryption of data. There are a multitude of financial costs associated with the implementation and long-term use of BWC technology.

Conclusion

This dissertation is an exploratory case study seeking to answer two overarching questions: (1) How is the utilization of BWCs in a community supervision agency similar to and different from policing literature? and (2) How do CSOs and administrators perceive BWC use by their community supervision department? This study is important because it is the first of its kind and it will add to the broader literature regarding technology use within the criminal justice system. There is research regarding the use of close-captioned surveillance and BWCs used within correctional facilities, but none regarding community supervision. This study will extend that discussion through adding the perspectives of the CSOs and administrators employed by a community supervision agency. Lastly, this study will be the first to provide a comparative analysis between CSOs' and police officers' perceptions of BWCs. The research methodology that will be used to address each of the research questions is discussed in the next chapter.

Chapter 4 - Methods

This chapter reviews the qualitative methodology used to conduct this dissertation research. Qualitative research “refers to the meaning, concepts, definitions, characteristics, metaphors, symbols, and descriptions of things” (Berg, 2007, p.3). Further, the qualitative approach used in this study is exploratory, given that there exists little academic research regarding community supervision officers’ perspectives regarding BWCs. Seventeen (17) semi-structured interviews were conducted over Zoom with a community supervision department in the southern region of the United States to answer the three overarching research questions: (1) *How do CSOs and administrators view the potential impacts of BWCs on behavior, intra-departmental relations, and public relations?*, (2) *How do CSOs and administrators perceive the use of BWCs will shape the execution of their day-to-day work duties?* and, (3) *How can we make sense of these finding through established theories?*

Permissions

An application was submitted through K-State’s Committee on Research Involving Human Subjects, and approval was granted on June 6, 2021, with an expiration date of June 5, 2024 (Appendix A). The IRB consent form was provided and reviewed for each participant. All participants granted permission for their interviews to be recorded for later analysis. Data collection occurred during the fall of 2021.

Sampling

Procedure

To gain access to a community supervision department willing to participate in this research, a project summary was created (Appendix B). The project summary indicated the purpose of the study, cooperation in completing the study with their department, and possible

benefits to further academic research. An internet search was completed to identify which states in the United States supervise both felony probationers and parolees. More information may be acquired through interviewing CSOs within community supervision agencies who provide services based on dual supervision, versus interviewing agencies who only supervise probationers or parolees. Within these agencies, CSOs are more likely to consider, or are currently, carrying a firearm, which may bring about the discussion of BWCs. Thus, it is more appropriate to compare these CSOs' perspectives to that of law enforcement, due to the similarities in peace officer training and uniformed equipment. For instance, Georgia's Department of Community Supervision has issued BWCs for every CSO "to maintain trust and legitimacy with the public and those [they] supervise" (GDCS Press Release, June 30, 2020). These CSOs report to both the parole board and judges; thus, they have a deeper understanding of prison culture and operations as well as community relations. Appendix D lists the states who fit this criterion.

Multiple emails and research requests were sent to various community supervision agencies identified in the internet search. Three departments passed on participating in this study. One department indicated it would be a conflict of interest, as they were doing their own research on the topic. A few other department requests were left unanswered. One community supervision department responded with interest. After a few telephone calls and email exchanges, both the executive branch of the department and their legal team granted permission for this research to be conducted.⁸ Individuals from the executive branch sent out a request through their internal database for volunteers to participate in this research project. Volunteers

⁸ The executive branch and legal team were provided with the following forms: Project Summary, Interview Schedule, IRB approval letter, and IRB Consent Form.

who wanted to participate were instructed to contact me through email or telephone. Each participant was sent an email further explaining this research, the IRB consent form, and requesting availability to conduct the interview. Before the scheduled interview began, the IRB consent form was reviewed and verbal agreements to participate from the volunteers were received. Each participant was instructed that they can end the interview at any time and that their personal information would remain confidential.

Sample population

Seventeen (17) semi-structured interviews were completed among CSOs and CSO supervisors within a community supervision department located in a southern state in the United States. There were fifteen (15) participants who identified as males and two (2) participants who identified as females. The age range of the participants was from 31-54 years old. Most of the participants identified as white, while one participant identified as black. The participants' level of experience with the department ranged from one and a half (1.5) years to twenty-three (23) years. The role that the participants indicated that they held included: CSO I, CSO II, CSO III/Specialist (includes high profile cases, sex offender caseloads, violent charges, intensive supervision, Drug Court), Supervisor (includes program managers as well as CSO supervisors), Assistant Director, and District Manager. Sixteen (16) of the participants hold a bachelor's degree or higher.

Data Gathering

Active interviewing

The qualitative method chosen to complete this research is through implementing active interviewing techniques. Active interviewing consists of interpretive practice with both participants and the interviewer throughout the interview process, like what Garfinkel (1967)

calls “practical reasoning” (Holstein & Gubrium, 1995, p. 16). Practical reasoning helps us to make sense of the situations and/or circumstances in which we may find ourselves and to aid in acting in said situations, contributing to the “production and maintenance of an intelligible social world” (Clayman, 2001, p. 4866).

Table 1.1 Descriptive Demographics of Sample Population (n=17)

<i>Years of Experience</i>	<i>Age</i>	<i>Sex</i>	<i>Race</i>	<i>Educa- tion</i>	<i>Major</i>	<i>Position</i>
1.5	36	Male	White	MA	Criminal Justice	CSO II
4	37	Male	White	BA	Animal Science	CSO II
5	49	Male	White	some college	N/A	CSO Specialist
5	31	Male	White	BA	Criminal Justice	CSO Specialist
7	31	Male	White	BA	Sociology	CSO Specialist
10.5	40	Male	White	BA	History	CSO Specialist
13.5	54	Male	White	BA	Business Management	CSO Specialist
14	43	Male	White	BA	Animal Science	CSO Specialist
15	37	Male	White	BA	Criminal Justice	Supervisor
15	47	Male	White	BA	Health/ Exercise Science	Assistant Director
15	39	Female	White	BA	Sociology- Biology	Supervisor
17	41	Male	White	BA	Industrial Design	CSO Specialist
21	45	Male	White	BA	Criminal Justice	CSO Specialist
22	54	Male	Black	BA	Political Science/ Public Policy	District Manager
23	46	Male	White	BA	Anthropology & Sociology & Criminal Justice	Supervisor
23	50	Male	White	MA	Organizational Leadership	CSO Specialist
25	52	Female	White	BA	Sociology	CSO III

Note. BA is abbreviated for Bachelor of Arts and MA is abbreviated for Master of Arts.

Within an interview, there is a distinction between the participant and the interviewer, which comes with certain social and conversational expectations. Active interviewing views the interview process as a dynamic “meaning-making” situation that focuses on how the “meaning is constructed, the circumstances of construction,.. [and] meaningful linkages” created during the interview process (Holstein & Gubrium, 1995, p. 9). For instance, at the end of each interview, the participants were given an opportunity to ask me questions. In most instances, a conversation occurred integrating my own personal experience as a community supervision officer within New Mexico and Georgia. Some of the participants were interested in the similarities and differences relevant to their own experiences. Due to my professional experience, a level of credibility and understanding of community supervision culture provided these “meaningful linkages” that allowed for a more welcoming environment to speak in a more direct way.

Another benefit of using active interviewing is that it “allows the interviewer to encourage the respondent to shift positions in the interview to explore alternative perspectives within stocks of knowledge” (Holstein & Gubrium, 1995, p. 37). Thus, the respondent was asked how they think someone else may answer the same question (from a supervisor’s position and/or from a probationer/parolee’s viewpoint). Active interviewing provides a way for participants to respond differently than during what is considered a standard interview, with the added ability to provide diverse and possible contradictory answers (Holstein & Gubrium, 1995). For instance, the participants were asked what they considered the advantages and disadvantages of implementing BWCs within community supervision agencies from the perspective of a CSO, probationer/parolee, and supervisor. Some of the answers they provided varied based on the viewpoint of another individual.

Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, weather constraints, and travel distance between the department and researcher, interviews were conducted through various communication technology mediums such as telephone calls and Zoom. Zoom, an online platform utilized for meetings, was utilized through Kansas State University due to the security perimeters that are put in place, and it was available free of charge due to my status as a student. The Zoom meetings were recorded through Zoom, then downloaded onto an external USB drive afterwards. The Zoom recordings were deleted from my Kansas State University account immediately after being downloaded to the external USB drive. The recorded interviews were labeled numerically to protect the participants' identity and create anonymity to their responses. The USB external drive was placed in a locked safe when not utilized.

Data Analysis

The research questions for this dissertation are derived from the literature review regarding these topics. A general inductive approach was used to explore the participants' responses. Implementing an inductive approach allowed the “research findings to emerge from the frequent, dominant, or significant themes inherent in raw data, without the restraints imposed by structured methodologies (Thomas, 2006, p. 238). The general inductive approach seeks to understand the “core meanings evident in the text, relevant to evaluation or research objectives” (Thomas, 2006, p. 241). Then the analysis was separated into different themes and categories that were most relevant to the research questions (Corbin & Strauss, 1990; Thomas, 2006). The design of the interview schedule allowed open-ended responses to questions about: BWC use within community supervision, organizational and procedural justice, behavior modification,

transparency, accountability, and legitimacy.⁹ The coding process that was used to conduct this data analysis is listed below:

1. Transcribed each interview verbatim and uploaded into ATLAS.ti version 22 software.¹⁰
2. Each interview was read line by line and summed up the respondents' answer in a few words, linked directly to a research question. Some codes were created based on the specific research questions asked, while other codes were created based on the main message the respondent stated, which created a summative code. The first three interviews provided most of the codes used as a guide in coding the rest of the interviews. After coding each interview, the codes were reviewed to see if a code could be collapsed into another code or expanded to encompass another perspective. If new codes emerged, then the interviews were reread based on the new codes.
3. After coding each interview, the following three phases were followed:
 - a. Phase I consisted of downloading all codes that pertained to the seven sub-questions asked to answer both research questions. Under each sub-question, quotes from the interviews were listed.
 - b. Phase II consisted of three different steps: (1) each quote was read and separated into a general theme, (2) each theme was reviewed, and any overlapping themes were merged, (3) the themes were placed into categories.
 - c. Phase III consisted of four different steps: (1) an outline was created based on the research question and sub-questions asked, (2) the outline was filled in

⁹ See Appendix C for the Interview Schedule

¹⁰ ATLAS.ti is a qualitative research tool used to aid in data analysis by generating reports by codes, themes, and categories.

based on the categories identified in Phase II, (3) the outline was filled in with the themes provided within that specific category for that specific question, (4) quotes were provided as supporting evidence.

Phases II and III were completed with all seven sub-questions. Each interview was coded using numbers and later given pseudonyms, creating anonymity for each participant. To minimize bias, memo writing was utilized after each interview to aid in separating any personal thoughts that occurred during and after the interview. Memo writing is reflective in nature and can aid in capturing aspects of the participant's narrative that may be otherwise dismissed, providing more of a thick descriptive narrative.

Data Limitations

There were three main limitations to conducting this research. The first limitation stemmed from the ongoing Covid-19 pandemic, which reduced my ability to conduct research due to governmental and departmental restrictions, including the ability to conduct interviews on-site or in-person and the soliciting of participants. The community supervision department had different regulations regarding out-of-state visitors, which required a two-week quarantine period before and after a site visit was conducted. Further, each state in the United States had travel restrictions in place based on the state's government Covid-19 protocols, which changed on a weekly to bi-weekly basis at times. The Covid-19 travel regulations would cause financial hardship if site visits were conducted. Due to Covid-19 related issues, the solicitation for participation was limited to emails and telephone calls only. Secondly, the community supervision department is located within the southern states of the United States which are affected by tropical storms. During Fall of 2021, multiple tropical storms affected the state where the research was conducted; thus, limiting the access to staff. At times, the department was in a state of emergency and research participation became secondary. Lastly, the department was

short-staffed, which limited the amount of time the participants would have to aid in completing this research. For instance, one of the participants was in their car in the court's parking lot during the interview. A couple of the participants discussed the extra duty assignments that they were currently doing because of the department being short-staffed. Despite these limitations, the research was able to be completed.

Conclusion

This exploratory research was completed through interviewing CSOs and administrators within a community supervision department. The methodology implemented was that of active interviewing, which focused on both the meaning-making process and the knowledge regarding the research project. This resulted in flushing out the participant's true narrative instead of an automatic response which gives the "right" answer. The key challenges that were faced were accessing participants, COVID-19 pandemic and tropical weather-related issues, and time restrictions and extra duty assignments the participants faced. To reduce some of these challenges, I was flexible in scheduling and offered more than one opportunity to participate in the research.

Chapter 5 - Potential Impacts of BWCs in Community Supervision

This chapter discusses how participants thought BWCs might affect community supervision agencies, based on perceived impacts of BWCs in law enforcement. The review question was asked: How do CSOs and administrators view the potential impacts of BWCs on behavior, intra-departmental relations, and public relations? Results from this analysis are derived primarily from three questions asked during the interviews: (1) How does the presence of BWCs influence the behavior of CSOs, probationers, parolees, and collateral contacts? (2) How does the use of BWCs impact CSOs' perceptions of organizational and procedural justice? and (3) How can the implementation of BWCs affect the transparency, accountability, and legitimacy of the Department of Community Supervision? Responses to these questions are examined in turn.

Behavior

Self & co-workers

Most CSOs indicated that the presence of BWCs may influence the behavior of individuals they come across, specifically themselves, their co-workers, and probationers and parolees. Regarding self-behavior, some participants said their behavior would not change due to their clients and public having various surveillance technology to film their every move. Logan stated that they are “trained to assume [they] are on camera.” Thus, their actions would not alter due to the normalcy of being under constant surveillance by the public, clients, and department. Henry stated, “I am who I am” and writes down the incidents exactly how they occur without modifying the verbiage used during an interaction with a client. On the other hand, other participants indicated that they would alter their behavior and language used with clients due to the presence of the BWC. A couple of the participants stated that the BWC would help

them act more professional by “behaving better” and using “courtroom” verbiage with their clients (George & Daniel). Thus, CSOs’ behavior may be modified to act in a more professional manner to include how they speak with clients, which may affect the client’s behavior.

Secondly, most participants indicated that their co-worker’s behavior may change due to the presence of BWCs. A couple participants stated that their co-worker’s language and actions would change to what they considered appropriate for being recorded (George, Blake, & Rory). Further, Parker indicated that the BWC “would keep you honest. I think most agents would be less likely to go rogue” because actions may be captured on footage and used by the department to hold them accountable. Jordan stated that they may hesitate before saying something to the client to ensure that what they are saying is in line with departmental policy. Another small group of participants stated that the presence of the BWCs would not alter their co-worker’s behavior in any way. While there was a mixture of responses regarding BWC altering CSO’s behavior, the majority indicated that their behavior either would not change, or minor adjustments would be made to their verbiage used with clients.

Probationers/parolees/collateral contacts

Most of the participants indicated that the clients and individuals they come across would alter their behavior due to the presence of a BWC by either behaving better or acting more reserved. Some of the participants stated that their client’s behavior would change in a positive manner. George stated that their clients would put “on an act for the camera.” The clients will either be on their “best behavior or show out” due to the presence of the camera being there (Henry). As indicated by other participants, being on their best behavior may consist of the client’s language (less cursing), and attitude changing.

One of the main concerns mentioned by the participants was the presence of a BWC creating a roadblock with rapport building and inhibiting their ability to freely communicate with one another. The camera may affect the client's behavior because they may "talk to the camera" instead of holding a conversation with the officer (George). As described above, by the CSO communicating in a more professional manner or courtroom manner, the ability for them to create a stronger rapport with the client may be hindered. Jack stated that they discuss their own life experiences, when appropriate, with a client to show empathy and strengthen the rapport between them and their client(s). They stated that they are less likely to share certain life experiences if their conversation is being recorded. Daniel expressed concern that their client's behavior would be censored due to the BWC, which could hinder their goal to "find problems and then get to the solutions." If the client is reserved in their actions and communication due to the presence of the BWC, then discovering the problems that they may be facing may not be as apparent. Arthur indicated that a client's behavior on a regular caseload may not change, but a specialized caseload client's behavior may change for a short amount of time until the presence of the BWC becomes normalized or seen as part of the CSOs uniform.¹¹

A few of the participants indicated that the BWC would not affect their client's behavior due to the normalization of surveillance in society. William stated that most law enforcement in their state wear a BWC. Thus, the public (including their clients) are used to being on camera and their behavior would not change. Oscar responded that their clients would do what they want despite the cameras being there. Thus, no change or deterrent effect in their client's behavior would occur. There were mixed results concerning the effect BWC would have on the

¹¹ Clients on a regular caseload may be seen once or twice a month by any CSO, whereas a specialized caseload may be seen on a weekly basis by a senior CSO.

behavior of CSOs and their clients. Overall, most of the participants indicated that the presence of the BWC would influence an individual's behavior (whether it is positive or negative) within community supervision.

Organizational & Procedural Justice

Organizational justice

As discussed in Chapter 2 and 3, organizational justice refers to how the employee perceives their treatment by the employer (Greenberg, 1987). Before inquiring about the objectivity of supervisors and executive staff, the participants were asked questions regarding their perception of being able to communicate freely regarding departmental policy and procedures: (1) between them and the executive branch/headquarters of the department, and (2) between them and their supervisors.

The respondents were asked if they were able to communicate freely with the executive branch or headquarters in their department. Their answers varied based on two factors: (1) the proximity of their office to headquarters, and (2) their current professional relationship with any of the executive staff. The department follows the chain of command to communicate with all the offices throughout the state. CSOs must rely on the executive branch to communicate clearly with the region and district administrators to keep them in the loop. Rory explained:

When you start going above that district administrator level into regional and into the headquarter staff, there is that giant disconnect. A lot of times, that staff don't even know who we are, to the point that we could swap name plates on the door, and they would walk in and call you by the wrong name.

Thus, the higher the individual is in the chain of command, the harder it may be to directly communicate with them. One exception is working in an office close to headquarters or having a

professional working relationship with a member(s) of the executive branch by serving on various committees. The proximity of the participant's office from headquarters may influence how strictly their office follows department policies and procedures as well as executive staff knowing the CSO either in a professional or personal manner. A few of the participants indicated that the closer their office is to headquarters, the easier it is to communicate with the executive branch, whereas the further out, the harder it may be.

CSOs may face obstacles due to the geographical region they supervise. The CSO office connected to headquarters is in a suburban area with a dense population. Leo stated that there are approximately 21 offices with 500 CSOs throughout the state, serving a diverse population with various historical and cultural differences. Rory stated that they:

worked in three [redacted counties] and it's very diverse because on [redacted county] doesn't like you saying somethin' one way, they're not gonna get it in another one. So, you have to switch [up]... and we're talkin' a 30-mile difference. So, language goes a long way on this job.

CSOs tend to supervise their clients differently based on the community in which they reside; thus, there can be miscommunication regarding how CSOs talk to and supervise their clients in a rural versus suburban area (Leo & Rory). A communication gap or misunderstanding may occur due to various aspects of CSOs' job duties changing and their juggling different cultures and languages due to serving a diverse population throughout the state.

Unlike the mixed responses provided by the participants regarding their ability to communicate with the executive branch, most of the participants stated that they can communicate freely with their supervisors. Even though they can communicate freely with their

supervisors, whether what they communicated with them is brought up to headquarters is a separate issue (Arthur & Daniel).

Procedural justice

As discussed in Chapter 2 and 3, procedural justice looks deeper into CSOs' perceptions of the department decision-making process and treatment. The participants were asked how they perceived: (1) headquarters' ability to view BWC footage objectively, and (2) supervisors' ability to view BWC footage objectively. The participants provided a mixture of responses ranging from completely objective to not at all objective. The participants' responses were categorized in the neutral column if they had a contingency or added variables added to their response. For instance, some respondents indicated the objectivity hinged on policy, the individual person viewing the footage, and the current state of politics. About half of the participants indicated that headquarters would be objective when reviewing BWC footage. The need for consistent enforcement of policies and procedures throughout the state was a theme brought up by a couple of participants. Ryan stated that if headquarters "institute[s] some sort of consistency and basically ground rules or template for how everybody will be reviewed and evaluated," then they would be objective in viewing the footage. George responded that headquarters "has the most potential for objective viewing" because they do not know all "600" staff on a personal level as well as their "rank" in the department. The level of objectivity that an executive employee may have when viewing footage may not be affected by a professional or personal relationship with the CSO and/or client portrayed on the footage. Parker stated that headquarters would be objective in viewing the footage and "they would try their best to balance looking out for the agent, so to speak, but at the same time being cautious of the liability they

accept if they don't hold people accountable." Even though they stated that headquarters would be objective, they indicated that department liability and CSO accountability would play a factor.

A couple participants explained that they did not believe headquarters could be objective in viewing BWC footage due to the limited view provided by the footage, focus on policy violations, and cultural differences in different geographical regions of the state. BWCs are usually worn on the center of the chest of an officer providing a view of what is directly in front of the officer. Thus, the BWC has a limited scope of view, failing to capture anything that occurs on the side of or behind the officer, thus leading James to state that the BWC is not an objective tool due to the limited scope of view. Thus, the BWC itself is not objective; any conclusion derived from the footage cannot be truly objective. If headquarters relies on the footage, then their objectivity of the situation is severely limited, which can be more detrimental than helpful for the department. Secondly, due to the job description of individuals at headquarters, the lens that they may view BWC footage through is more in line with political and/or departmental liability. James stated, "I think the further up you go, the more it becomes a liability issue." Further, the main executives in headquarters represent the department at legislative hearings and report directly to the governor. Thus, another participant (Oliver) indicated that their objectivity may be compromised due to them reviewing the footage through a political lens. The concern that footage may be used for purposes beyond those originally stated to justify the adoption of BWCs is not without merit. Such tendencies are referred to as "function creep" or "surveillance creep" and there is a history of surveillance technologies beyond used beyond their original scope (Koops, 2021; Marx, 1988). Lastly, there are various offices around the state that implement policies different from the offices closer to headquarters due to

geographic makeup of the community, cultural attributes, and density of population. Henry stated:

I think that's where the cutoff between headquarters and the field, especially in [redacted county]. We've always been kind of an outlier because things have always been different here. We've always had to work different because we have to adapt to... the environment we're in. You have people who never worked here..., are so far removed from field work and actually supervising people that I don't think they can be objective.

They described how CSOs' job duties can change based on the geographical region and the community in which they work. CSOs need to pay attention to their surrounding environment and make split decisions based on the situation (i.e., the appropriateness of arresting a probationer/parolee at their home or in the community). The participants held various opinions regarding the objective viewing of BWC by headquarters.

Many of the participants stated that the supervisors would be objective when viewing BWC footage. In agreement with other respondents, James cautioned that the supervisors may be objective, but they may view the footage and conclude their findings based on what is good for the department versus what is good for the officer. Rory stated that based on their experience with supervisors, they tend to look at the whole picture, thus viewing the BWC footage objectively, then examining if the interaction was within policies and procedures and was legal. A few of the participants indicated that a supervisor's objectivity depends on a variety of factors. One factor is the length of time the supervisor has been out of the field working their own caseload. Parker stated:

I think the supervisors probably that have just gotten out of the field recently would be more sympathetic to try and look the other way for an agent 'cause they still feel more

tied to that. I think the ones that have been supervisin' for a while would absolutely be more objective in lookin' at a video and tryin' to hold everybody accountable for whatever they see.

A few other participants indicated that the supervisors would be objective, but two factors may influence their level of objectivity: human bias and how far removed they are from the field. Human bias may account for the CSOs and probationer/parolees' reputation within the department. Jack stated that no supervisor can be 100% objective when viewing the footage since most supervisors are field officers and may have an intimate knowledge of the CSO and/or client portrayed in the situation. For the most part, many of the participants indicated that the supervisors would be objective when viewing the BWC footage, to the best of their ability, despite human biases and the limitations of the footage itself.

In summary, most of the participants stated that they can communicate freely with their direct supervisors; however, office proximity to headquarters, professional or personal relationships, and following the chain of command play a role in their ability to communicate freely with the executive staff. Supervisors' and headquarters' ability to review BWC footage objectively varied due to experience with field work, personal knowledge of client(s) and CSO(s), professional perspective, and geographical region. Now we turn our attention to how BWCs may affect how the public views the department's accountability, transparency, and legitimacy.

BWC Effect on Department

The participants were asked: how would the implementation of BWCs affect the transparency, accountability, and legitimacy of the Department of Community Supervision? The

participants provided mixed responses regarding transparency, accountability, and legitimacy; thus, the participants responses are organized by “effect” and “no effect.”

Effect

Some of the participants stated that BWCs would increase transparency, accountability, and legitimacy between the department and the community. BWC footage can help in teaching the public what CSOs’ job duties are and what they experience in the field (Leo, Parker, Rory, & Henry). CSOs wear many hats that are constantly interchanging depending on the situation and the client with whom they are interacting. Leo stated:

I think it would give a little better perspective for people on ‘hey, that’s what those guys do. Good lord, they have to deal with that every day.’ Yeah, we do. We try to help these folks as best as we can, but you know you can only drag a horse to water so long before it’s on them.

BWC footage may be used to be transparent through aiding in explaining the multiple facets of a CSO’s job, which may increase the department's legitimacy with the community and among various agencies. BWC footage may also be used as an accountability tool to show exactly what occurred in any interaction that was in question by the public or clients. If there is a question regarding a public exchange that occurs between a CSO and client, then the footage being released to the public may aid in the department being transparent and holding clients and CSOs accountable with the community (Parker & Logan). A few of the participants expressed that BWCs may aid in increasing the level of professionalism, which increases accountability and legitimacy of the department within the community. Logan shared an instance where video footage held a client accountable:

I guess it was about a year ago. We had an offender that filmed a contact with his officer that got violent... [The] footage ultimately ended up putting him back in jail because it showed him being the aggressor. So, video footage can work both ways... You know, the video doesn't lie. It tells the true story no matter who's right or wrong. So, I think accountability would definitely be increased on all lenses.

In this instance, the footage cleared the CSO from false allegations of use of force, holding both the CSO and client accountable for their actions. Whether the CSO involved in the incident knew they were being filmed at the time is unknown; however, William stated that they are trained to assume they are always being recorded.

Lastly, Logan indicated that the department is overly cautious at times regarding what information they provide to the public. Providing some BWC footage to the public could improve communication through this aspect of being transparent and holding CSOs and clients accountable for their actions. Blake indicated that transparency and accountability go hand in hand. All in all, Henry sums up this section by stating that BWCs would "show where our place in the criminal justice system really lies because we're such an in-between and we've got to morph the different worlds/rules constantly." Thus, BWC may increase accountability, legitimacy, and transparency between the department and community.

While some participants argued that BWCs would influence transparency, legitimacy, and accountability, others were more reserved in their assessments, claiming that any effects would be contingent on factors beyond the mere implementation of BWCs. A few of the participants indicated that the amount of effect that BWCs would have on the department's legitimacy, transparency, and accountability within the community depends on a few factors such as BWC footage usage, appropriate use of BWCs, and geographical region. BWC footage

can have either a positive or negative effect on transparency and accountability within the community by validating or invalidating allegations against the department or CSOs (Leo, Oliver & Logan). Some of the participants indicated that BWC footage would show exactly what occurred within a situation which can be used to hold CSOs and clients accountable. Arthur stated that if the “right intentions” are there and BWC footage is released to the public, without editing the interaction(s), then the BWCs can help increase legitimacy. Secondly, society needs to understand that the department is not trying to hide anything by withholding BWC footage, as BWCs are not always appropriate to use due to the sensitivity of information that is disclosed and the population that they supervise (Jack). Some of the participants questioned who would have access to the footage beside the department, such as the courts and the public? Henry cautioned that the public does not understand the difference between CSOs and police officers; all they see is a badge. CSOs’ job duties include other elements besides law enforcement, which may include connecting clients to resources, building a rapport, and providing guidance in various aspects of their life.

Lastly, there may be cultural differences based on the geographical region of the state that CSOs work out of. Within a suburban area, the public is used to seeing law enforcement with BWCs; that may increase their legitimacy with the public as an officer (Oliver). Within a rural environment, it may hurt the department's legitimacy due to the perception of being more law-enforcement oriented instead of helping to reintegrate probationers/parolees into the community. Oliver explained that in a rural area, clients may think, “you’re wearing it to build a case against me and you’re trying to trap me in something and get it on video.” Daniel warns that BWC footage may create a space for the public to second guess CSOs’ actions and how they interact with their clients, which can decrease the accountability and legitimacy of the

department. For instance, CSOs may use different terminology and language that is usually not appropriate within a professional setting when meeting with clients. Thus, how BWC footage is used by the department may have a possible effect on their relationship with the community.

No effect

A few of the participants indicated that BWCs would not affect the accountability, transparency, and legitimacy of the department with the community. A couple of the participants indicated that the department is already legitimate and transparent in their actions, and the CSOs are already held accountable by the department and community; introducing a BWC would not change these facts. A couple participants indicated that having a BWC would not aid in increasing the department's legitimacy or transparency with the community because the community does not know what CSOs do in the first place. George explained:

I think that the general public sees me as wearing a uniform with a badge ... on my shirt.

I don't think any of them really know exactly what I do, and I think the uniforms brought that aspect, 'cause we haven't always had uniforms.

The symbolism of a badge is highly correlated with law enforcement personnel who have arresting powers over all individuals within a community, whereas CSOs arresting powers are limited to individuals who are placed on probation and parole.¹² Secondly, Oliver stated CSOs' behavior is not being questioned by the public, thus the department does not need to work on being more transparent with them. BWC may aid in reducing fear of law enforcement within

¹² Some community supervision agencies train under peace officer standards and can provide certain CSOs with the ability to have the same arresting authority as law enforcement. Some CSOs may also be cross-trained and/or deputized under other law enforcement agencies which give them the same authority when working under that agency.

minority communities but may not increase the department's legitimacy, transparency, or accountability with the community. James stated:

I don't know if the public feels any better... As far as maybe in areas where... people are scared of police, and I know... there are places where... individuals, the public, they're scared of those interactions, and they may feel more comfortable knowing that those interactions are recorded.

They were alluding to police officers' behavior being under review and questioned by the public due to use of force allegations and tension between police officers and minority communities. A few of the participants expressed that BWCs would not increase the department's legitimacy, transparency, and accountability with the community.

Conclusion & Discussion

The first sub-question examined the respondents' perceptions of a behavioral effect occurring based on the usage of BWCs. The respondents indicated that the behavior of their co-workers and citizens, including clients, would be affected more than their own. However, a few of the respondents indicated that the behavioral mannerisms of some individuals, regardless of who they are, would not be deterred. These results align with other studies on the deterrent effect of BWCs on citizen and police officer behavior which are similarly mixed (Ariel et al., 2017; Taylor & Lee, 2019a; Taylor & Lee, 2019b; Demir, 2019; Demir et al., 2020). Ariel et al. (2017) found that the deterrence level of individual behavior is on a spectrum ranging from minimal to over-deterrence with the use of BWCs within police-citizen encounters. Taylor and Lee's (2019b) study indicated that arrestees perceived that BWCs would aid in a positive behavioral change for both detainees and officer's dependent upon clear operational policy and procedures of BWC activation. Further, the studies of Demir (2019) and Demir et al., (2020)

showed citizens perceived the use of BWCs in traffic stops increased their perception of being treated fairly and justly by the officers leading to them to have increased compliance with the officers' directives.

The second sub-question assessed the respondents' perceptions of organizational justice in the department based on their ability to communicate freely with executive staff and supervisors. The assumption is the more an individual feels like they can communicate freely with executive staff and supervisors, the more trust they have in the department or agency they work for, leading to an increased level of workplace productivity. Results indicate that most of the participants communicate freely with their direct supervisors, whereas their ability to communicate freely with the executive staff is inhibited by the following factors: (1) office proximity to headquarters, (2) professional or personal relationships, and (3) following the chain of command. Multiple respondents indicated that the executive branch makes efforts to increase communication between them and CSOs through sending out surveys and having CSOs participate in various sub-committees created to gain a CSO's perspective. If the department continues to incorporate CSOs in the decision-making process when it comes to implementing BWCs, the likelihood of officer acceptance increases as in the Huff et al. (2020) study. This study found higher perceptions of organizational justice following the implementation of BWCs compared to the control group (no BWCs) and volunteers, mandated, and resistant officers (all wore BWCs) (Huff et al., 2020, p. 573).

The third sub-question assessed the respondents' perceptions of procedural justice in the department based on executive staff and supervisors' ability to view BWC footage objectively. There was a mixture of opinions regarding supervisors' and executive staff's ability to objectively view BWC footage. This dissertation results suggest a correlation between the

respondents' perceptions of organizational justice and procedural justice based on their opinion of being treated fairly by the department and the quality of the department's decision-making procedures. For instance, most of the respondents indicated that they can freely communicate with the supervisors and believe that they would be objective when viewing BWC footage. Some of the respondents questioned their ability to speak freely with the executive staff as well as their ability to view the BWC footage objectively. Again, a CSO's office proximity to headquarters and following the chain of command decreased the respondents' perceptions of organizational and procedural justice within the department. Even though some of the respondents stated that headquarters implements various strategies of communication with CSOs, more effort towards the rural and further offices would increase their perceptions of organizational justice. When employees of an organization have a high perception of organizational justice, retention increases, burnout of employees decreases, and overall morale within the department increases as well. Thus, how the BWCs are introduced to the CSOs can affect their perceptions of organizational justice, procedural justice, and usage of BWCs within the department (Kyle & White, 2017; Huff et al., 2020; Koen & Willis, 2020).

Lastly, there was an assortment of thoughts concerning the implementation of BWCs' effect on how the public views the department's level of transparency, accountability, and legitimacy in the community. Some of the respondents indicated that the BWC footage would provide an avenue to discuss what CSOs do versus what society assumes they do. When asked to explain in layman's terms what their job duties were, some participants stated that even some of their own family members still do not understand what they do, even after working as a CSO for 10+ years. They stated that they are often mistaken for police officers due to carrying a firearm and wearing a badge. The department's transparency and legitimacy with the community

may increase through the public's understanding of what CSOs' job duties entail. However, at least half of the respondents did not think BWCs would do anything for the department's legitimacy and transparency, as those two elements are not being questioned by the public.

The main political reason BWCs were implemented in law enforcement agencies was due to the larger issues of police brutality, specifically against racial minorities. In the context of community corrections, two of the respondents indicated that the department's use of force complaints is very low; thus, implementing BWCs to deter these types of complaints would be unnecessary. White, Gaub, and Todaks' (2018) study concluded that the usage of BWCs within a police department for the purpose of lowering citizen complaints and use of force incidents was unwarranted due to the already low level of complaints received by the public. Many of the respondents indicated that BWC footage would aid in holding clients and CSOs more accountable for their actions. Further professionalism may increase among all parties involved through more "courtroom" verbiage being used versus slang and cuss words. CSOs themselves may feel more pressure on being productive for every minute that they are working due to the constant feel of surveillance due to the BWC. Many of the participants mentioned that BWC footage would be helpful for training purposes, which can indirectly increase accountability and legitimacy of the department with both the employees and the community. Based on the results of this dissertation, careful consideration should be made when implementing BWCs within community supervision agencies based on increasing their legitimacy, accountability among officers, and decreasing citizen complaints.

Chapter 6 - BWCs in Day-To-Day Operations

The preceding chapter examined how participants view the potential impacts of BWCs on behavior, intra-departmental relations, and public relations. The current chapter pivots to examining how CSOs and administrators perceive the use of BWCs will shape the execution of their day-to-day work duties. Results from this analysis are derived primarily from three questions asked during the interviews: (1) What are the different ways BWCs are used for CSOs' work duties? (2) How does the usage of BWCs affect CSOs' case management? and (3) What are the advantages and disadvantages of using BWCs within community supervision? Responses to these questions are examined in turn.

Work Duties

When asked about how BWCs were incorporated into their work duties, participants described four general categories of use. These include (1) promoting accountability among officers, (2) facilitating the complaint process, (3) officer training, and (4) deployment in high-risk situations. The following sections explore these categories in greater depth.

Accountability

Multiple participants indicated that either the Central Office or their supervisors would use BWC footage to hold officers accountable through verifying that they are doing their job duties and by measuring the job performance of the officer. During two of the interviews, the participants' perceptions were that their supervisors would use the BWC footage as a tool to verify they did their job. For instance, Henry stated that they felt, "[a] supervisor would use the BWC for officer accountability to verify how they are spending their time, and/or level of professionalism while in public," creating a verification tool for the supervisor to utilize. Lincoln indicated that they thought the supervisors and/or Central Office would use the BWC

footage as a kind of “quality control for contact with offenders, collateral contacts, and regular citizens while on duty.” Quality control encapsulates an officer’s ability to aid in referring offenders to the necessary community resources while verifying that they remain in compliance with their conditions of supervision. BWC footage may provide another way for supervisors to critique the performance of officers.

One fear expressed by Blake was that a supervisor reviewing officer’s footage would be “armchair quarterbacking their supervision to the extent of, ‘You’ve done too much. You’ve not done enough. You spent too much time at their house. You didn’t spend enough time at that house. You...didn’t, basically, supervise that person like I wanted you to.’” In this sense, the BWC footage may provide a supervisor with an additional source to micro-manage the CSO’s actions or inactions in the field. Further, BWC footage can also be used for disciplinary purposes. A couple of participants shared with me that their department recently installed GPS equipment into most of their vehicles. The GPS equipment allows for the speed, location, and car functions to be recorded within a database that the department administrators and supervisors may access. Some of the participants indicated that the BWC footage would be used similarly to that of GPS in the state vehicles. For instance., if the CSO is under review for disciplinary issues or their whereabouts are questioned, then a supervisor can pull up the GPS report connected to the vehicle you were assigned to drive during the time in question (Ryan, William, & Blake). Like the GPS technology, BWC technology may be used as an accountability tool to aid in justifying disciplinary actions. BWC footage may provide an additional level of transparency and ability to discipline rule violators. The footage can also be used by administrators to ensure compliance with organizational standards, policies, and procedures.

Another aspect of accountability is the possibility of using BWC footage to investigate civilian complaints. Participants also noted that BWC footage could be used to validate or invalidate a complaint made against officers. In this manner, some participants stated that they believed the supervisors will only view the footage if a citizen or client makes a complaint or if they need to investigate an incident. Leo indicated that BWC footage could either verify or exonerate an officer on a citizen/offender complaint. As a CSO, an individual is responsible for referring clients to treatment services and enforcing conditions of supervision. The highest level of punishment that a client can receive while on supervision is being sent to prison. At times, CSOs' job duties put them in the position to enforce the conditions of supervision. When the client is in violation of their conditions of supervision, punitive measures may be taken, such as arresting a client and taking them to jail on a no bond arrest order. Leo described how grievances can arise against a CSO:

We, uh, piss people off and they retaliate. Sometimes they embellish. You know, you're stern with somebody and they say you're rude... You grab them to put them in handcuffs and they say you rough them up. I like the idea that it's recorded. No, that's not how it happened, you know. You're trying to shift blame away from you, and I hope it would be used in such a way to... vet and verify that, [to] squash complaints.

Leo described how clients and citizens may exaggerate what occurred in an interaction between them and a CSO. There is a tendency to deflect instead of take responsibility in a situation where an individual is facing a punishment (punitive measures). Thus, BWC footage may be used as a tool to protect the CSO from citizen and client grievances through showing what occurred during the interaction.

Evidentiary proceedings

Participants also mentioned that BWC footage may impact case management by providing additional support for officer testimony during evidentiary proceedings such as administrative parole violations. A few participants indicated that BWC footage would be useful to support their testimony regarding the circumstances of the revocation or new criminal charges if the client or defense attorney were arguing about a “discrepancy” regarding what was said by either the officer and/or client. Below, Logan described how BWC footage may be used in court, while pointing out the difference between law enforcement-initiated court proceedings and probationary court proceedings.

The way our laws are written, you're on supervision, we only really need reasonable suspicion to search. So, we can come into somebody's house and we see drug paraphernalia here, well, number one, we do now have probable cause but somethin' of a little lesser angle, we may only have reasonable suspicion. We can actually see that... you get into the court side of it 'cause, also, we keep these cases, basically, from cradle to grave if we find a new charge 'cause not only do we have the revocation process, we also have the new charge we're dealin' with. So, you wind up in court and you're in a revocation hearing and they say, “Well, you know, that wasn't mine.” Or, “That wasn't there.” Well, you start playin' the bodycam footage and ... you see it... straightforward from beginning to end. It's hard to argue with footage. It's hard for that judge to watch it and go, “Well, well, yeah, it's there because we see it from beginning to end. We see nobody messed with it and it's there.” Not to say that's gonna take the case of your report. Absolutely not because, naturally, you have to go through the sequence of steps

from when you make the arrest to, you know, turnin' it in and everything else because it is the due process.

The CSO needs reasonable suspicion to conduct a search within a client's residence, which is lower than that needed for law enforcement. Reasonable suspicion may be established when the CSO believes that the client is in violation of their conditions of probation/parole based on the circumstances and environment of the interaction (e.g., the smell of marijuana, the client being inebriated). When a CSO writes a violation report that includes a new charge, they are required to attend both court hearings to provide testimony of what occurred. In the above example, BWC footage may be used to supplement the CSO's testimony and/or violation report.

At times, judges ask for the recommendation of the community supervision agency at initial sentencing (if a pre-sentence report was completed or if the client is currently on supervision), and at revocation court hearings. Usually, recommendations are based on the client's background, which include social and economic standing, circumstances of the current charges, and criminal record. Ryan described their experience at a revocation hearing and how the BWC footage may support their recommendation.

Any time you're in court... testifying to what you found, you know, we're constantly findin' guns, drugs, other things in houses. If all that's already on camera, it, it's already there. And then just the attitude of the probationer/ parolee. If you're havin' to give a report to the court or to the parole board that... he doesn't want to be on supervision, every time you're at the house, there's a problem. If that's all documented with a video camera then... it's all there. It just helps you with your case.

In the above example, BWC footage may be used to show the behavior of the client over a span of time. If the behavior indicates that the client is not a good candidate for community

supervision, then the recommendation may be for an unsuccessful discharge from supervision, or their sentence being revoked and being ordered to spend the remaining time in custody. If the behavior indicates cooperation and productivity within the community, then the recommendation may be for an early discharge from supervision. If BWCs are implemented within a community supervision agency, a few participants indicated that there should be clear cut policies stating what footage can and cannot be released to the public, to a client, or to the court. Multiple participants indicated that the BWC footage would help protect them against possible allegations over extensive use of force in civil and criminal cases when executing arrest warrants and/or taking a person into custody.

Case documentation

A large component of community supervision is providing case management to the clients who are placed on probation or parole. BWC footage could help with writing narratives for the client's case, especially if a CSO worked warrant roundups or saw a multitude of clients in one day.¹³ Leo described how BWC footage can be used as what another participant called a "memory helper" or "second pair of eyes."

It was not unusual that I would go out and make 25 or 30 stops in a night seeing these cases, and they were all over the place. And, so it would have helped to be able to go back and, at least to some degree, review some of the footage if I had a body worn camera, so I could accurately recall what they told me if they changed employment, or if there was a change in something that they wanted me to get them some more information on, or whatever it may have been. I have a pretty good memory, but it would have

¹³ Narratives or case notes are used to denote what occurred during the offenders' time on supervision or while assigned to the community supervision department.

definitely helped with that, and it would also help in doin' my travel log and stuff like that, to go back and do that without havin', it would have saved me some time on that end of it, 'cause again, I'm workin' out of a car.

BWC footage records “exactly what happens,” and may make writing case notes easier. Some of the participants indicated that they are taking “notes constantly,” but if they had access to BWC footage, then they may focus on the interaction instead of taking notes (Oliver). The footage may be beneficial in providing the smaller details that can be forgotten when confronted with a high-stress situation or when a CSO is juggling too many things at once.

Sense of security in high-risk situations

Another way that BWC footage may be used is to provide a sense of security when confronted with high-risk situations or working extra duty as a peace officer within the state.¹⁴ High-risk situations may encompass interacting with individuals who are inebriated, have an active warrant for their arrest, or are in violation of their conditions of supervision, and the appropriate course of action is to arrest the individual. Participants indicated that a BWC would be beneficial while executing an arrest warrant or conducting warrant roundups with a taskforce. Jack stated, “obviously you know any time an arrest, or any type of hands-on contact is expected... I would definitely want to have a camera.” In this context, the participant would use the BWC footage as a backup to show what occurred within the interaction. Any time that “hands-on contact” occurs between a CSO and client or public citizen, that interaction turns into a use of force situation. The footage may provide another way for the CSO to explain escalation and de-escalation techniques used within a use of force situation.

¹⁴ To be a CSO within this state, an individual must complete peace officer standards and training (P.O.S.T.) certification as established by the state Peace Officer Standards and Training Council. Once certified, the CSOs may be activated as a peace officer to work extra security details or aid other law enforcement divisions.

The other way BWC footage may provide a sense of security to CSOs occurs when they are working extra duty assignments as a peace officer in the community instead of strictly as a CSO. A couple of participants indicated that they work college football games as law enforcement; thus, the BWC could help capture any negative interaction that may occur with the public. Not only do CSOs assist in providing extra security at community events, but they also assist other law enforcement agencies. Lincoln indicated that the BWC would aid in providing a sense of security when they are “entering a home, or a residence, or a cell entry, or actively working to suppress a riot or something. You know, moving a crowd out of an area.” The presence of the BWC may deter some citizens’ negative behavior while providing CSOs with an extra tool to utilize (BWC footage) if a use of force situation arises. BWC footage may be used as a tool to protect the officer when working extra duty details, interacting with the public, and dealing with high-risk situations.

Training purposes

Participants also believed that BWC footage may be utilized as a training tool for current and new CSOs. Like most law enforcement agencies, the department has a field training program that new CSOs are required to successfully complete after attending their basic training academy. Henry explained how they would use BWC footage to show new CSOs interactions between officers and clients.

I think you could definitely use it for a training improvement, to show real world footage to new officers of what it’s like to actually be in the field, make field contacts, and things to look for when they’re in the field.

Henry explained that BWC footage may be used as an additional training aid to show new CSOs different situations that they may encounter after basic training is complete. The trainers may use

the footage to discuss what the footage captured, what the officer did well, how they would handle the same situation, and how the officer could improve. After completing the FTO program, the department suggests that the supervisors should ride along with the CSOs, under their guidance, to provide additional mentoring and performance evaluations. Daniel stated that the supervisors “will ride [along] with you to see how you perform your job when you’re not in the office... which I enjoy.” Usually during the ride along, the supervisor points out various ways an officer can improve, whether it be safety protocols, communication style, case narratives, and knowledge regarding departmental policies and procedures. The ride along may provide additional mentoring and support that CSOs may require to sharpen their skill set, as well as helping the supervisor empathize with the CSO regarding their caseload and community culture.

Another way BWC footage may be utilized as a training tool for CSOs is to critique their own job performance. Arthur recalled the process of EPICS training as a comparison to how BWC footage may be used within the department. The department utilizes an evidence-based program titled effective practices in community supervision (EPICS). The main goal of EPICS “is to teach community supervision officers how to translate principles of effective intervention into practice, and how to use core correctional practices in their interactions with offenders” (Office of Justice Programs, 2022). The training consists of both in-class instruction and practical exercises in the field. The students in the EPICS training are required to record several CSO-client interactions and send them back to the EPICS instructors for review. Arthur stated:

...they would audio record their sessions with the offender...like ‘hey I’m taping this conversation.’ Then our department would use it as, okay, you know, you did well in this discussion. You used all the tactics of what we taught you... You steered the

conversation this way or you didn't do anything that we taught you. So, you could use [BWC footage] in that sense.

The participant described how BWC footage would be useful as a training tool by providing an opportunity to review their interactions with clients. Thus, BWC footage can be used as an internal training tool in a variety of ways. The supervisors can use the footage as another performance evaluation tool. The training academy instructors and field training officers can use the footage to show new recruits real interactions with clients and citizens. CSOs can use the footage as a self-evaluation tool to improve their skills as an officer. BWCs promote transparency by providing an audio and visual record of events; this same transparency may also conflict with privacy values.

Privacy considerations

Participants brought up concerns that BWC footage may constitute or result in privacy violations due to the nature of their job duties. Privacy violations may occur during field visits (when medical or sensitive information is disclosed about a client) and while conducting urinary drug tests. The first privacy consideration that was mentioned included an officer conducting field visits. One aspect of a CSO's job is to conduct field visits to verify the client's place of residence, and to make sure they are complying with their conditions of supervision and integrating into the community as a productive member of society. One of the supervision conditions that individuals on probation/parole may have to abide by is agreeing for CSOs to visit them at their place of residence and/or employment. They also must agree that the CSO may conduct a search if there is reasonable suspicion that they were engaged in a criminal act (Administration Office of United States Courts Probation and Pretrial Services Office, 2022). Even though the client on supervision has agreed to their terms of probation/parole, those

conditions may be imposed on the individuals with whom they reside. Some of the participants indicated that if the CSO conducts their job duties in a professional manner, then the BWC should not be an issue when speaking with other individuals who reside with or associate with the client on supervision. One of the issues that CSOs may contend with is being confused with local law enforcement. Logan described the difference between law enforcement and CSOs going into people's homes.

...we deal with a lot of people on a, more of a personal angle than other law enforcement ...A body camera is very helpful in these home visits and when we're out in the field. Like I said ...we're not in a ... five-minute traffic stop or a ten-minute traffic stop, we're in somebody's home, we're in their... personal space. Although, they're on supervision, so, they have to understand that you have a diminished sense of privacy but we're still walking through your house... Not only walkin' through your house, a lot of 'em live with grandma and mom and everything, and aunt, we're walkin' through their house.

CSOs may be involved with the client for a year or more which requires more communication to build a good rapport with the client and their family. The possibility of BWC footage being available to the public, or even internally, may create a privacy violation for associates and family members who reside with the client.

One of the main differences between law enforcement and community supervision is the population that is under their purview. Police officers are responsible for the citizens within their jurisdiction, whereas CSOs are responsible for individuals sentenced to supervision by the courts or parole board. A couple of the participants had prior experience as a police officer and compared their thoughts regarding the implementation of BWCs in law enforcement and community supervision. Ryan indicated that they would use the BWC when speaking with an

“offender,” but grappled with the idea of leaving the BWC on when walking through a parent’s house.

I would see it bein’ turned on any time you’re talking to an offender. And that’s, you know, that’s a question, I don’t know, is if you go to a house and it’s just mom and dad there, do you have to turn your camera on or is it only when you’re dealin’ with an offender. I know I worked with city police, here, a lot and they have body worn cameras now, and it’s any time they get out of the car now, they’re turnin’ their camera on. But we’re a little different ‘cause we’re actually goin’ into people’s homes without search warrants and stuff, so I don’t, I don’t really know the answer to that. I would say every time you’re talkin’ to an offender, it would be on, but I don’t know, you know, with family and stuff if it should be on or not.

One of the main points that Ryan made is CSOs have a different role than that of police officers, thus BWCs cannot be used in the same manner. Ryan grappled with what conditions of supervision and surveillance tools overflow onto others that reside with the clients. Overall, most of the participants brought up the legality of capturing individuals who are not on probation or parole when conducting their job duties. A few of the participants indicated that they would be concerned regarding minors being caught on BWC footage when meeting with their clients. A clear cut BWC policy discussing the legality of privacy regarding associates, family members, and children of the client was recommended by some of the participants.

Participants also expressed concerns about the privacy implications of a BWC being used when conducting a urinary drug test. Urinary drug tests are usually administered in a bathroom with the client and CSO. Generally, the CSO is required to visually verify that the urine

specimen is coming out of the clients' genitalia directly into the cup. Blake described their perspective on drug tests and BWC privacy issues.

...[when conducting a urinary drug test] obviously, you're in a bathroom setting with somebody, supervising them submitting a urine sample into a cup. Obviously, it's another situation, too, that... can potentially open officers up to some liability as to somebody making a claim of some sort of inappropriate contact or something. But, again, I don't think it would be appropriate for most people to have a body camera on when they're doing those too.

Going to the restroom in a public setting tends to be a very private act. When you add a stranger, per se, to the mix, whose job is to visually verify and collect the specimen, the situation tends to be uncomfortable for both parties involved. It is not uncommon for clients to become anxious or are unable to use the restroom in front of a CSO the first couple of times they are required to submit a urinary specimen for drug testing purposes. Usually, if the client cannot produce a specimen within 10-15 minutes, then they are instructed to drink some water and wait for 30-45 minutes before trying again. Most community supervision departments have a time limit associated with how long the client can wait before violating their conditions of supervision for failure to provide a specimen for drug testing. At times, a CSO has the discretion to conduct a drug test in the field. Blake indicated that they would seek approval to conduct the drug test in the field with the BWC activated if "I felt it was necessary." Henry stated that the BWC would be acceptable while conducting a urinary drug test if the camera does not capture any "intimate areas" or when viewing the results. Conducting a urinary drug test encroaches on an individual's privacy by requiring the CSO to visually witness the collection of the specimen into a container;

the BWC footage creates the opportunity for the interaction to be viewed by many, providing an additional sense of anxiety for the client.

To avoid these privacy violations that may occur with BWC footage, some participants suggested that the department should create a policy or waiver to notify clients and the public that CSOs are using BWCs. Parolees are serving their prison sentence in the community; thus, they have limited rights to privacy, while probationers are sentenced by the judge to supervision. Oscar stated,

[For a] probationer, it would probably be some kind of clause in there, I'm sure, another condition added or somethin' that, a stipulation. I don't think you could just put cameras on and make it become normal, I'm sure there'd have to be somethin' else they'd sign about it, some kind of waiver or somethin' sayin' that they're aware, that they, you know, they waive the right to privacy, some point that, but, I mean, you know, their house, their cars, their common possessions, their phones, I mean, everything now is, is free game. So, and they sign that sayin' that they acknowledge that, and they know that and that's part of, that's part of probation, that's part of parole.

The participant indicated that creating and posting a notice of BWC usage by the community supervision department would aid in the department being transparent with the public and their clients. Additionally, adding a condition or clause indicating that the probationer or parolee is aware of the use of BWCs by CSOs may reduce some of the discomfort and privacy intrusions that may occur during field visits and drug testing. As time goes on, the use of BWCs may be seen as part of the CSO uniform, where the client may forget about it being present.

Anxiety and discomfort in making field decision

Some of the participants indicated that BWCs may create an additional discomfort or anxiety when having to decide on how to handle a complex and/or high-risk situation. Ryan indicated that using BWCs within community supervision provides a “perception that somebody’s always watchin’ you.” The Hawthorne effect states that when someone feels like they are being watched, their behavior changes, whether their behavior changes in a positive or negative manner is unknown. Social sciences continue to teach society that humans can be unpredictable; thus, an interaction between a client and CSO can change without a moment’s notice. Consequently, this perception of being watched may delay an officer’s reaction time in a situation as Henry explained, “I be so paranoid that I’m gonna be crucified for a bad decision that I wouldn’t act in time, you know?” The BWC may create anxiety for a CSO if they focus more on using the BWC in accordance with department regulations instead of focusing on the client. A CSO’s job is dynamic and often unpredictable; thus, being able to react to a situation within a timely manner or without fear of repercussions is important in keeping both the officer and the client safe.

The thought of additional surveillance led some participants to question if the public and the department would scrutinize the officers and/or the field supervisors for the officer’s actions. Henry stated, “I wonder, if things are being recorded, would the public and would the hierarchy hold the supervisor accountable for every single thing. Like, ‘Why didn’t you know this was happening? Why didn’t you see this?’” The discomfort that may be placed on CSOs may also be placed on the supervisors to ensure their officers are using the BWC in accordance with departmental policy and procedures. Supervisors being scrutinized by the executive administration and the public may provide a “temptation for higher ups to potentially

micromanage a little bit more” (Jack). This is an example of Thompson’s (2005) mediated visibility, where footage is no longer restrained by temporal and spatial elements, creating an environment where CSOs and supervisors can be publicly scrutinized across the globe.

With the added stress of additional micromanaging and BWC footage, some of the participants indicated that they would feel pressured to act in a more punitive manner. Daniel stated when advised that “he’s doing something wrong...now I have to make a decision as to whether or not I’m...helping them or arresting them. That creates...some problems too because...if it’s recorded, I’m gonna probably arrest them.” CSOs often use their discretion when family or associates of clients confide in them regarding concerning behavior from a client who may be in violation of their conditions of supervision (e.g., using drugs, curfew violations). Instead of focusing on the rehabilitative aspect of community supervision, the participants indicated that they would be more punitive in their actions. Some participants felt that they would be anxious about not using the BWC as instructed by the department, especially if they are dealing with a complex situation (e.g., a client detoxing from drugs, a client who is mentally unstable, a combative client). The added anxiety and discomfort outweighed any of the benefits of implementing BWCs within a community supervision office according to some of the participants.

Technology Limitations and Finance

A couple of the participants mentioned various concerns of possible over-reliance of BWC footage, limitation of BWC and footage, and misinterpretation of BWC footage. One general theme that came up throughout the interviews was the concern that BWC footage does not provide the full story in an event. “Like I said, you might not have seen what led up to when that situation started... If you clip a shot... you can make anything look like anything... Once it

gets into the world it takes on its own being” (Arthur). BWC footage provides a limited view of a situation due to a variety of factors such as: (1) camera placement on the officer, (2) type and quality of the BWC, (3) BWC malfunctions or equipment limitations, (4) possible damage due to physical confrontations, and (5) when the BWC is activated or deactivated. Another concern was that there would be an over-reliance on BWC footage over a CSO’s testimony and possible misinterpretation of the situation caught on the footage. Oliver stated:

My word’s gonna not be taken... the same way as, as a recording, you know? A recording is very... subjective... It’s not always an objective tool to use... The video’s not great to begin with. The audio sometimes cuts in and out. And it [BWC] only sees what its pointing at... If it’s covered or obscured, or there’s something happening off, out of the camera’s ... line of sight that actually affected the event... I can see too much weight being given to a video recording over... an officer’s... perspective or a testimony on [how] the way the situation happened or went down; what was actually goin’ on.

The BWC will only record what is immediately in front of it; it does not have a 360° bird’s-eye view of the situation. Thus, if the CSO hears something either behind them or to their peripheral, both the sound of the noise and visual may not be captured by the BWC. Secondly, the BWC cannot describe the emotions or train of thought behind the CSO’s or client’s actions. Lincoln described limitations such as technology malfunctions and the narrow scope of BWC footage in their own words.

The context of body cameras, you're not, it's not always there. The lead up... if it wasn't activated far enough in advance or if ...[you're] in a tussle it turns off whatever... [I] think sometimes the context of the situation is not always fully available in just a screenshot of... what's going on correctly... It also doesn't take into account what the

officer sees off to the side of the peripheral. They turn their head, the body camera's not turning with them. It's only seeing what's directly in front of them... I think that kind of narrows the scope of what, when it's released, what the public or the media sees...

If individuals are solely relying on the BWC footage, then the totality of the situation is missed, which creates unwarranted bias against the officers involved and the department. Oftentimes, the footage that is released through media channels is edited to fit the message that the sender is trying to portray to the public (i.e., if the footage is released by the department to justify use of force or if the footage is released by the defense attorney to show an unjust use of force).

Relying solely on BWC footage within evidentiary proceedings can reduce the weight of an officer's word on the stand and the department's legitimacy. Issues may arise when there is no footage or if the footage is defective in some sort of fashion (i.e., loss of audio or video). There are limits to BWCs and the footage that is captured. For instance, the BWC cannot capture the totality of the situation, may break or malfunction, and updates to keep the technology up to date.

Lastly, some of the participants indicated that the financial costs of implementing and maintaining BWCs within the department would be an unnecessary burden. The department would have to take into consideration the monthly maintenance costs, additional time to download the videos, and updating their current case management database to hold the videos or create a database that is compatible with their current system (Parker). Further, there are "a million different ways to spend money before body cameras," such as "treatment programming" and department uniforms and vehicles (Parker; Daniel). The department's funds are granted yearly by the state legislature and are awarded grants; thus, the agency is required to justify where they spend their money, which should line up with the agency's overall mission. The disadvantages of implementing BWCs within community supervision, discussed by the

participants, included: possible privacy violations, anxiety, and discomfort in making field decisions, technology limitations, and the financial costs.

Conclusion & Discussion

This chapter focused on how CSOs and administrators perceived the usage of BWCs within their department. Results from this analysis were derived primarily from three questions asked during the interviews: (1) What are the different ways BWCs are used for CSOs' work duties? (2) How does the usage of BWCs affect CSOs' case management? and (3) What are the advantages and disadvantages of using BWCs within community supervision? Overall, BWCs may be useful in completing various case management duties, as an aid in officer training, and increasing officer and client accountability. However, there are potentially multiple disadvantages to implementing BWCs within community supervision, such as: hindering rapport between the client and CSO, privacy considerations, technological limitations, and the financial cost.

The respondents indicated that they would use BWCs to promote accountability among CSOs and clients in high-risk situations, case management duties, and officer training. The participants indicated that they would use BWCs as a form of accountability for both the officer and client, to either validate or invalidate complaints. This is in line with research that found a reduction in the amount of citizen complaints after the implementation of BWCs in the respective police departments (Katz et al, 2014; Ready & Young, 2015; Ariel et al., 2015; Sutherland et al., 2017). Further, the presence of the BWC may provide a sense of security for the CSOs in high-risk situations, while working in conjunction with other departments, or working in a peace officer capacity. Some participants indicated that they would use the BWC footage for evidentiary procedures in court and revocation hearings. In Braga's et al. (2018)

study, prosecutors indicated that they would use BWC footage as evidence within court proceedings. Other participants stated that BWC footage can aid in various case management tasks such as case notes and client preparation similarly to BWCs and law enforcement research (Jennings et al, 2015; Koen et al., 2018; Rowe et al., 2018; Todak et al., 2018). BWC footage may be used as a training tool for new recruits and for CSOs to sharpen their skills. Multiple studies concluded that BWC footage aided in various training aspects (Braga et al., 2018; Phelps et al., 2018).

Lastly, participants perceived the following disadvantages associated with implementing BWCs in a community supervision department: privacy violations, discomfort and anxiety, technological limitations, and financial costs. The participants indicated that privacy violations may occur when conducting field visits or during urinary drug testing of a client. Even though probationers and parolees give up certain constitutional rights by being under adult supervision, the question remains as to what degree of privacy can they expect within their own place of residence? One main condition of adult felony supervision is the client agreeing to home visits by their CSO, where the CSO does not have to provide a search warrant to enter the residence. Failure to comply with this condition is a violation of supervision. By introducing BWCs into an individual's residence, footage is captured that may be stored and viewed by others. Does the client; as well as other occupants of the home, waive their rights to being captured on film? The policy and procedure should grant CSOs some level of discretion regarding activation of BWCs during any type of encounter based on the circumstances of the situation. This is consistent with a growing body of research which indicates officers' discretion to activate their BWC affects how they use the BWC and their perception of it (Smykla et al., 2016; Gramagila & Phillips, 2017; Newell & Greidanus, 2018; Wooditch et al., 2020; Pelfrey & Keener, 2018). Secondly,

the participants stated that the BWC may create a level of discomfort and anxiety for the CSO when handling a complex or high-risk situation. The additional surveillance may cause CSOs to act in a more punitive manner and/or strictly follow policy and procedure in every situation.

Lastly, there are technological limitations and financial costs associated with BWCs that need to be considered prior to the implementation of them by their department. Over-reliance on BWC footage and surveillance technology can undermine CSO's testimony. For instance, BWC technology has limitations, as it only captures what the camera lens is pointing directly at, only records upon activation, and can get damaged, causing footage to be lost. There is also a heavy financial cost associated with the implementation and upkeep of BWCs and footage without the budget and additional grants; it may not be cost effective for smaller departments or community supervision agencies.

Overall, respondents agreed that utilizing BWCs as an internal tool to aid in case management and when completing high-risk duties such as warrant roundups would be beneficial in community supervision agencies. The limitations of BWCs within community supervision agencies should be considered prior to implementing them. Depending on the main mission statement of the agency, the disadvantages of BWCs may outweigh the advantages.

Chapter 7 - Correlating Results with Established Theories

In chapters 5 and 6, implications of the results were discussed, including how the findings converge or diverge with prior BWC research. Rather than rehash those connections, this section will consider some theoretical perspectives that may shed light on the results—tracing connections between findings and their broader sociological and criminological implications. This chapter provides an answer to the last research question: How can we make sense of these findings through established theories? The theories that are reviewed in this section are: Foucault’s disciplinary power, Ritzer’s McDonaldization, and resource dependency theory (RDT).

In modern society, surveillance technology surrounds us through various devices in the community and citizens’ homes. When conducting field visits, CSOs can potentially be monitored through various surveillance technologies used in their clients’ homes (such as ring doorbells, CCTV, home alarm systems, Alexa, and Android technology). The BWC could capture what occurred in front of the CSO versus what is captured by other devices and citizens. Even though BWCs have a limited view, the footage may be used as a resource to collaborate the CSO’s testimony that may not be captured at another angle from another citizen’s device. Being able to provide multiple angles regarding a controversial incident between law enforcement and the public may reduce a negative public response. Goldsmith’s (2010) application of mediated visibility postulates that society can watch recordings of incidents between individuals through media outlets without the constraints of time and locality, making law enforcement visible to the public on a global scale.¹⁵ For instance, some of the participants indicated that they would utilize

¹⁵ Goldsmith applied Thompson’s (2005) concept of “The New Visibility” to law enforcement. Thompson’s (2005) concept provides another dimension of Foucault’s panopticon that incorporates what he calls mediated visibility, which is defined this way: “...the field of vision is no longer constrained by spatial and temporal properties of the

a BWC during arrests, while working in the community as a peace officer, and during warrant roundups. Recognizing the abundance of surveillance technology used by consumers and their clients may become a crucial element in community supervision agency's ability to reduce the amount of public scrutiny they may face due to social media.

Foucault – Disciplinary Power

The usage of BWCs within policing and community supervision has theoretical underpinnings in the advancement of surveillance within society. Surveillance can be viewed as a form of discipline as a means of social control by formal institutions (e.g., government, schools, and military) and informal institutions (e.g., family and peers), with the last phase being that of self-discipline created through the implementation of normalized power (Foucault, 1995; Simon, 2007).

Foucault's perspective on the normativeness of surveillance is explained through his historical account of the use of technological advancements of discipline and punishment in society ranging from the 1700's until the 20th century. Foucault's book, *Discipline & Punish: The Birth of the Prison*, was written to describe how punishment evolved from the "spectacle" to that of punishment through the reciprocal relationship between power and knowledge (Foucault, 1995, p. 23). The more knowledgeable we become, the better we become at exerting power to control the masses through the social construction of the "normal citizen." Foucault (1995) discusses the transformation of absolute power from the sovereign to the state, then to "experts" that aid in defining who is normal in society, thus creating the group referred to as "other."

here and now but is shaped, instead, by the distinctive properties of communication media, by a range of social and technical considerations... and by the new types of interaction that these media make possible" (Thompson, 2005, pp. 35-36).

According to Foucault (1995), formal punishment - or repressive power - evolved into normalized power, which is a tool to normalize social behavior and create an efficient system that incorporates discipline regimens through schools, religion, employment, laws, military, and internal regulation (Foucault, 1995). In other words, the threat of repressive power being used against an individual may serve as a deterrent to commit a criminal act. However, normalized power occurs when an individual automatically or subconsciously follows aspects of the social contract without repressive power being used. The individual becomes a “docile body,” where their movements are controlled, manipulated, and supervised through various formal and informal institutions which subject them to various forms of discipline based on the social construction of the “normal citizen” (Foucault, 1995). Discipline is incorporated into everyday living and reinforced through society’s expectations of normativeness through a structured environment that is unquestioned by general society (Foucault, 1995). This disciplinary power is derived from hierarchical observation, normalizing judgment, and examination (the procedure that occurs through a mixture of hierarchical observation and normalizing judgment) (Foucault, 1995, p. 170).

Through his basic understanding of deterrence theory, Foucault (1995) discusses the use of surveillance as a form of discipline and punishment, using Bentham’s conception of the panopticon. The “panopticon is a machine for disassociating the see/being seen dyad: in the peripheral ring, one is totally seen, without ever seeing; in the central tower, one sees everything without ever being seen” (Foucault, 1995, p. 203). Some of the earliest American prisons were built upon Bentham’s design of the panopticon to maximize the prison guard’s ability to survey many inmates by oneself. The panopticon extends the government’s ability to assert power without the physical assertion, as the prisoner is aware of continued surveillance, even though he

cannot see the physical body of the surveyor. The social control of the individual by the government is extended from the prison system into society through the criminal justice system, through corporate agencies, and through the private surveillance industry. Thus, society has transformed into both a class-based and disciplined society (Foucault, 1995). The last phase of the panopticon is internalized surveillance and social control by the individual which is extended from citizen to citizen; this is a prime example of the exertion of normalized power (Foucault, 1995). The hierarchical observation is extended using surveillance technology within the criminal justice system, which aids in normalizing the judgment of individuals who are subjected to the criminal justice system through the repressive power of the government.

Applying Foucauldian logic within community supervision agencies, the administrators/directors/commissioners who oversee the agency are granted power to run the agency in accordance with state and federal mandates. For instance, some of the participants indicated that the criminal justice pendulum swings based upon the political environment – they are either focused more on rehabilitative or punitive responses. The political realm can also affect how the BWC footage is used within a community supervision agency. For instance, James described the perceived benefit of BWC as well as the extended arm of surveillance that would follow the client when released from a correctional facility.

Sometimes, there's things we can't predict and there's, there's some things that we could probably use the benefit of having some footage of to say, "This is what actually happened," you know? But I think for officers, that gets 'em to, you know, that police state, you know, constant surveillance kind of situation where people that are supervised, probably, don't want to be part of that, they probably had enough of that in prison. And part of our goal is to reintegrate them into society without... the feeling that they're...

constantly being watched, every move, and they don't have any room for misstep... I think... the families and the individuals that we deal with on a daily basis probably wouldn't appreciate it much as well.

The above quote demonstrated the possible usefulness of BWC footage within community supervision; however, the level of surveillance that clients and their families would be subjected to through BWCs being utilized may undermine the main goal of community supervision – to reintegrate offenders in society.

Secondly, CSOs are trained to become experts who supervise probationers and/or parolees, who are removed from the category of normal citizen to that of “others.” Government-sanctioned supervision of individuals within a society is considered a type of punishment used in part to deter individuals from committing criminal acts. Both the CSOs' and the offenders' perceptions regarding the criminal justice system and criminality affect the level of deterrence that surveillance has on an individual. For instance, James stated how he perceived the reaction of some of their clients if BWCs were utilized by their department.

I think we've moved in a society where so much is taped either by phones or body cameras, or people with surveillance cameras in their house, that I don't think people notice 'em as much as we think they notice 'em because we know they're there... I don't really think they're gonna have as big of a problem with where we walk into their house with a body camera on, other than them goin', 'Excuse the mess!' You know, 'Sorry I didn't clean up.' And you're like, 'Yeah, it's been that way for the last six months.'... I don't think you're gonna have that much of an issue with... the presence of the body camera.

The above quote discusses the normalization of surveillance within society which reduces the possibility of BWCs holding a deterrent effect on criminality. Child protection laws generally indicate that parents or legal guardians must provide the basic elements (such as suitable housing, medical care, education, and clothing) to children who reside within their household. If these basic elements are not provided, then the parents or legal guardians may face criminal charges. In the above quote, James indicated that the client may use socially accepted verbal responses by referring to the basic social standards of cleanliness; however, their behavior may not be modified solely on the presence of the BWC. The BWC footage maybe used within evidentiary proceedings if child abuse and neglect charges are placed on the client. If the CSO does not address any criminal behavior, then the client is less likely to alter said behavior.

Based on the results in chapter five which discuss behavior modification due to the presence of BWCs by both CSOs and clients, it seems as though the panopticon gaze is extended beyond the prisoners and now includes the CSOs as well. For instance, some of the participants indicated that they would be hesitant in their decision-making abilities due to the presence of the BWC in fear that they may be disciplined for not acting accordingly or be micromanaged. Other participants indicated that some individuals (including co-workers, clients, and themselves) would change the verbiage to be more professional- or societal-appropriate in nature. The concept that the language used would be modified based on the presence of a BWC creates the impression that the current verbiage used is inappropriate. CSOs' actions and communication styles may be surveyed by the department through the disciplinary power that is exerted. Thus, Foucault's concept of docile bodies and normativeness is extended to the CSOs as well, as their movements are controlled and manipulated based on the utilization of the BWC. Most participants stated that they are under constant surveillance, whether it be in the office or in the

community, which brings about the question: At what point in society did the department start surveying their employees (guards), like that of the clients (prisoners)?

Lastly, Foucault was often concerned with the relationship between power and knowledge. One way to hold knowledge and power within society is through controlling the narrative by monitoring the material that is published and/or displayed for society to see. For instance, one of the departments approached for this study indicated that they were doing similar research, which prevented this research to be conducted with them at this time. Months later, social media posts were published, showing BWC research in partnership with a company that develops technology and weapons for law enforcement, military, and corrections. The community supervision agency has a current contract with the company who provides the BWCs for their CSOs to utilize. This begs the question: Is biased research being presented to the department's stakeholders, constituents, and employees? By subjecting community supervision clients (probationers and parolees), who are considered a special population, to filming of interactions with CSOs, are constitutional rights further violated, or is the scarlet letter further cemented into a digital world?¹⁶ Figuratively speaking, Foucault's panopticon is expanded into society with surveillance technology (BWC, GPS monitoring), where community supervision clients and CSOs are the main subjects placed on display for the world to see (evident in television shows that focus on inmates inside correctional facilities, as well as their adjustment in society). Rather than ameliorate problems, the use of surveillance technologies only seems to

¹⁶ Scarlet letter refers to Hawthorne's book, *The Scarlet Letter*, written in 1850. As a type of punishment for committing a deviant act, the main character of the book had to wear an A (the scarlet letter) for adultery, which symbolizes shame and brings about community judgment. The scarlet letter then becomes part of the individual's identity, like that of having a criminal record; the letter changes from an A (adulterer) to a C (criminal) (Hawthorne, 1947).

further entrench power relations between CSOs and supervisees as well as between employees and employers.

McDonaldization Theory

Ritzer's McDonaldization theory, based on Weber's work on rationality, is relevant for the results of this dissertation. McDonaldization refers to a process where traditional ways of doing work are replaced by rational ones (Ritzer, 2000). The main dimensions of McDonaldization are efficiency, calculability, predictability, and control (Ritzer, 2000, p. 16). Efficiency refers to creating an ideal way to complete a goal. Calculability means "quantitative aspects of products sold (portion size, cost) and services offered (the time it takes to get the product)" (Ritzer, 2000, p. 17). Predictability is "the assurance that products and services will be the same over time and in all locales" (Ritzer, 2000, p.17). Lastly, control is expressed through the way the department controls their clients and workers, including management, through various threats and modifications to policies such as replacing employees with technology.

When applying McDonaldization theory to the results discussed in this dissertation, it is surmised that the utilization of BWCs fits the main dimensions of the theory: efficiency, calculability, predictability, and control. For instance, BWC footage may be used for training purposes and certain aspects of case management. If BWC technology aids in writing case narratives or replaces case notes regarding the interaction between the CSO and client, this would reduce the CSO's time spent on that aspect of case management. Some of the participants indicated that they would use the BWC for training purposes, such as showing new officers' real interactions with CSOs and clients, providing a way to discuss different ways to handle tough situations or use the footage as an ice breaker. Further, when CSOs are trained in the same

manner and instructed to follow the department's policy and procedures, regardless of their own opinion, then the department can calculate expenses such as the amount of money used for CSOs' salary, training, uniforms, and retention efforts for CSOs. Control is exerted over the employees by enforcing departmental policy and procedures, as well as replacing employees with technology. A few of the respondents indicated that a disadvantage of using BWC footage in evidentiary proceedings may cause an over-reliance on the footage, simultaneously reducing their own testimony. BWC footage should be used as an additional resource; however, further research should be conducted on the legality of using BWC footage captured by the CSO with the protected special population prior to releasing the footage to the public. Further, the results indicated that BWCs would change the behavior of their clients for the better, as well as prompting them to respond in a more professional manner, which is another form of departmental control.

There is reason to view the implementation of BWCs as a purely rational act by rational organizations. Yet, Ritzer (2000) explains that the pursuit of rational processes and outcomes may yield irrational consequences. As he explains, "rational systems inevitably spawn irrational consequences... rational systems serve to deny human reason; rational systems are often unreasonable" (Ritzer, 2000, p. 20). In the context of community supervision, such irrationality may occur if BWCs create an obstacle for establishing rapport between supervisors and clients or by discouraging clients from speaking frankly and truthfully. For instance, if a client has a substance abuse addiction and relapses, a few of the participants indicated that they would be more punitive versus treatment-orientated in their response, due to the presence of the BWC. One of the main tools that CSOs utilize daily is their communication skills. BWCs may affect an individual's behavior to a certain extent, but how an individual communicates with

another directly affects their response. If this is the case, then it can be said to be an expected irrationality resulting from the pursuit of rational ends by an organization. In this manner, the community service organizations may rationally pursue accountability improvements and liability reductions but may end up undermining the central objective of their organization—to rehabilitate offenders and protect the community.

Lastly, one of the main reasons behind implementing BWCs within policing was to address accountability, transparency, and legitimacy issues, which seems like a rational goal to achieve. However, irrationality may occur when the department strives to improve one of these aspects to the point that it may, in turn, undermine another aspect. For instance, one participant indicated that clients are ordered to pay a monthly supervision fee which may leave individuals who live in poverty choosing between paying basic expenses or this fee. Logan explains by using a scenario they are often faced with:

[the client may state] “I’m strugglin’ to keep my light bill on.” I’m like, “Okay, bring me 20 bucks.” And they go, “What?” “Well, on parole it’s 63 dollars.” I’m like, “I go in your house, I want to see you turn your lights on and pay 20 bucks instead of 63, and I’ll let the guy at headquarters know I told you to do that ‘cause you made the effort and you just don’t have it, you know? I’m not gonna tell you to not go buy food for your kids when, you know, or your kid needs school supplies. Take care of that.” So, I think... if our headquarters personnel and the people that ultimately make the rules for us, step back and understand... what happens in the real world.

In the above example, Logan provides a real-life scenario that most CSOs have or will come across in their careers. If the executive branch or society holds the CSO accountable for not enforcing the rules and using their own discretion in reducing the mandatory financial obligation,

the legitimacy and transparency of the department may be questioned. For instance, if the department is being truly transparent with the community, then they would report that they had a rogue CSO who failed to follow the instructions of the governing party (Judges and/or Parole Board). This in turn may hurt the legitimacy of the department when considering the accountability aspect. For instance, if the CSO is disciplined for failing to follow departmental procedure, then the department is undermining their goal of aiding in the reintegration of clients in the community. If the department fails to discipline the CSO, then they are not holding everyone accountable as required (exceptions are made). It can be rationally conceived for a department to aim at being transparent, legitimate, and accountable; however, the irrationality that occurs in pursuit of one goal may undermine another. Since community supervision aims at providing services and aiding in the reintegration of clients in society, there seems to be no rational way to provide a clear path to handle human beings that are simultaneously rational and irrational in nature.

Resource Dependency Theory (RDT)

Community supervision agencies are government-run organizations that rely on resources from state or federal legislature funding, grants, and stakeholders. The basic premise Pfeffer and Salancik (1978) RDT implies is that organizational behavior is affected by external resources, which can be applied to the results of this dissertation. According to Pfeffer (1987: 26-27), RDT and interorganizational relations are:

the fundamental units for understanding intercorporate relations and society are organizations; 2) these organizations are not autonomous, but rather are constrained by a network of interdependencies with other organizations; 3) interdependence, when coupled with uncertainty about what the actions will be of those with which the

organizations interdependent, leads to a situation in which survival and continued success are uncertain' therefore 4) organizations take actions to manage external interdependencies, although such actions are inevitable never completely successful and produce new patterns of dependence and interdependence; and 5) these patterns of dependence produce interorganizational as well as intraorganizational power, where such power has some effect on organizational behavior (as cited in Hillman, Withers, & Collins, 2009, pp. 1404-1405).

Community supervision state agencies are run by an individual who is appointed by the governor of the respective state. Usually, when a new governor is elected within a state, new directors are appointed to the state agencies under the governor's office. With a new change in administration comes new policies and procedures for the employees to follow. Many law enforcement agencies (including community supervision) applied for federal grants to implement BWCs or conducted research to examine the prospect of using BWCs. For instance, a few of the participants indicated that the executive branch objectivity when viewing BWC footage may be hindered due to their political ties or the political environment. This is an example of organizational behavior being affected by the department's dependence on legislative funding as well as external stakeholders who influence government policy. After every administration change, employees and clients may wait to see which way the pendulum swings, causing policies to change in either a more punitive or restorative manner. For instance, if the pendulum swings in a restorative nature, then the department may be pressured by external stakeholders to implement restorative justice initiatives. Thus, community supervision agencies are interdependent with state and federal governments, stakeholders, and financial funding opportunities.

According to RDT, organizations or firms may use five different options to reduce the “environmental dependencies” including “(a) mergers/vertical integration, (b) joint ventures and other interorganizational relationships, (c) boards of directors, (d) political action, and (e) executive succession” (Hillman et al., 2009, p. 1404). Community supervision agencies are either under the Department of Corrections or their own entity within the state. Either way, there are “joint ventures” that occur between the prison (parolees) and court (probationers) systems due to the paroling out of individuals or the incarceration of individuals based on supervision violations. Even though the agency is run by one individual (Secretary of Corrections, Commissioner, Director), they are surrounded by directors and deputy directors of various divisions within the agency, which creates a diverse platform to discuss ways to be creative, which then reduces the department’s dependency on legislative initiatives. This community supervision agency is run by a director with two deputy directors underneath them.

Community supervision agencies usually attend and may participate in legislative sessions to remain involved in the political realm. The utilization of BWCs within community supervision agencies is not a new concept or discussion; the funding of the initiative keeps the cameras as a discussion in states with limited funding. One of the participants mentioned that BWCs were implemented across all law enforcement agencies within their state; however, the legislators considered mandating BWCs within their department but were unable to secure funding. Lastly, “executive succession” occurs after new governors are appointed and/or departmental negligence. The community supervision agency participates in four of the five options suggested to reduce their dependencies; the only option not discussed was “mergers/vertical integration.” Thus, community supervision agencies will have some level of interdependence on the environmental resources, which may cause role conflict within the

department. This was evident through the level of mistrust indicated by the participants regarding the executive branch's ability to view BWC footage objectively versus that of a supervisor.

Participants indicated that the executive branch has the added pressure of having to respond to the public and governor directly, versus the supervisors who may empathize with the CSO.

Further research should be conducted to examine RDT within community supervision agencies. Hillman et al., (2009, p. 1416) suggests that integrating RDT with other perspectives will aid in creating a more thorough understanding of "organizational interdependencies." For instance, integrating institutional theory and RDT to study community supervision organizations and their environment may provide new information when examining the use of technology and surveillance. Another research pathway to take would be integrating stakeholder theory with RDT. This may provide a deeper understanding of which stakeholders' community supervision agencies are more dependent upon based on environmental factors.

Conclusion

Even though there are a multitude of established theories to provide further analytical understanding of the results of this dissertation, this chapter only discussed Foucauldian logic, McDonaldization, and RDT. When applying Foucauldian logic, it appears that the participants are also being watched, which brings up the question: At what point in time did the guards become prisoners as well? When applying Ritzer's McDonaldization, a Pandora's box of infinite questions arises due to the irrationality of pursuing rational ways of completing departmental goals as well as undermining the main goal of community supervision agencies – to provide services and to reintegrate clients within the community. Lastly, RDT discusses various ways to reduce environmental dependencies; however, the interlacing of organizational resources

and political initiatives places a strain on the relationships between CSOs and their executive branch.

Chapter 8 - Conclusion

This dissertation examined CSOs' and administrators' perceptions regarding the use of BWCs within community supervision agencies. This dissertation was guided by three primary questions: (1) How do CSOs and administrators view the potential impacts of BWCs on behavior, intra-departmental relations, and public relations?, (2) How do CSOs and administrators perceive the use of BWCs will shape the execution of their day-to-day work duties?, and (3) How can we make sense of these findings through established theories? Based on the results of this dissertation, agencies may want to reconsider implementing BWCs until greater clarity is gained regarding the impact of such devices on the department's legitimacy within the community, accountability among officers, and prevalence of citizen complaints. While respondents indicated that BWCs may facilitate the fulfillment of various case management duties, officer training, and client and officer accountability, they also were concerned that these devices may hinder rapport between the client and CSO, create privacy issues, present technological problems, and incur a financial burden. Thus, a cost benefit analysis should be conducted prior to implementing BWCs within community supervision agencies. Lastly, there are theoretical implications surrounding the utilization of BWCs within community supervision agencies when analyzed through: (1) Foucauldian logic – possible extension of the panopticon gaze encompassing the CSO officer as well, (2) Ritzer's McDonaldization – the irrationality of using rational processes, and RDT – possible over-dependency on legislative actions and funding. Below is a summary of the respondents' stance on BWCs, as well as recommendations to management and the public. Then, the limitations of this dissertation and future research are discussed.

Respondents' Stance and Recommendations

When asked what their stance was regarding the use of BWCs within community supervision agencies, seven (7) of the respondents were in favor of them, eight (8) of the respondents were neutral, and two (2) of the respondents were opposed. The participants who support the use of BWCs in community supervision agencies indicated it would aid in accountability among the CSOs and clients, and they would be another resourceful tool to use. The participants who took a neutral stance regarding the use of BWCs made it dependent on the ability of the department to gain financial funding for the implementation of the camera. Further, some of the respondents did not want to commit to a position due to ignorance about the new BWC policy and procedures, specifically any potential clauses concerning privacy and officer discretion to activate or deactivate their cameras. Lastly, two of the participants disagreed with the usage of BWCs within community supervision agencies due to the financial costs and the possible negative effect the camera would have on strengthening the rapport between the CSO and client. The rapport that the client and CSO have may influence how they behave towards one another, as well as the outcome of supervision.

The participants provided recommendations regarding the implementation and support of BWC programs. The priority would be to ensure a departmental budget is available, as there may be more important tools or resources than BWCs on which to spend money, such as uniform equipment, vehicles, community-based programming, and retention efforts. Secondly, state agencies should make more of an effort to gain input from rural offices that are three or more hours away from their headquarters. There is a cultural difference between rural and suburban areas that should be considered when creating departmental policies or implementing new technology. Lastly, executive staff should go into the field to gain the perspective of what it is

like to be a field officer today. This would increase communication between the executive branch and supervisors with CSOs.

Limitations

Every study conducted is not without its limitations. The limitations faced while conducting this research began with gaining access and approval to conduct interviews with CSOs. For instance, one department indicated that they were conducting their own research regarding the usage of BWCs in their agency. Further, requests to conduct this research were left unanswered by multiple community supervision agencies throughout the United States. Once approval was granted by the community supervision agency interviewed in this dissertation, other hurdles appeared such as tropical storms and Covid-19 pandemic-inspired restrictions. The agency is located within a southern state in the United States and is prone to experiencing tropical storms. During the time of conducting this research, multiple office sites were severely affected by two tropical storms. This reduced CSOs' availability to participate, as some CSOs were both personally and professionally affected. Further, this research started one year into the Covid-19 pandemic. The Covid-19 pandemic continues to change the way community supervision agencies and the Department of Corrections conduct their daily operations; thus, the department is figuring out a new normalcy.

This study interviewed one community supervision agency. Out of approximately 500 officers only 17 (or 3.4%) were interviewed, limiting the amount of data gathered. This research is not generalizable to all community supervision agencies; however, it does provide some understanding regarding the perceptions CSOs may have regarding the implementation of BWCs within community supervision. As Berg (2007, p. 259) stated, "when case studies are properly undertaken, they should not only fit the specific individual, group, or event studied but also generally provide understanding about similar individuals, groups, and events." If we assume

that human beings are unique, then replicating this exact study with the same conditions will provide a variance in responses. Even though the responses may vary, this qualitative study provided an in-depth analysis creating a snapshot of the participants' perspectives.

Some of the participants seemed hesitant in their responses. For instance, during one interview a participant started whispering their response when I asked questions regarding their perception of being able to communicate freely with the executive branch. Others seemed to provide answers that can be construed as departmental safe. For instance, some of the participants did not take a firm stance regarding questions aimed at discussing their perceptions of the executive branch. Their answers were dependent upon certain factors. Further, one of the participants stated that the agency conducted an internal communications survey and were not pleased about the results due to the employees indicating that their communication was not to the level they thought. Thus, some participants may have adjusted their responses due to the perceived fear of retaliation from their supervisors or executive branch. Maybe there is no definitive answers to the research questions asked in this dissertation due to the complex nature of working in a public service agency and because human beings are simultaneously simple and complex.

Future Research

This dissertation examined CSOs' perceptions of BWCs in community supervision agencies by conducting semi-structured interviews. There are a couple of different areas of future research that may be conducted based on this dissertation. First, quantitative research should be done to gain a more complete understanding of CSOs' perceptions of BWCs within community supervision. For instance, a survey can be created based on the themes that came out of the interviews and distributed to multiple community supervision agencies throughout the United

States. It may be easier for CSOs to complete a survey than to participate in an interview lasting approximately 45 minutes. Secondly, the respondents were concerned with privacy implications regarding the use of BWC for themselves, their co-workers, and citizens. A legal content analysis would be beneficial regarding state and federal regulations concerning citizens' rights to privacy and public safety officer usage of surveillance technology. Should BWCs be conditionally accepted by society as Thomsen (2020) contends? Lastly, administering pre- and post- BWC implementation surveys with a community supervision agency can provide further research regarding CSO perceptions while capturing a possible change in opinion based on the BWC.

Bibliography

- Adams, S. J. (1965). Inequity in social exchange. In L. Berkowitz (ed.), *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, 2, 267-299. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0065-2601\(08\)60108-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0065-2601(08)60108-2)
- Adams, I., & Mastracci, S. (2017). Visibility is a trap: The ethics of police body-worn cameras and control. *Administrative Theory & Praxis*, 39, 313-328. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10841806.2017.1381482>
- Adams, I., & Mastracci, S. (2019). Police body-worn cameras: Effects on officers' burnout and perceived organizational support. *Police Quarterly*, 22(1), 5–30. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1098611118783987>
- Administration Office of the United States Courts Probation and Pretrial Services Office. (2016). *Overview of probation and supervised release conditions*. <https://www.uscourts.gov/services-forms/overview-probation-supervised-release-conditions>
- American Probation and Parole Association (APPA) Technology Committee. (2020). *Body-worn cameras in community supervision*. American Probation and Parole Association. <https://www.appa-net.org/eweb/docs/APPA/stances/ip-BWCCS.pdf>
- Ariel, B., Farrar, W.A., & Sutherland, A. (2015). The effect of police body-worn cameras on use of force and citizens' complaints against the police: A randomized controlled trial. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology*, 31(3), 509–535.
- Ariel, B., Sutherland, A., Henstock, D., Young, J., Drover, P., Sykes, J., Megicks, S., & Henderson, R. (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. *Journal of Experimental Criminology*, 12, 453-463. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11292-016-9261-3>
- Ariel, B., Sutherland, A., Henstock, D., Young, J., Drover, P., Sykes, J., Megicks, S., & Henderson, R. (2017). "Contagious accountability": A global multisite randomized controlled trial on the effect of police body-worn cameras on citizens' complaints against the police. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 44(2), 293-316. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0093854816668218>
- Ariel, B., Sutherland, A., Henstock, D., Young, J., Drover, P., Sykes, J., Megicks, S., & Henderson, R. (2018). Paradoxical effects of self-awareness of being observed: testing the effect of police body-worn cameras on assaults and aggression against officers. *Journal of Experimental Criminology*, 14, 19–47. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11292-017-9311-5>

- Ariel, B., Sutherland, A., Henstock, D., Young, J., & Sosinski, G. (2018). The deterrence spectrum: Explaining why police body-worn cameras “work” or “backfire” in aggressive police-public encounters. *Policing (Oxford)*, *12*(1), 6–26. <https://doi.org/10.1093/police/paw051>
- Berg, B.L. (2007). *Qualitative research methods for the social sciences*. (6th ed.). Pearson/Allyn & Bacon
- Blader, S. L., & Tyler, T. R. (2003). What constitutes fairness in work settings? A four-component model of procedural justice. *Human Resource Management Review*, *13*(1), 107–126. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1053-4822\(02\)00101-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1053-4822(02)00101-8)
- Braga, A. A., Sousa, W. H., Coldren Jr., J. R., & Rodriguez, D. (2018). The effects of body-worn cameras on police activity and police-citizen encounters: A randomized controlled trial. *Journal of Criminal Law And Criminology*, *108*, 511-538.
- Braga, A. A., Weisburd, D., & Turchan, B. (2018). Focused deterrence strategies and crime control: An updated systematic review and meta-analysis of the empirical evidence. *Criminology and Public Policy*, *17*(1), 205–250. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1745-9133.12353>
- Braunstein R., & Erickson, D. (2019). Best practices, challenges and opportunities for body worn camera programs. *South Dakota Law Review*, 510-520.
- Bromberg, D.E. & Charbonneau, E. (2018). Body-worn cameras and policing: A list experiment of citizen overt and true support. *Public Administrative Review*, *78*(6), 883-891. <https://doi.org/10.1111/puar.12924>
- Bromberg, D., Charbonneau, É., & Smith, A. (2020). Public support for facial recognition via police body-worn cameras: Findings from a list experiment. *Government Information Quarterly*, *37*(1). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.giq.2019.101415>
- Bureau of Justice Statistics (n.d.). *Community corrections (Probation and parole): Terms & definitions*. <https://www.bjs.gov/index.cfm?ty=tp&tid=15>
- Chappell, B., Hernandez, J., & Diaz, J. (January 7, 2022). All 2 white men convicted of murdering Ahmaud Arbery are sentenced to life in prison. Retrieved from: <https://www.npr.org/2022/01/07/1070618256/ahmaud-arbery-killers-sentence>
- Clayman, S. E. (2001). Ethnomethodology: General. In *International Encyclopedia of the Social & Behavioral Sciences*, Elsevier Science Ltd., 4865-4870. <https://clayman.scholar.ss.ucla.edu/wp-content/uploads/sites/15/2019/07/Clayman-2001-Ethno-Encyclo-Article.pdf>
- Corbin, J. & Strauss, A. (1990). Grounded theory research: Procedures, canons, and evaluative criteria. *Qualitative Sociology* *13*(1).

- Coudert, F., Butin, D., & Le Métayer, D. (2015). Body-worn cameras for police accountability: Opportunities and risks. *Computer Law and Security Review*, 31, 749–762. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.clsr.2015.09.002>
- Crow, M. S., Snyder, J. A., Crichlow, V. J., & Smykla, J. O. (2017). Community perceptions of police body-worn cameras: The impact of views of fairness, fear, performance, and privacy. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 44, 589–610. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0093854816688037>
- Demir, M., Apel, R., Braga, A. A., Brunson, R. K., & Ariel, B. (2018). Body worn cameras, procedural justice, and police legitimacy: A controlled experimental evaluation of traffic stops. *Justice Quarterly*, 37(1), 53–32. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07418825.2018.1495751>
- Demir, M. (2019). Citizens’ perceptions of body-worn cameras (BWCs): Findings from a quasi-randomized controlled trial. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 60, 130-139.
- Demir, M., Braga, A. A., & Apel, R. (2020). Effects of police body-worn cameras on citizen compliance and cooperation: Findings from a quasi-randomized controlled trial. *Criminology and Public Policy*, 19(3), 855–882. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1745-9133.12505>
- Freedom of Information Act. (2021). *Freedom of information act statute*. <https://www.foia.gov/foia-statute.html>
- Foucault, M. (1995). *Discipline and punish: The birth of the prison* (2nd Vintage books ed.). (A. Sheridan, Trans.) New York: Vintage Books. (Original work published ca. 1975-1977).
- Gaub, J. E, Todak, N., & White, M. D. (2020). One size doesn’t fit all: The deployment of police body-worn cameras to specialty units. *International Criminal Justice Review*, 30(2), 136-155. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1057567718789237>
- Georgia Department of Community Supervision (2016, August 9th). *Press Releases: DCS Brings Innovation to the Use of Body Cameras*. <https://dcs.georgia.gov/press-releases/2016-08-09/dcs-brings-innovation-use-body-cameras>
- Georgia Department of Community Supervision (2020, June 30th). *Press Releases: Looking Back Leading Ahead: DCS Celebrates Five Years of Innovative, Progressive and Forward-thinking Community Supervision*. <https://dcs.georgia.gov/press-releases/2020-06-30/dcs-celebrates-five-years>
- Goetschel, M & Peha, J.M. (2017). Police perceptions of body-worn cameras. *American Journal of Criminal Justice*, 42, 698-726. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12103-017-9415-5>
- Goldsmith, A. J. (2010). Policing's new visibility. *British Journal of Criminology*, 50(5), 914-934. <https://doi.org/10.1093/bjc/azq033>
- Goodison, S., & Wilson, T. (2017). Citizen perceptions of body worn cameras: A randomized controlled trial. Washington, DC: Police Executive Research Forum. Retrieved from

<https://perf.memberclicks.net/assets/bodyworncameraperceptions.pdf>

Gramaglia, J. A., & Phillips, S. W. (2018). Police officers' perceptions of body-worn cameras in Buffalo and Rochester. *American Journal of Criminal Justice*, 43(2), 313-328. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12103-017-9403-9>

Greenberg, J. (1987). A taxonomy of organizational justice theories. *The Academy of Management Review*, 12(1), 9–22. <https://doi.org/10.2307/257990>

Harvard Law Review Association. (2015, April). Considering police body cameras. In *Developments in Law: Conversations on Policing (1794-1817)*. *Harvard Law Review*, 128(6). <http://link.galegroup.com/apps/doc/A412800618/AONE?u=ksu&sidAONE&xid=2eac5e5f>

Hawthorne, N. (1804-1864). (1947). *The scarlet letter*. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Healey, P. (1999). Institutional analysis, communicative planning, and shaping places. *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, 19(2), 111-121. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0739456X9901900201>

Headley, A. M., Guerette, R. T., & Shariati, A. (2017). A field experiment of the impact of body-worn cameras (BWCs) on police officer behavior and perceptions. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 53(October), 102–109. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcrimjus.2017.10.003>

Hedberg, E. C., Katz, C. M., & Choate, D. E. (2017). Body-worn cameras and citizen interactions with police officers: Estimating plausible effects given varying compliance levels. *Justice Quarterly*, 34(4), 627–651. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07418825.2016.1198825>

Hillman, A.J., Withers, M.C., & Collins, B.J. (2009). Resource dependence theory: A review. *Journal of Management*, 35(6), 1404-1427. DOI: 10.1177/0149206309343469

Holstein, J. A. & Gubrium, J. F. (1995). *The active interview*. Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications.

Huff, J., Katz, C. M., & Webb, V. J. (2018). Understanding police officer resistance to body-worn cameras. *Policing*, 41(4), 482–495. <https://doi.org/10.1108/PIJPSM-03-2018-0038>

Huff, J., Katz, C. M., Webb, V. J., & Hedberg, E. C. (2020). Attitudinal changes toward body-worn cameras: Perceptions of cameras, organizational justice, and procedural justice among volunteer and mandated officers. *Police Quarterly*, 23(4), 547–588. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1098611120928306>

Hyatt, J. M., Mitchell, R. J., & Ariel, B. (2017). The effects of a mandatory body-worn camera policy on officer perceptions of accountability, oversight, and departmental culture. *Villanova Law Review*, 62(5), 1005–1035.

- Hyland, S. S. (2018, November). *Body-worn cameras in law enforcement agencies, 2016*. Bureau of Justice Statistics. Office of Justice Programs. United States Department of Justice. <https://www.bjs.gov/index.cfm?ty=pbdetail&iid=6426>
- Jennings, W. G., Fridell, L. A., & Lynch, M. D. (2014). Cops and cameras: Officer perceptions of the use of body-worn cameras in law enforcement. *Journal of Criminal Justice, 42*, 549–556. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcrimjus.2014.09.008>
- Jennings, W. G., Lynch, M. D., & Fridell, L. A. (2015). Evaluating the impact of police officer body-worn cameras (BWCs) on response-to-resistance and serious external complaints: Evidence from the Orlando police department (OPD) experience utilizing a randomized controlled experiment. *Journal of Criminal Justice, 43*, 480-486. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcrimjus.2015.10.003>
- Kaeble, D. & Alper, M. (2020, August). *Probation and Parole in the United States, 2017-2018*. Bureau of Justice Statistics. Office of Justice Programs. United States Department of Justice. <https://www.bjs.gov/content/pub/pdf/ppus1718.pdf>
- Katz, C. M., Choate, D. E., Ready, J. R., & Nuno, L. (2014). *Evaluating the impact of officer body worn cameras in the Phoenix Police Department*. Center for Violence Prevention & Community Safety, Arizona State University. https://publicservice.asu.edu/sites/default/files/ppd_spi_feb_20_2015_final.pdf
- Koen, M. C., Willis, J. J., & Mastrofski, S. D. (2018). The effects of body-worn cameras on police organisation and practice: a theory-based analysis. *Policing and Society, 29*(8), 968–984. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10439463.2018.1467907>
- Koen, M. C., & Willis, J. J. (2020). Making sense of body-worn cameras in a police organization: a technological frames analysis. *Police Practice and Research, 21*(4), 351–367. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15614263.2019.1582343>
- Koops, B.J. (2021) The concept of function creep. *Law, Innovation and Technology, 13*(1), 29-56, <https://doi.org/10.1080/17579961.2021.1898299>
- Kyle, M. J., & White, D. R. (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. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0735648X.2016.1208885>
- Lawshe, N. L., Burruss, G. W., Giblin, M. J., & Schafer, J. A. (2019). Behind the lens: Police attitudes toward body-worn cameras and organizational justice. *Journal of Crime and Justice, 42*(1), 78–97. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0735648X.2018.1554839>
- Lum, C., Stoltz, M., Koper, C. S., & Scherer, J. A. (2019). Research on body-worn cameras. *Criminology & Public Policy, 18*(1), 93–118. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1745-9133.12412>
- Makin, D. A., Willits, D. W., Koslicki, W., Brooks, R., Dietrich, B. J., & Bailey, R. L. (2019).

Contextual determinants of observed negative emotional states in police–community interactions. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 46(2), 301–318.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0093854818796059>

Marx, G.T. (1988). *Undercover: Police Surveillance in America*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

McCluskey, J. D., Uchida, C. D., Solomon, S. E., Wooditch, A., Connor, C., & Revier, L. (2019). Assessing the effects of body-worn cameras on procedural justice in the Los Angeles Police Department. *Criminology*, 57(2), 208–236. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1745-9125.12201>

McClure, D., Vigne, N. L., Lynch, M., Golian, L., Lawrence, D., & Malm, A. (2017). *How body cameras affect community members' perceptions of police: Results from a randomized controlled trial of one agency's pilot*. Washington, DC: Justice Policy Center, Urban Institute. <https://www.urban.org/research/publication/how-body-cameras-affect-community-members-perceptions-police>

National Archives. (N.D.). The bill of rights: A transcription. Retrieved from: <https://www.archives.gov/founding-docs/bill-of-rights-transcript>

Newell, B. C., & Greidanus, R. (2018). Officer discretion and the choice to record: Officer attitudes towards body-worn camera activation. *North Carolina Law Review*, 96(5), 1526–1578.

Office of Justice Programs. (2016, April 11th). Program Profile: Effective practices in community supervision (EPICS). Retrieved from: <https://crimesolutions.ojp.gov/ratedprograms/465>

Oppel, Jr., R.A., Taylor, D.B., & Bogel-Burroughs, N. (April, 26, 2021). What to know about Breonna Taylor's Death. Retrieved from: <https://www.nytimes.com/article/breonna-taylor-police.html>

Owens, C., & Finn, W. (2018). Body-worn video through the lens of a cluster randomized controlled trial in London: Implications for future research. *Policing (Oxford)*, 12(1), 77–82. <https://doi.org/10.1093/police/pax014>

Pelfrey, W. V., & Keener, S. (2018). Body-worn cameras and officer perceptions: A mixed-method pretest posttest of patrol officers and supervisors. *Journal of Crime and Justice*, 41(5), 535–552. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0735648X.2018.1479287>

Peterson, B. E., Yu, L., La Vigne, N., & Lawrence, D. S. (2018). *The Milwaukee police department's body-worn camera program: Evaluation findings and key takeaways*. Washington, DC: Urban Institute. <https://www.urban.org/research/publication/milwaukee-police-departments-body-worn-camera-program>

Phelps, J. M., Strype, J., Le Bellu, S., Lahlou, S., & Aandal, J. (2018). Experiential learning and

- simulation-based training in Norwegian police education: Examining body-worn video as a tool to encourage reflection. *Policing (Oxford)*, 12(1), 50–65.
<https://doi.org/10.1093/police/paw014>
- Pfeffer, J., & Salancik, G.R. (1978). *The external control of organizations: A resource dependence perspective*. New York: Harper & Row.
- President's Task Force on 21st Century Policing. (2015). *Interim report of the President's Task Force on 21st Century Policing*, 28. Washington, DC: Office of Community Oriented Policing Services.
https://cops.usdoj.gov/pdf/taskforce/Interim_TF_Report_150228_Intro_to_Implementation.pdf
- Ready, J. T., & Young, J. T. N. (2015). The impact of on-officer video cameras on police–citizen contacts: Findings from a controlled experiment in Mesa, AZ. *Journal of Experimental Criminology*, 11(3), 445–458. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11292-015-9237-8>
- Richards, P., Roberts, D., Britton, M., & Roberts, N. (2018). The exploration of body-worn video to accelerate the decision-making skills of police officers within an experiential learning environment. In *Policing (Oxford)*, 12(1), 43–49. Oxford University Press.
<https://doi.org/10.1093/police/pax017>
- Ringrose, K. (2019). Law enforcement's pairing of facial recognition technology with body-worn cameras escalates privacy concerns. *Virginia: Law Review*, 105, 57-66.
<https://www.virginialawreview.org/articles/law-enforcements-pairing-facial-recognition-technology-body-worn-cameras-escalates/>
- Ritzer, G. (2000). *The McDonaldization of Society*, 3rd ed., Pine Forge Press, Thousand Oaks, CA.
- Roche, S. P. (2019). The impact of surveillance and procedurally just behavior on civilian affect and responses in hypothetical interactions with police officers. *Policing*, 42(6), 1107–1123.
<https://doi.org/10.1108/PIJPSM-12-2018-0192>
- Roethlisberger, F. J., & Dickson, W. J. (1939). *Management and the worker*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Rowe, M., Pearson, G., & Turner, E. (2018). Body-worn cameras and the law of unintended consequences: Some questions arising from emergent practices. *Policing (Oxford)*, 12(1), 83–90. <https://doi.org/10.1093/police/pax011>
- Schaefer, L., & Williamson, H. (2018). Probation and parole officers' compliance with case management tools: Professional discretion and override. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 62(14), 4565–4584.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0306624X18764851>

- Simon J. (2007). *Governing through crime: How the war on crime transformed American democracy and created a culture of fear*. Oxford University Press.
- Smykla, J. O., Crow, M. S., Crichlow, V. J., & Snyder, J. A. (2016). Police body-worn cameras: Perceptions of law enforcement leadership. *American Journal of Criminal Justice*, 41(3), 424–443. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12103-015-9316-4>
- Sousa, W. H., Miethe, T. D., & Sakiyama, M. (2018). Inconsistencies in public opinion of body-worn cameras on police: Transparency, trust, and improved police-citizen relationships. *Policing (Oxford)*, 12(1), 100–108. <https://doi.org/10.1093/policing/pax015>
- St. Louis, E., Saulnier, A., & Walby, K. (2019). Police use of body-worn cameras: Challenges of visibility, procedural justice, and legitimacy. *Surveillance & Society*, 17(4), 305–321. <https://doi.org/10.24908/ss.v17i3/4.8649>
- Stalcup, M. & Hahn, C. (2016). Cops, cameras, and the policing of ethics. *Theoretical Criminology*, 20(4), 482–501. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1362480616659814>
- Sutherland, A., Ariel, B., Farrar, W., & De Anda, R. (2017). Post-experimental follow-ups—Fade-out versus persistence effects: The Rialto police body-worn camera experiment four years on. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 53, 110–116. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcrimjus.2017.09.008>
- Taylor, E., & Lee, M. (2019a). Off the record? Arrestee concerns about the manipulation, modification, and misrepresentation of police body-worn camera footage. *Surveillance & Society*, 17(3/4), 473–483. <https://ojs.library.queensu.ca/index.php/surveillance-and-society/index>
- Taylor, E., & Lee, M. (2019b). Points of view: Arrestees’ perspectives on police body-worn cameras and their perceived impact on police-citizen interactions. *British Journal of Criminology*, 59(4), 958–978. <https://doi.org/10.1093/bjc/azz007>
- The U.S. National Archives and Records Administration. (2021). *The Bill of Rights: A transcription*. <https://www.archives.gov/founding-docs/bill-of-rights-transcript>
- Thibat, J. & Walker, L. (1975). *Procedural justice: A psychological analysis*. Hillsdale, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Thomas, D. R. (2006). A general inductive approach for analyzing qualitative evaluation data. *American Journal of Evaluation* 27(2): 237-246. DOI: 10.1177/1098214005283748
- Thompson, J. B. (2005). The new visibility. *Theory, Culture & Society*, 22(6), 31–51. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0263276405059413>
- Thomsen, F. (2020). The ethics of police body-worn cameras. *Moral Philosophy and Politics*, 7(1), 97-121. <https://doi.org/10.1515/mopp-2019-0027>

- Todak, N., Gaub, J. E., & White, M. D. (2018). The importance of external stakeholders for police body-worn camera diffusion. *Policing*, 41(4), 448–464. <https://doi.org/10.1108/PIJPSM-08-2017-0091>
- Turner, B. L., Caruso, E. M., Dilich, M. A., & Roese, N. J. (2019). Body camera footage leads to lower judgments of intent than dash camera footage. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, 116(4), 1201-1206. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1805928116>
- White, M. D., Todak, N., & Gaub, J. E. (2017). Assessing citizen perceptions of body-worn cameras after encounters with police. *Policing*, 40(4), 689-703. <https://doi.org/10.1108/PIJPSM-07-2016-0105>
- White, M. D., Gaub, J. E., & Todak, N. (2018). Exploring the potential for body-worn cameras to reduce violence in police-citizen encounters. *Policing (Oxford)*, 12(1), 66–76. <https://doi.org/10.1093/police/paw057>
- White, M., Todak, N., & Gaub, J. (2018). Examining body-worn camera integration and acceptance among police officers, citizens, and external stakeholders. *Criminology and Public Policy*, 17(3), 649-677. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1745-9133.12376>
- Wickström, G. & Bendix., T. (2000). The “Hawthorne effect” – what did the original Hawthorne studies actually show? *Scandinavian Journal of Work, Environment & Health*, 26(4), 363-367. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/40967074>
- Wolfe, S. E., & Lawson, S. G. (2020). The organizational justice effect among criminal justice employees: A meta-analysis. *Criminology*, 58(4), 619-644. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1745-9125.12251>
- Wooditch, A., Uchida, C. D., Solomon, S. E., Revier, L., Connor, C., Shutinya, M., McCluskey, J., & Swatt, M. L. (2020). Perceptions of body-worn cameras: Findings from a panel survey of two LAPD divisions. *American Journal of Criminal Justice*, 45(3), 426–453. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12103-020-09517-5>
- Wright, J. E., & Headley, A. M. (2020). Can technology work for policing? Citizen perceptions of police-body worn cameras. *The American Review of Public Administration*, 51(1), 17–27. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0275074020945632>
- Yokum, D., Ravishankar, A., & Coppock, A. (2019). A randomized control trial evaluating the effects of police body-worn cameras. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, 116(21), 10329–10332. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1814773116>
- Young, J. T. N., & Ready, J. T. (2016). A longitudinal analysis of the relationship between administrative policy, technological preferences, and body-worn camera activation among police officers. *Policing (Oxford)*, 12(1), 27–42. <https://doi.org/10.1093/police/paw005>

Appendix A - IRB Approval



TO: Kevin Steinmetz
Sociology, Anthrop, Social Wrk
Manhattan, KS 66506

Proposal Number IRB-10724

FROM: Rick Scheidt, Chair
Committee on Research Involving Human Subjects

DATE: 06/07/2021

RE: Approval of Proposal Entitled, "Community Supervision Officers Perspective on Body-Worn Cameras."

The Committee on Research Involving Human Subjects has reviewed your proposal and has granted full approval. This proposal is **approved for three years from the date of this correspondence.**

APPROVAL DATE: 06/06/2021

EXPIRATION DATE: 06/05/2024

In giving its approval, the Committee has determined that:

No more than minimal risk to subjects

This approval applies only to the proposal currently on file as written. Any change or modification affecting human subjects must be approved by the IRB prior to implementation. All approved proposals are subject to continuing review, which may include the examination of records connected with the project. Announced post-approval monitoring may be performed during the course of this approval period by URCO staff. Injuries, unanticipated problems or adverse events involving risk to subjects or to others must be reported immediately to the Chair of the IRB and / or the URCO.

Electronically signed by Rick Scheidt on 06/07/2021 12:40 PM ET

Appendix B - Project Summary

Community Supervision Officers' and Supervisors' Perspectives on Body-Worn Cameras

Kevin F. Steinmetz, Ph.D. (PI)

Mari-Esther Edwards (GRA)

Kansas State University

Dissertation Project Summary

The Issue: In 2014, President Obama created a task force on policing due the media coverage of police brutality that resulted in deaths of minorities and police departments' legitimacy and trust within the communities were suffering. Similar to police departments, community supervision agencies have adopted the use of body-worn cameras to increase legitimacy and accountability among the officers and their clientele (APPA, 2020). Community supervision agencies are part of an invisible population that is discussed mainly among criminal justice practitioners, certain academic fields that examine social or human behaviors, and the clientele or specials population that they serve. Consequently, the amount of academic research that provides a platform for the voices of community supervision officers regarding body-worn cameras is limited. The implementation of body-worn cameras within community supervision agencies are unique since their job duties are a hybrid of both law enforcement and social worker attributes. Thus, it is important to bring their voices to the fourth front in the at large conversation regarding the utilization of body-worn cameras within law enforcement and community supervision agencies.

Our Study: The proposed study seeks to build on the empirical literature that researched the implementation of body-worn cameras in law enforcement through an exploratory study of community supervision officers' and supervisors' perceptions of the utilization of body-worn cameras within community supervision departments. The graduate researcher will employ in-depth qualitative interviews which will ask probing questions regarding the utilization of body-worn cameras, behavioral modification by surveillance technology, case management, procedural justice, and organizational justice.

What We Are Asking of You: We would appreciate an assurance that your department is willing to cooperate in this study. Such cooperation principally involves allowing us access to Adult Probation/Parole Officers and Supervisors in your organization willing to participate in the study. It would also involve helping us understand the current administrations perspective on implementing body-worn cameras within the agency, to include any pending state legislation that may affect how the department operates. *We require no financial resources from your organization.*

Benefits to Your Organization:

- Help generate knowledge that may inform best practices, policies, and procedures of adult probation and/or parole agencies utilizing body-worn cameras.
- The general knowledge derived from this study may highlight challenges facing the utilization of body-worn cameras and can be used to recommend resource allocations.
- Have an impact on the field of criminology and criminal justice by contributing to academic knowledge about community supervision use of surveillance technology, specifically body-worn cameras.
- Inform research which will be used to help educate undergraduate and graduate students and will be shared with academics and practitioners at professional conferences.

Appendix C - Interview Schedule

Adult Probation/Parole Officers' (APPOs) and supervisors' perceptions of body-worn cameras (BWCs) within community supervision.

After going over the informed consent statement and securing verbal consent, the researcher will further explain the goals of the project, share background information and gather basic demographic information from the participant to include their name/pseudonym, age, gender, race/ethnicity, education level, years of service or date of employment, office, current role, and basic duties. Identifying information will be stored separately, connected with a project ID#, in a secure, password-protected environment available only to the PI and PhD candidate.

Introductory Questions:

- 1) How long have you worked for *department name*?
- 2) What is your current role within your department?
- 3) How would you describe your job duties to a regular citizen or layperson?
- 4) How did you come to work with *department name*?

Note: This will be used to start an open conversation with the participants. The interview questions will serve as a guide and may not be used verbatim. Active interviewing allows for flexibility and sets the tone to be friendly and conversational instead of a standard interview.

APPOs and administrators' perceptions of BWC usage within the department?

- 5) What are the different ways you may utilize BWCs for your work duties? Please elaborate.
- 6) Could you please explain the ways BWC footage maybe used by your organization? Please elaborate.
- 7) Could you describe the impact BWCs may play as you carry out your everyday job duties? Please elaborate.
- 8) In your role, how do you think you will make use of BWC footage? If so, how?
 - a. For APPOs: Will your supervisors use BWC footage? If so, how?
 - b. For Supervisors: Will the APPOs you supervise make use of BWC footage? If so, how?
- 9) Do you think there will be any advantages of using BWCs for APPOs? Please elaborate.
 - a. For supervisors?
 - b. For probationers/parolees?
- 10) Do you think there will be any disadvantages of using BWCs for APPOs? Please elaborate.
 - a. For supervisors?
 - b. For probationers/parolees?

- 11) Could you describe how you may use your discretion as an officer when deciding when to activate or not activate your BWC?
- 12) Do you think the use of BWCs may intrude on anyone's privacy? Please elaborate.
 - a. APPOs?
 - b. Parolees/probationers?
 - c. Other community members?
- 13) Do you think that the presence of BWCs may affect the behavior of individuals you come across (such as probationers, parolees, and associates)? If yes, how so?
- 14) Do you think that the presence of BWCs may affect your behavior? How so?
 - a. The behavior of your colleagues?
- 15) How does central office communicate with you regarding policy and procedures?
- 16) Do you think the administration or central office communicates clearly with field officers/APPOs regarding policy and procedures? Please elaborate.
- 17) Do you feel like you will be able to communicate with your supervisor and/or central office regarding BWC policy and procedures freely? Please elaborate.
- 18) If BWCs are implemented within the department, how do you think central office will communicate with you regarding the policy and procedures regarding BWCs?
- 19) Do you think supervisors will be objective when viewing your BWC footage?
- 20) Do you think central office will be objective when viewing your BWC footage?
- 21) Do you think that BWCs will increase communication or transparency between the community and the department? Please elaborate.
- 22) Do you think that BWCs will increase accountability between the community and the department? Please elaborate.
- 23) Do you think that the departments usage of BWCs will increase their legitimacy with the community? Please elaborate.

Demographic Characteristics

- 24) Age: _____
- 25) Race: _____
- 26) Ethnicity: _____
- 27) Gender/Sex: _____
- 28) Education Level: _____

Wrap-up

- 29) If you could, what would you tell society regarding the use of body-worn cameras in probation/parole agencies?
- 30) What kind of surveillance technology do you think is appropriate to use within probation/parole agencies?
- 31) Is there anything else you would like to say?
- 32) Do you have any questions for me?

Based on your experience with our study, are there other persons you feel we should reach out to?

Appendix D - Dual Community Supervision States

1. Alaska
2. Arkansas
3. Delaware
4. Florida
5. Georgia
6. Idaho
7. Iowa
8. Kentucky
9. Louisiana
10. Maine
11. Maryland
12. Michigan
13. Minnesota
14. Mississippi
15. Missouri
16. Montana
17. Nevada
18. New Hampshire
19. New Mexico
20. North Carolina
21. North Dakota
22. Oklahoma
23. Oregon
24. Rhode Island
25. South Carolina
26. Tennessee
27. Utah
28. Vermont
29. Virginia
30. Washington
31. Wisconsin
32. Wyoming