Watching the Watchmen:

A Multi-Site Contextual Study of Police Officers' Perceptions of Citizen Monitoring

by

Hilary Todd

M.A., Simon Fraser University, 2015
B.A., University of British Columbia, 2013

Thesis Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

in the
School of Criminology
Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences

Declaration of Committee

Name: **Hilary Todd**

Degree: **Doctor of Philosophy**

Title: **Watching the Watchmen: A Multi-Site Contextual Study of Police Officers' Perceptions of Citizen Monitoring**

Committee: **Chair:**   **David MacAlister**
Associate Professor, Criminology

Curt Griffiths
Supervisor
Professor, Criminology

Rick Parent
Committee Member
Associate Professor Emeritus, Criminology

Bryan Kinney
Committee Member
Associate Professor, Criminology

Galib Bhayani
Examiner
Instructor, Criminology

Vernon White
External Examiner
Senator
Canadian Senators Group

Ethics Statement

The author, whose name appears on the title page of this work, has obtained, for the research described in this work, either:

a.   human research ethics approval from the Simon Fraser University Office of Research Ethics

or

b.   advance approval of the animal care protocol from the University Animal Care Committee of Simon Fraser University

or has conducted the research

c.   as a co-investigator, collaborator, or research assistant in a research project approved in advance.

A copy of the approval letter has been filed with the Theses Office of the University Library at the time of submission of this thesis or project.

The original application for approval and letter of approval are filed with the relevant offices. Inquiries may be directed to those authorities.

Simon Fraser University Library
Burnaby, British Columbia, Canada

Update Spring 2016

Abstract

The nature of policing involves frequent public interactions, making it a highly visible profession. While this visibility is not a new phenomenon, recent technological advancements have facilitated the development of policing's "new visibility" (Goldsmith, 2010). Citizen monitoring is the practice of recording the police as they conduct their work and subsequently uploading this footage to the internet. Widespread social media usership has contributed to its prevalence and effectively enables the public to 'police the police'. Surveillance can have a significant impact on individuals and their actions (Campbell and Carlson, 2002). This study examined a sample (N=48) of Canadian and Dutch police officers' experiences with, and perceptions of, citizen monitoring. The study was guided by the questions: (1) What impact does citizen monitoring have on police officers' experiences and attitudes and behaviour? (2) What impact does citizen monitoring have on police officers' use of justified force? and (3) What role does context play in frontline police officers' experiences and perceptions of citizen monitoring? Results indicated that police officers can be affected by citizen monitoring. Specifically, the study found that an awareness of being recorded could contribute to a lack of confidence among police officers, that citizen monitoring sometimes led to situations in which the force option(s) used were less than was either required or necessary, that citizen monitoring could cause police officers to hesitate in scenarios that necessitated immediate, direct, and decisive action, and that citizen monitoring might, in some circumstances, have contributed to officers entirely by-passing situations that required action of some sort. This exploratory study addressed a significant deficit in research on citizen monitoring and aims to inform policy and training procedures.

Keywords: Social Media; Technology; Police Decision Making; Use of Force; Comparative Policing; Citizen Monitoring of Police

This thesis is dedicated to my husband and to my parents who all believed in me even when I didn't believe in myself.

Acknowledgements

Table of Contents

List of Acronyms

BIPOC   Black, Indigenous, and people of colour

BWC   Body Worn Cameras

CCTV   Closed Circuit Television

CEW   Conducted Energy Weapon

CNEDA   Canada Northern Economic Development Agency

ERT   Emergency Response Team

FIDO   "Fuck It, Drive On"

IMIM   Indecent Management Intervention Model

JIBC   Justice Institute of British Columbia

LAPD   Los Angeles Police Department

NWPD   New Westminster Police Department

NWMP   North-West Mounted Police

NUFF   National Use of Force Framework

PI   Primary Investigator

PTAC   Physical Training and Control Tactics

RCMP   Royal Canadian Mounted Police

REB   Research Ethics Board

SFU   Simon Fraser University

SRO   Single Room Occupancy

TPS   Toronto Police Service

VPD   Vancouver Police Department

So, we get out of my car and close the door and look over and one kid, I watch as he just sprints over to another kid and just decks him and I am like ugh, crap! I have to get in there as this kid gets beating on another kid. I am alone. I am by myself, and I am in a field with 200 students. What does every high school kid do when there is a fight? They've all got their phones ready to go. I've got literally 100 phones video recording me taking down a 14-year-old kid. I was like ugh, this probably doesn't look great. This was one of those moments when you're like well I am still going to do it because he's beating the other kid, but the whole time I am thinking oh my god, PLEASE don't end up on YouTube.

<div align="right">Officer 10</div>

Chapter 1. Introduction

On March 3, 1991, a Black taxi driver named Rodney King was the subject of a high-speed vehicle pursuit by members of the Los Angeles Police Department (LAPD) (Adams, 2016). At the culmination of this chase, four members of the LAPD beat King, causing a facial fracture, a broken right ankle, bruises, and lacerations (Adams, 2016). A bystander, George Holliday, captured the beating on his personal video camera from his apartment balcony (Adams, 2016). Two days after the beating, Holliday contacted the LAPD regarding the video footage but was ignored. He then went to the local television news outlet, KTLA (Adams, 2016). KTLA aired the video, and the clip elicited a resounding response, ultimately serving as the impetus for the 1992 Los Angeles Riots.

George Holliday's video footage of the LAPD's interactions with Rodney King are an early and powerful example of citizen monitoring and a "threshold event" (Goldsmith, 2010; p. 918). The footage presented an example of police abuse of force – a stark contrast to the behaviour expected of law enforcement officials. The LA Race Riots, incited by King's beating, were violent and destructive, and the unrest shed light on racial tensions and police misconduct.

Visibility has always been a key feature of policing. Chermak and Weiss (2005) write that the police are the most visible of all criminal justice institutions. Historically, their uniforms, and later, the introduction of marked vehicles have contributed to law enforcement officials' visibility and to their "operational effectiveness" (Goldsmith, 2010; p. 915). Members of the public have traditionally been able to monitor police actions and interactions because police were so easily identifiable (Paperman, 2003). Their visibility was originally categorized as primary visibility, something which occurred when police officers and their actions were visible to those within close physical proximity (Goldsmith, 2010). Primary visibility led to secondary visibility with the advent of radio and print news. Police agencies use technology to "conduct surveillance of others"; however, the advent of secondary visibility enables members of the public to monitor police work (Ericson and Haggerty, 1997; p. 139).

Today, secondary visibility has become much more prevalent with technological advances and now, with the widespread use of smart phones and the internet, it supersedes primary visibility. Smartphone technology is ubiquitous in modern society and these devices are increasingly used as a tool to monitor police interactions with the general public. Technological

advancements have produced the "high visibility" environment in which policing occurs (Sandhu and Haggerty, 2017; p. 79). Smartphones and mounting interest in capturing and disseminating "user-generated video of police (mis)conduct" on various social media platforms have changed the landscape of modern policing (Clayton Newell, 2018; p. 60). This is known as policing's "new visibility" (Goldsmith, 2010; Thompson, 2005).

The new visibility to which the police are subject is largely under the control of the public and is known as citizen monitoring, a phenomenon whereby civilians engage in surveillance of the police. Citizen monitoring of the police takes various forms, including independent civilian oversight agencies and citizen advocacy groups; however, in this study, citizen monitoring is operationalized as video footage obtained by the general public of the police through cell phone technology which is subsequently disseminated online. Citizen monitoring applies primarily to uniformed, frontline patrol officers as there is less visibility of plainclothes officers in specialty and investigative units. In the past, government bodies and law enforcement agencies defined and enforced deviance and criminality. Today, citizen monitoring means that the general public can define and enforce deviance and criminality with respect to the police and their conduct. Although throughout history members of the public have been able to monitor police actions, in a general sense, because of primary visibility, advances in technology have contributed to the public's increased influence on police behaviour.

For citizen monitoring to be impactful, the initial capture of video footage or of photographic images must subsequently be uploaded to the internet. Once images and/or footage have been uploaded, rapid circulation of the material can occur. A single example of citizen monitoring can be 'liked', shared, downloaded, and disseminated globally in a matter of seconds. As such, the internet acts as the medium that enables citizen monitoring. Without its generative capacity, citizen monitoring would not exist in its current form. Citizen monitoring can expose instances of police misconduct in a manner that was previously not possible. Because of its generative capabilities, the phenomenon can draw widespread attention to police actions.

While an incident such as the Rodney King beating exposes police misconduct, it is critical to the efficacy of police work that the public trusts that the majority of police interactions are both lawful and in accordance with appropriate policy and procedure. Police must adhere to the rule of law and ensure the rights of citizens under the Charter of Rights and Freedoms. Citizen monitoring has the potential to expose police misconduct; however, it can also misrepresent lawful police

conduct as misconduct and in this way, it is possible that it undermines police authority. Citizen monitoring is a powerful tool, and it behooves those in authority to understand fully its implications.

Citizen monitoring is normally initiated once a police-citizen encounter is underway. Typically, what might be seen as an antagonistic situation triggers an individual to take notice and activate their camera, though it must be noted that routine encounters are sometimes recorded as well. Citizen monitoring has the potential to capture police officers engaged in abuses of power, and, in situations where this type of behaviour is filmed, the footage can be used by policing authorities to justify disciplinary action. However, the footage captured can also be manipulated— either intentionally or unintentionally—and show only a portion of what unfolded in a police-citizen encounter. If citizen monitoring does not capture an entire incident, it can lead to the misinterpretation of said event. This, in turn, can mean that a justified use of force incident is, in the eyes of the public, an example of excessive use of force. Preliminary examination of citizen monitoring suggests that front-line police officers are most impacted by citizen monitoring, and further, that the presence of the citizen monitoring can contribute to risk-adverse behaviour among police officers.

Police agencies have, in the past, had control over image management (Goldsmith, 2010). Citizen monitoring acts as a "destabilizing and destructive" force for police agencies' ability to maintain their public image (Goldsmith, 2010; 920). Policing's new visibility, namely, the dissemination of footage portraying police-citizen interactions, enables widespread viewing and leads to what can be considered 'trial by social media' (Goldsmith 2010; Thompson, 2005). The heightened visibility faced by police organizations can have an impact on the level of public trust in the police and police legitimacy (Sandhu and Haggerty, 2015). Social media platforms enable users to discuss the police interaction portrayed and issue calls for action. Recent police-involved incidents in both the United States and Canada have been captured on camera and subsequently uploaded to various social media platforms. This citizen monitoring, or surveillance, forms a system in which the public can effectively 'police the police'. Manipulated or in its pure form, it can contribute to the public's increased scepticism of the police. The video footage Holliday captured of King and the LAPD in 1991 is, arguably, one of the earliest examples of citizen monitoring. The incident remains pivotal in the history of policing.

Since 1991 when Holliday captured the Rodney King beating on camera, there have been many examples of citizen monitoring of police work in encounters that involved the use of force

and became high profile. In October 2007, Polish immigrant, Robert Dziekanski died at Vancouver International Airport when Royal Canadian Mounted Police (RCMP) deployed a conducted energy weapon (CEW) (Braidwood, 2010). The incident was captured on a cell phone by a citizen bystander (i.e., citizen monitoring) (Braidwood, 2010). Ultimately, this video footage (the "Prichard video") was disseminated and had a significant impact on the trajectory of the Dziekanski case. In August 2007, Paul Boyd was fatally shot by a Vancouver Police Department (VPD) member after wielding a bicycle chain at police officers. Years later, a video captured by a bystander emerged, showing the fatal shot Boyd sustained. Again, the video was used as evidence in the subsequent investigation. In both cases, citizen monitoring was fundamental in the determination of the evolution of the incident.

In recent years, there have been many highly publicized police-citizen encounters involving Black, Indigenous, and persons of colour (BIPOC). Although police-race relations have been contentious throughout history, the prevalence of citizen monitoring has served to magnify incidents that have occurred in recent years. Some of these highly publicized incidents have involved fatalities and the public backlash has been intense, particularly in the United States (Nix and Pickett, 2017; Weitzer, 2015; Wolfe and Nix, 2016). In 2014, Michael Brown, who was unarmed, was shot dead in Ferguson, Missouri by police officer Darren Wilson. The following day, as a result of the incident, protests broke out in Ferguson. The police addressed the looting, vandalism, and break-ins in their riot gear to no avail; the protests continued.

Since the Ferguson protests, there have been other demonstrations also resulting from instances of alleged police misconduct. In May 2020, following the police involved death of George Floyd, protests and riots broke out across the United States. In some cities, the unrest was so serious that curfews were imposed, and the National Guard deployed (Sierra-Arévalo, Nix, and Mourtgos, 2023). These events contributed to a crisis of police legitimacy (Peyton, Sierra-Arévalo, and Rand, 2019). Activists and the Black Lives Matter movement developed the 'Defund the Police' slogan which soon became synonymous with calls for widespread and sweeping police reform across the United States and Canada (Paulson-Smith, Nehlsen, Lau, Knutson, Wesner, Klug, Beck, Reinhard, and Weinschenk, 2023). Paulson-Smith et al. (2023) discuss the 'Defund the Police' movement and describe it as weeks-long demonstrations fuelled by the goal of achieving accountability for police violence. The 'Defund the Police' movement seeks to identify racial inequity and point out the challenges associated with police encounters involving BIPOC individuals. Social media is widely considered a contributing factor in the

proliferation of these movements. Day (2015) writes, "events [Brown's shooting] were happening before – as many activists say, 'there's a Mike Brown in every town' – but it's only now that technological advances and digital savvy individuals have ensured the dots are joined." Individuals contributing to the viral nature of the Black Lives Matter movement are sometimes dubbed "digital activists" (Day, 2015). They are young adults, with strong technological abilities and familiarity with the internet and the ways in which it offers an opportunity to contribute to the development and growth of social movements and causes.

A significant challenge for the police, their authority, and their visibility is the public's perception and understanding of appropriate use of force. There is a substantial, but sometimes subtle, difference between police use of force and police abuse of force; however, members of the public do not necessarily possess the knowledge and background information needed to understand this distinction. This can further contribute to the deluge of public criticism aimed at police officers. Citizen monitoring can serve to compound this potential misunderstanding. As the findings in the present study reveal, citizen monitoring is present and prolific, and its ubiquity is impactful for officers. It is not considered a threat by most officers; however, it does impact their decision making and use of force in encounters with citizens. The public has the ability to capture footage of use of force incidents, but this footage has limitations in its ability to show an incident from start to finish, and further, from all dimensions. Given this, certain use of force incidents can appear, on film, as though they are justified instances of force, when in fact, the officer(s) seen have abused their authority, or vice-versa. Officers are well aware of this; therefore, an objective of the present study was to determine whether, and to what extent, citizen monitoring might affect front-line police officers in their use of force decision-making process.

Citizen monitoring captures police officers through the lens of a member of the public. This is a perspective that cannot be identical to that of the officer involved, if for no other reason than physical positioning. To provide balance to this one-sided and often well-publicized view of incidents, particularly in light of the current displeasure and distrust of the police in certain police-citizen interactions, government officials and public interest groups have pushed for the introduction of body-worn camera technology. Body-worn cameras are touted as a tool to "fundamentally change 'flawed' police practices" (Ariel et al., 2015; p. 510). Initially adopted into law enforcement strategies as a response to low levels of public confidence in the police, body-worn cameras have been and continue to be the subject of academic inquiry (Lum, Stoltz, Koper, and Scherer, 2019). Researchers seek to determine conclusively whether the technology

prevents instances of excessive police use of force, and whether its use reduces complaints about the police by members of the public (Ariel et al., 2015; Goodison and Wilson, 2017; Katz et al., 2014). Even though the body-worn camera would present a different point of view to that of the citizen monitoring view, it might, nevertheless, not give a complete picture and could lead to false conclusions and injustices. While body-worn cameras and their impact have been the topic of considerable research, the effects of increasingly prolific citizen monitoring on police and on police work have not been examined to the same extent.

The Rodney King incident was a threshold moment for citizen monitoring. Since then, advancements in technology have presented increasing opportunities for citizen monitoring to take place. The presence of citizen monitoring is undeniable; however, little is known about its impact on police officers and on their work. The research presented in this dissertation addresses this deficit. Through the use of in-depth, semi-structured interviews with 48 front-line police officers from Canadian and Dutch police agencies, this study explored the experience of citizen monitoring from the perspective of uniformed police officers in the field. The study addressed the impact citizen monitoring had on police officers' use of justified force and on their experiences, attitudes, and behaviours. Further, the study addressed the role that contextual factors, including individual, organizational, and environmental, had on the interviewed officers' experiences of citizen monitoring.

Research on surveillance and monitoring indicates that individuals alter their behaviour when they know or believe they are being watched; however, there is a limited understanding of the specific impact of surveillance and monitoring on the police population (Goodyear, Kerner, and Quennerstedt, 2019; Meleady, Abrams, Van der Vyer, Hopthrow, Mahmood, Player, Lamont, and Leite, 2017). Meleady et al. (2017) suggest that subtle surveillance cues can contribute to cooperative behaviour. However, they add that surveillance "may not produce the desired behaviour" for a variety of reasons including the fact that it may add to uncertainty, evaluation apprehension, and anxiety regarding the judgement of others (Meleady et al., 2017; p. 1163). Based on studies detailing the profound way in which human behaviour is altered in response to surveillance and monitoring, it is anticipated that police officers react in ways similar to the general public (Campbell and Carlson, 2002; Snyder and Gangestad, 2000). The recent deluge of police related videos on social media platforms and news websites, and further, the responses generated from these videos all point to the potential challenges police officers might face should they be captured on video. These factors are a large part of the motivation behind self-regulation,

which is necessary for self- and job-preservation, and for the sake of upholding the desired public appearance.

In 2013, the Primary Investigator (PI)'s Master's research explored citizen monitoring and the effect it had on front-line police officers. Through in-depth interviews with 13 police officers employed by various agencies in the Lower Mainland of British Columbia, a preliminary understanding regarding citizen monitoring and its impacts was garnered. The findings supported the hypothesis that citizen monitoring may impact and influence police work. Participants shared a common sentiment that citizen monitoring contributed to the increasing challenges associated with police work. The recommendations made in that study included the implementation of training programs that consider the impact of citizen monitoring and increased efforts at educating the public regarding operational police work. Despite the exploratory findings presented, the sample size was limited to police officers working the greater Vancouver, British Columbia region and therefore too small for the findings to be considered conclusive. Accordingly, it was deemed that further research was required in order to better understand the impact of citizen monitoring on police officers.

In 2015, the PI began their doctoral research, seeking to expand the scope of their preliminary Master's study. Through an examination of police officers' experiences with, and perceptions of, citizen monitoring across Canada and the Netherlands, the PI hoped to gain a much more comprehensive understanding of the phenomenon and its impacts. Using a qualitative approach, the PI examined the various ways in which citizen monitoring impacted front-line police work and the environments in which citizen monitoring tended to occur. Although the Dutch and Canadian samples were not directly comparable, interviews from both samples presented compelling insights into police officers' experiences with and perceptions of citizen monitoring. The conclusion of this study was twofold. First, the findings revealed that some police officers could be affected by citizen monitoring. Second, in some cases, it could cause hesitation and/or avoidance in the application of justified force. These findings pointed to the complexity of citizen monitoring for police as well as the role of education and administrative support for front-line officers.

A particularly interesting and telling aspect of this study's importance was the interview process, specifically, the willingness of officers, both in the Netherlands and in Canada, to discuss citizen monitoring. When the study commenced in 2017, media scrutiny of police because of

citizen monitoring was intense and it was anticipated that some police officers would be wary of speaking freely to researchers. Police faced a great deal of public scrutiny, and a self-protecting attitude was prevalent. The PI anticipated resistance, but found that, once rapport had been established, officers were very willing to discuss citizen monitoring and its various implications. Interviews can produce rich data by affording participants the opportunity to articulate their personal experiences, perspectives, and emotions in their own expressive language. Additionally, There was a general consensus as to the importance of the research, regardless of the officer's personal feelings about the phenomenon. Certainly, there was agreement as to the permanence of citizen monitoring going forward, and a general sense that departments were playing 'catch up' to technological impacts rather than being proactive and prepared for the impact technology in the hands of the public might have on police work. Citizen monitoring has been impactful and positive in bringing to light abuses of police powers. It has been impactful for police in a detrimental way when the technology itself has been abused. An understanding of this is critical in order that police departments can support officers and maintain the trust of the public they serve.

The study is organized as follows: Chapter Two identifies key literature relating to frontline policing, use of force, and surveillance. Additionally, the chapter presents a discussion regarding different cultural features of Canada and the Netherlands, including key demographic information, levels of support for the police, the use of force paradigm, and high-profile incidents. Chapter Three describes the study's methodology and the data analysis process. In Chapters Four, Five, and Six key findings are discussed. Chapter Four details key contextual findings among both the Canadian and Dutch samples. Chapter Five discusses Canadian participants' experiences with, and perceptions of, citizen monitoring and Chapter Six outlines the Dutch participants' experiences with, and perceptions of, citizen monitoring. Chapter Seven concludes with a discussion regarding the implications of the findings, the study's limitations, and recommendations based on the findings.

It's too bad because now [because of citizen monitoring] officers are too scared to use force because they're going to get scrutinized. If they keep doing that – I mean, if someone is coming at you with a knife, I don't have time to think what's he or she going to do if I draw a gun. It's a danger to us as police officers and to the public. If they're like, he had a knife, and I don't want to get in trouble, so I'll draw a baton and it gets out of hand.

<div align="right">Officer 14</div>

Chapter 2. Literature Review

Serving, protecting, and interacting with the public are each essential elements of the police role, and consequently contribute to their visibility. According to Singh (2022), "The police are the initial faces of law enforcement and commence the criminal justice process and thus hold significant responsibility for functioning law and order." (p. 69). Their visibility and credibility are closely linked, and as representatives of the state, it is imperative that police retain public trust (Singh, 2022). The advent of 24-hour news, social media, and, possibly most significantly, smart phone technology have all added to the complexity of police visibility and, in turn, have contributed to the development of citizen monitoring.

Given the recent proliferation of cellular telephones, and in particular, 'smartphones', the rate at which citizen monitoring occurs has risen, and continues to increase. Citizen monitoring's prevalence is in large part due to the propagative nature of social media. In order for the phenomenon to occur, it requires the initial capture of video footage or of photographic images and the subsequent uploading of the material on the internet. Once images and/or footage have been uploaded to the internet, rapid propagation of the material can occur. A single example of citizen monitoring can be liked, shared, downloaded, and disseminated around the world in a matter of seconds. In this way it acts as the medium that facilitates citizen monitoring. Without its generative capacity, citizen monitoring would not exist in its current form and be as impactful as it is.

Statistics Canada reports that approximately 80.3% of adult Canadians own a smartphone (Statistics Canada, 2018)[1]. Smartphones have a wider range of applications than a traditional cellular device might have. While smartphone owners can use their phones for conventional functions such as making and receiving phone calls, the devices can also be used to capture photographs, video footage, and to access the internet. Social media platforms can be accessed on smartphones, and in 2021, Statistics Canada reported that 77.6% of the adult population regularly used social media apps and websites on their phones (Statistics Canada, 2021). For purpose of this dissertation, citizen monitoring is defined as the practice wherein members of the public record the police conducting their work either properly or improperly and subsequently upload the footage onto the internet. The focus of this study is on citizen monitoring in relation to the police use of force. Although citizen monitoring of police is a relatively new phenomenon, it has the potential to impact how police officers carry out their mandated and legislated

responsibilities, in particular with respect to the use of force. Of note is the notion of "mandated" and "assumed" responsibilities of the police. Mandated responsibilities are legislated responsibilities, whereas assumed responsibilities are the consequence of public demands and growing expectations of the police. In other words, assumed responsibilities are downloaded onto the police and as such, contribute to the increased involvement of police with persons with mental illness. In recent years, police use of force has become a topic of debate due to numerous high-profile fatal police-citizen interactions. This chapter provides the foundation for the study that was conducted on citizen monitoring of the police in Canada and Netherlands.

2.1. A Brief History of Policing

The emergence of modern democratic policing is largely attributed to Sir Robert Peel and to the nine guiding principles he developed in 1829 (Ottawa Police, 2020). Sir Robert Peel, frequently called the father of modern policing, is known as having created the first modern police force in London in the same year (Adegbile, 2017; Lemieux, den Heyer, and Dilp, 2015; Williams, 2012). Peel "recognized that to move forward he would need to advocate for a modern approach that emphasized preventative measures and crime detection provided for by a uniformed but distinctly civilian force" (Lemieux et al., 2015; p. 47). A key function of policing, according to Peel, was the proactive prevention of crime, rather than its reactive detection (Williams, 2012). Additionally, Peel believed in the importance of police legitimacy (Williams, 2012). Peel argued that for the police to be seen as a credible and legitimate organization, a set of key principles should be considered and normalized (Williams, 2012).

Sir Robert Peel's nine principles, formulated during his tenure as the British Home Secretary in the early 19th century, laid the foundation for modern policing and continue to resonate in law enforcement practices today (Williams, 2012). These principles emphasize the importance of maintaining public trust and collaboration with the community (Brown, 2014; Kusha, 2012). Peel emphasized that the police must secure public favor and rely on voluntary cooperation, rather than coercion, to maintain law and order (Williams, 2012). He stressed the significance of preventing crime rather than merely reacting to it, promoting the idea that effective policing involves proactive measures and the use of intelligence (Williams, 2012). Peel also highlighted the importance of impartiality, stating that the police should be independent from political influence and treat all individuals equally (Williams, 2012). He advocated for the use of minimum force, only resorting to violence when absolutely necessary, and emphasized the

importance of obtaining public support and cooperation (Williams, 20212). Finally, Peel underscored the need for ethical behavior and professionalism within the police force, advocating for proper training, accountability, and the development of strong organizational structures (Williams, 2012).

Nearly two centuries since their inception, Peel's nine principles are still considered instrumental in the field of law enforcement and continue to serve as the basis for policing in North America, Europe, and elsewhere in the western world. However, as Sarre and Prenzler (2018) write, there have been notable developments within policing in the past thirty years. These developments can be described as themes, innovations, and on occasion, a combination of both (Sarre and Prenzler, 2018). In addition, there have been significant technological advancements in the field of policing.

Canadian policing emerged relatively slowly but followed the model of policing espoused by the Metropolitan Police and Sir Robert Peel. Police departments, following the 'Peelian principles' and model, were established in the major Canadian cities of Toronto, Montreal and Quebec City between 1835 and 1840 (Wilfred Laurier University, 2019). While those cities had quickly urbanized, the rest of Canada was relatively remote and populated mostly by Indigenous peoples. In 1868, the Dominion Police Force was founded so that its members could police the denser portions of eastern Canada (Wilfred Laurier University, 2019). Several years later, Prime Minister John A. MacDonald had concerns regarding conflicts and the possibility of military intervention and, as such, developed the North-West Mounted Police (NWMP) and tasked them with enforcing laws and maintaining order (Wilfred Laurier University, 2019). In 1904 the Dominion Police Force and the North-West Mounted Police merged and ultimately became the Royal Canadian Mounted Police (RCMP).

Today, there are a variety of policing organizations in Canada, including the RCMP, which provides various services to all provinces, excluding Ontario and Quebec, territories, and 180 municipalities (The Law on Police Use of Force, 2020). While the RCMP does police some urban municipalities under contract, most large cities across the country have their own police agencies. For instance, Vancouver, Calgary, Toronto, and Montreal, some of the nation's largest cities, each have their own police agency, specifically, the Vancouver Police Department, Calgary Police Service, Toronto Police Service, and Service de Police de la Ville de Montréal respectively. Other regions are policed by provincial or regional police forces. For example, Peel Regional Police

provide services to a large area in Ontario, including the municipalities of Mississauga and Brampton, and the Ontario Provincial Police have jurisdiction over provincial highways and waterways, as well as rural communities that do not have their own municipal or regional police service (OPP, 2020).

In the Netherlands, the origins of policing are rooted in the history of the country, where the development of a more centralized system of law enforcement was driven by economic and political power. Prior to 1994, the Dutch police were organized into 148 municipal police forces and one national force; however, after the introduction of a new Police Act in 1993, there was a reorganization (Wintle, 1996). This reorganization led to the reform of all individual police forces and resulted in one single service comprised of "twenty-five regional forces and a national police service agency". These receive support from the Royal Netherlands Marechaussee, which, as a military entity, assists with police duties during times of peace (OSCE Polis, 2023; Wintle, 1996; 181). The previous system had been in place since 1851. Wintle (1996) notes that this change was in large part due to the "continuing crisis in the Dutch police which [had] been endemic since the 1960s" and contributed to a loss of confidence (Wintle, 1996; 181). Since the introduction of the new Police Act, the Dutch National Police, referred to as 'Politie', reorganized again in 2013 and this resulted in its current structure, which includes ten regional units, a central unit, and a police services centre (Government of the Netherlands, 2023). The Dutch Police has a total strength of approximately 55,000 officers (Government of the Netherlands, 2023). The number of police officers in each region varies depending on the number of residents in a particular region and the level of crime.

Today, the Dutch police force is recognized for its commitment to community policing and its focus on building strong relationships between police officers and the people they serve. The Dutch police are known for an emphasis on community policing. In addition, the Dutch National Police carries out specialized tasks including investigations related to drug trafficking, fraud, environmental crimes, sexual offences, the regulation of non-Dutch nationals, and operational supportive tasks (OSCE Polis, 2023).

The respective histories of Dutch and Canadian policing reveal distinct trajectories that have shaped their approaches to law enforcement. Canada's colonial origins and subsequent evolution reflect a complex interplay between Indigenous relations and the pursuit of social justice. Despite this, The RCMP's iconic presence has become emblematic of Canadian policing values.

Within the Netherlands, Dutch policing is deeply rooted in a tradition of civic responsibility and community-oriented approaches. Despite their unique histories, both Canada and the Netherlands have adapted their policing practices over time in response to evolving societal needs. Police oversight and oversight of the police on behalf of the public (i.e., citizen monitoring) have changed over time, particularly given technological advances. The discussion around citizen monitoring is intrinsically linked to the examination of police use of force as it holds the potential to impact the manner in which officers employ force, including lethal force.

2.2. Use of Force

2.2.1. History of Use of Force

The history of police use of force can be traced back to the earliest forms of law enforcement in ancient civilizations (Palmiotto, 2016). According to Biitner (1970), use of force lies at the root of the policing profession. Use of force was central to the role of the ancient Egyptian "Medjay" and to the "peace officers" of medieval Europe tasked with maintaining law and order . (Palmiotto, 2016). Palmiotto (2016) writes that the first police force was created in Egypt in approximately 3000 B.C., and that there was an official in each of their 42 jurisdictions responsible for justice and security. Maintenance of law and order was important in many early societies, including the Babylonians, Assyrians, Egyptians, Greeks, and Romans (Palmiotto, 2016). In Rome, Emperor Augustus established various law enforcement cohorts who would "use force or even excessive force to enforce the laws of the Roman empire" (Palmiotto, 2016; p. 4). In France, the paramilitary police unit known as the gendarmerie used force in order to ensure compliance (Palmiotto, 2016).

Early police forces in the United States employed excessive force with an aim of targeting and "controlling the lower and working class, many of whom were recent immigrants with no means to change misbehaviour" (Alpert and Dunham, 2009; p. 6). According to Alpert and Dunham (2009), police brutality was seen as acceptable at this time. Police officers in the Americas have been armed for well over a century, having riot batons or truncheons and/or firearms at their disposal. In the 1970s, linear-progressive use of force models began emerging in the United States and although these models are now seen as having numerous flaws, they presented the first examples of such graphic models (McCartney and Parent, 2015).

The British policing model was adopted in Canada and went through a series of modifications in an effort to have it better suit the territory. In Canada, the incorporation of cities brought with it the formation of police forces. These early police forces were responsible for maintaining "public order, controlling and detecting crime, and fulfilling a service/regulatory function" (Sheptycki, 2017; 624). At the onset, the goal of policing in Canada was crime prevention and this became evident in terms of the targeted efforts aimed at apprehending "career criminals" (Sheptycki, 2017). In Canada, use of force models emerged in the 1980s, approximately a decade after they were first introduced in the United States (McCartney and Parent, 2015). By the late 1990s, the Canadian Association of Chiefs of Police (CACP) endorsed an initiative aimed at developing a national use of force model, which would serve to support officer training, and would enable a better understanding of operational police work among the public (McCartney and Parent, 2015).

Police officers have a significant level of authority over the public. Of course, this authority exists so that police officers can fulfill their primary function: the maintenance and preservation of order within society. Their authority is established and maintained by various legal provisions. An essential component of their authority is the use of force. Police officers are legally authorized to use force in circumstances that necessitate such. Application of force can, in some situations, include lethal force. Training, legislation, and regulations serve to restrict the uninhibited use of force by police officers. Additionally, oversight agencies work to deter and prevent officers from using force, and they investigate police officers who have misused or abused their various authorities.

2.2.2. Legal Justification

Canadian police agencies receive their authorization to use force from various sections of the *Criminal Code,* provincial statutes, and departmental policies. These policies and pieces of legislation function to ensure that police officers employ force reasonably and justifiably. Further, the legislation and policies are written in a manner that ensures clarity so that members of the public can understand the rules governing police use of force as well. Police duties have evolved through Common Law, under which the expectation is that police officers preserve peace, enforce laws, apprehend offenders, and protect lives and property. Given their duties, police officers have the right to employ force, including lethal force, only when justifiable by law.

In 1893, Canadian parliament passed the *Criminal Code* in Canada (Beahen, 2008). The impact of its introduction was and remains significant for police agencies across the country. In Canada's 1985 *Criminal Code,* Section 25. (1) stated:

> Every one who is required or authorized by law to do anything in the administration or enforcement of the law (a) as a private person, (b) as a peace officer or public officer, (c) in aid of a police officer or public officer, or (d) by virtue or his office, is, if he acts on reasonable grounds, justified in doing what he is required or authorized to do and in using as much force as is necessary for that purpose.

The stipulations within this section clearly outline the considerations associated with use of force. In particular, the *Criminal Code* states that police officers are justified in their use of force, provided the application of said force is considered necessary. Additionally, Section 25. (3) states that:

> …a person is not justified for the purposes of subsection (1) in using force that is intended or is likely to cause death or grievous bodily harm unless the person believes on reasonable grounds that it is necessary for the self-preservation of the person or the preservation of any one under that person's protection from death or grievous bodily harm.

Section 25. (4) states that "a peace officer, and every person lawfully assisting the peace officer is justified in using force that is intended or is likely to cause death or grievous bodily harm to a person to be arrested, if":

a) The peace officer is proceeding lawfully to arrest, with or without warrant, the person to be arrested;
b) The offence for which the person is to be arrested is one for which that person may be arrested without warrant;
c) The person to be arrested takes flight to avoid arrest;
d) The peace officer or other person using the force believes on reasonable grounds that the force is necessary for the purpose of protecting the peace officer, the person lawfully assisting the peace officer or any other person from imminent or future death or grievous bodily harm; and (e) the flight cannot be prevented by reasonable means in a less violent manner.

In addition to Section 25 (1), (2), (3), (4), Sections 37, 27, 34, and 26 each provide guidelines for police officers with respect to use of force. The information laid out in these Sections provides clear direction regarding police officers' legal right to defend themselves, their responsibility to

use only as much force as is necessary in a situation, their ability to use lethal force if needed, and the use and abuse of force. Further, the expectation is laid out that police officers using force must be able to justify the reasons for their actions.

Police officers are also bound in their use of force by Section 7 of the *Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms*. The general principle underlying police officers' use of force is that it should only be used in circumstances in which its use is necessary and complies with Section 7 of the *Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms.* Section 7 of the *Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms* states, "Everyone has the right to life, liberty and security of the person and the right to not be deprived thereof except in accordance with the principles of fundamental justice." Further, police officers must abide by provincial regulations, including various laws and policies surrounding the use of force. For instance, in Ontario, police officers must comply with the guidelines set out in the Equipment and Use of Force Regulation.

Canadian police agencies employ a 'Use of Force Continuum Model' that outlines when and how police officers should use force. According to the Canadian Association of Chiefs of Police (CACP) (2000), models outlining the way in which police officers should use force first emerged in the United States during the 1970s. Butler (2009) states, "Use of force models in North American Policing are believed to have evolved from U.S. Army Military Police training programs in the 1960's [sic]." (p. 3). Further, Butler (2009) argues that there is indication of such models emerging in France in the 1940s. Initially, the models were rigid and linear in their formation (CACP, 2000; Butler, 2006). This would have given police officers the impression that all options should be exhausted before moving on to an alternative option (CACP, 2000). However, use of force situations in policing are often dynamic, and are in reality far from linear in the manner in which they unfold. Because of this, situations in which the use of force is necessary require constant re-evaluation and re-assessment of both the subject, and the force options available.

In light of the concerns surrounding early linear use of force models, agencies developed revised models that were known as 'situational' frameworks. According to Butler (2009), "Situational frameworks attempted to more clearly define how an officer observes a situation, considers all the objective and subjective factors (totality of the circumstances) and then chooses an appropriate response." (p. 4).

Use of force models first emerged in Canada in the 1980s (CACP, 2000; Butler, 2006). Nova Scotia introduced the first provincial model, and Quebec followed soon afterward (CACP, 2000; Butler, 2006). In 1994, Ontario developed their use of force model. Later, other agencies, including the RCMP adopted this practice, also (CACP, 2000; Butler, 2006). The use of such a framework is now considered common practice within the field of policing, largely because in 1999, the Canadian Association of Chiefs of Police (CACP) "endorsed an initiative involving a proposal to develop a national use of force model" (CACP, 2000, p. 3). This model was intended to represent best practice in terms of use of force research, theory, and practice (CACP, 2000). Butler (2009) explains that this model was based on four foundational principles:

1. That the model be easily understood by viewing it
2. That it not imply linear progression of options
3. That the public should be able to grasp the basics
4. That it use consistent language (Butler, 2009; p. 5)

The result of the efforts levied by the CACP (2000) was the 'National Use of Force Framework' or NUFF. The NUFF was developed as a way to "promote the consistency in use of force training, practice, and standards across Canada" (Hoffman et al., 2004; p. 1). This model is intended to assist police officers in a number of manners: first, it is to function as an educational tool during the training process; second, it is to serve as a reference for use of force decision making for officers whilst in the field; and, third, it is to assist police as they explain the actions they took before, during, and after the application of force.

The NUFF is a circular model that is built on six fundamental principles. These principles, as identified by Butler (2006), serve as the foundation for the framework. The first principle emphasizes that the primary responsibility of a peace officer is to preserve and protect life, and the second principle emphasizes that the primary objective of any use of force is to ensure public safety. The third principle highlights the importance of police officer safety, as it is essential to public safety. The fourth principle asserts that the use of force framework does not replace or augment the law, as the law speaks for itself. The fifth principle states that the use of force framework embodies principles found in federal statute law and current case law. Finally, the sixth principle clarifies that the use of force framework is not intended to dictate operational policy. Overall, these principles form the basis of the NUFF and guide the actions and decisions of peace officers in their efforts to maintain public safety and uphold the law. The NUFF, unlike earlier linear

models, is not prescriptive, and instead, requires that police officers are "in a continuous state of assessing, planning, and acting" (Butler, 2006; p. 7).

Although the NUFF model is employed by Canadian law enforcement agencies both during the training process and while working on the front lines, it is not used by the RCMP. Instead, the RCMP developed their own training model which was designed to align with the NUFF. The RCMP model is called the Incident Management Intervention Model (IMIM). According to the RCMP (2019), the IMIM is a "teaching aid used for training officers…[and] is also very helpful when an officer must clearly explain his or her actions in court" (n.p). The IMIM and the NUFF are aligned in their vocabulary and approach to use of force (RCMP, 2019). Similar to the NUFF, the IMIM is based on a series of guiding principles.

The Royal Canadian Mounted Police (RCMP) has established seven guiding principles for interventions aimed at promoting public safety. The first principle is that public safety is the primary objective of any intervention (RCMP, 2022). Second, police officer safety is crucial to ensuring public safety (RCMP, 2022). The third principle underscores the importance of careful risk assessment, which must always be taken into account when applying the intervention model (RCMP, 2022). Risk assessment involves evaluating the likelihood and extent of life loss, injury, and property damage. Moreover, risk assessment is a continuous process that must evolve as situations change. The fourth principle indicates that the IMIM is consistent with federal statute law and common law authorities and in no way replaces or augments the law (RCMP, 2022). The fifth principle emphasizes that the least intrusive intervention necessary to manage risk is the best strategy (RCMP, 2022). Finally, the sixth principle stresses that the best intervention is the one that causes the least harm or damage (RCMP, 2022). By following these principles, the RCMP aims to ensure that interventions are conducted in a manner that maximizes public safety while minimizing harm or damage.

2.2.3. General Principles of Use of Force

Although specific laws related to police officers and their legal justification to use force, including lethal force, range from nation to nation, international human rights law provides a framework for police use of force (Casey-Maslen and Connolly, 2017). The three general principles as identified by international human rights law are: necessity, proportionality, and precaution (Amnesty International, 2016). Both necessity and proportionality are considered to be

a "combination of customary rules and general principles of law"; the third principle has emerged more recently and exists to reduce the risk of injuries (Casey-Maslen and Conolly, 2017; p. 79).

The principle of necessity is typically seen as being comprised of three critical elements. To be met, it requires law enforcement officers to use force only when it is required to achieve a legitimate law enforcement objective (UNODC, 2023). This means that officers must try to de-escalate a situation before resorting to the use of force. Moreover, officers must have a reasonable belief that their actions are necessary to protect themselves or others from imminent harm. The principle of proportionality requires that the amount of force used by officers is proportionate to the threat posed (Amnesty International, 2016). This principle means that the use of force should not exceed what is necessary to accomplish the law enforcement objective. The amount of force used should be reasonable based on the circumstances at hand, including the severity of the crime, the level of resistance, and the threat posed. The principle of precaution requires that officers take reasonable steps to minimize the risk of harm to all parties involved (Amnesty International, 2016). This principle requires officers to consider the safety of everyone involved in a situation, including bystanders, suspects, and officers. Officers must ensure that their use of force is necessary, proportional, and that it is directed at the intended target. Despite the legislative authority to use force, the use of force continuum, and use of force policies in police services, citizen monitoring of the police via cell phone cameras and social media may impact the decision of officers to exercise force in encounter situations even when acting within these frameworks.

2.2.4. Use of Force in the Netherlands

The history of police use of force in the Netherlands can be traced back to the 17th century and the early days of the Dutch Republic when the first organized police force was established. According to Wintle (1996), early Dutch police were responsible for maintaining public order, and later for ensuring public welfare policy. Initially, policing was primarily a "local affair consisting of watchmen and informers working directly for the local magistrates", but over time their role evolved to include a wide range of responsibilities, including crime prevention, traffic control, and community policing (Wintle, 1996; p. 183). The Dutch Municipality Act, or *Gemeentewet* of 1851 was a critical step in the development of a modern policing system. At that time, a National Police Force decree was issued, which created the National Police (Wintle, 1996).

In the Netherlands, the use of force by police officers is governed by the Police Act and the Code of Criminal Procedure. According to the Police Act, police officers are allowed to use force if they believe it is necessary to achieve a lawful objective, such as preventing a crime or arresting a suspect (Government of the Netherlands, 2023). The Code of Criminal Procedure states that police officers are allowed to use force if they believe it is necessary to protect themselves or another person from harm (Government of the Netherlands, 2023). However, the use of force by police officers in the Netherlands is heavily regulated and subject to strict guidelines. The Dutch National Police has a use of force policy that sets out the circumstances in which force can be used, and the types of force that can be used (Government of the Netherlands, 2023). The policy states that the use of force must be proportionate to the circumstances, and that the police officer must exhaust all other options before resorting to the use of force.

2.3. Use of Force Training Programs

A critical component of police training covers the appropriate, proportionate and legitimate use of force. Ross (2000) states, "The complex nature of the police occupation and dynamic changes that move through our society frequently make the job of policing extremely difficult and perhaps prone to civil litigation". Given the "complex nature" to which Ross (2000, p. 169) refers, training is seen as an essential part of both the early and ongoing police experience. Most often, use of force training involves lectures, scenario-based training, and time at the shooting range (Rajakaruna, Henry, Cutler, and Fairman, 2017). Some feel as though use of force is best learned on the job (Bayley and Bittner, 1997), while others are of the opinion that formal education is key to the correct application of force (Paoline et al., 2007; Worden and Catlin, 2002).

Police training is an important aspect to consider in any examination of police roles and it is often cause for debate and expression of various and conflicting opinions. Some police officers believe formal education is necessary in order to develop and apply force in an appropriate manner; others believe the proper application of force should be learned through hands-on training in the field (Todd, 2015). According to Wilson (2010), there tend to be two prevalent themes in many training models and use of force procedures. These are: first, the models act as training aids to officers during their initial and concurrent training, and second, there is no requirement to sequentially escalate from one force option to the next (Wilson, 2010). Police are equipped with a use of force continuum that is intended to assist them with their decision to apply

force. Based on the available options, police should select the most appropriate form of force given the totality of circumstances and the training they have received.

Staller, Koerner, Heil, Klemmer, Abraham and Poolton (2021) explain that police-training tends to be instructor focused and linear. Such learning environments tend to be low-stress and low-variance, which may not prepare recruits adequately for conflict situations in the field. Additionally, Staller et al. (2021) found that the predominantly employed training structure "provides recruits with a relatively small percentage of training time actually engaged in practice focused activities, especially involving problem solving skills" (p. 14). An applied learning model is often used in police training. Recruits learn an extensive set of use of force skills, including the handling of a firearm, self-defence, and various physical skills (Adang, 2012). Academic literature related to police training typically focuses on topics such as, predicting the performance of police recruits, evaluations, and critiques (Sloan and Paoline, 2021).

Police recruits in the Netherlands receive extensive use of force training. According to Haese (2022), there are several routes available to prospective police officers in the Netherlands. The Dutch National Police offers a secondary vocational education (MBO) and two higher professional education (HBO) programs. MBO courses, which is considered mid-level education, includes four different levels of training and the programs themselves take up to four years; however, the police training itself takes place over two years (Netherlands Government, 2023). This program is designed to teach students the basics of policing tasks. HBO courses, conversely, offer a higher level of education and are oriented toward professional training. The HBO program is the equivalent to a Bachelor of Policing and over the course of four years, the students learn policing skills and gain insight into various specialised departments (Haese, 2022).

Recruits are taught various use of force skills during their training, including self-defence, conducting arrests, deployment of firearms and tasers, and so on (Haese, 2022). In addition, recruits who go beyond the MBO level and enter the HBO program are provided instruction on the different roles within the organization and they receive practical experience by working in police units (Haese, 2022). Renden, Nieuwenhuys, Savelsbergh, and Oudejans (2015) state that "police officers in the Netherlands train a fixed set of arrest and self-defence skills ranging from techniques to control a suspect to actual combat techniques such as combat techniques such as punching and kicking" in order to prepare for violent situations (p. 8). Following their training as recruits, officers receive approximately four to six hours of additional training in arrest and self-

defence skills (ADST) every year. Renden et al. (2015) argue that this amount of training is not sufficient given the responsibility associated with use of force among police officers. They found that "improvements in police training are warranted, for instance, to decrease the number of injured officers or the number of cases that are labelled as unjustified police force." (Renden et al., 2015; p. 16). In order for police officers to be adequately prepared for the challenges they face in the field it is critical that their training reflects the dynamic and intense nature of their work. As in Canada, the pervasiveness of cell phone cameras and the expanse of social media may impact how Dutch police officers exercise their discretion and authority to use force.

2.4. Police Visibility

On March 2, 1991, from the balcony of his Los Angeles home, George Holliday captured video footage of Los Angeles Police Department (LAPD) officers in an altercation with Rodney King. The recording shows the police officers inflicting a series of baton blows and kicks despite an audible plea from King for the officers to "Please stop". The incident, and subsequent acquittal of the officers involved, ultimately led to the Los Angeles Riots. 63 people were killed and 2,383 were injured. Holliday's video footage of the initial incident remains one of the earliest, and most notable examples of citizen monitoring. In fact, Maurantonio (2014) writes that Holliday's video was "one of the most watched pieces of amateur video in history" (p. 740).

The necessary visibility of police officers has heightened consequences in today's world of smart technology. According to Chermak and Weiss (2005), police officers, when compared to other branches of the criminal justice system, are considered the most visible. Haggerty and Sandhu (2014) similarly argue that police officers are subject to a range of public scrutiny which has been amplified given the increasing number of police involved incidents that are caught on camera. The view that police visibility has been amplified as a result of the ubiquity of smart phone ownership and the prevalence of social media use is echoed by others. Newell (2019) suggests that the insurgence of smart phone video footage depicting police officers engaged in their work has "transformed police work into a high visibility career" (p. 61). Brown (2016) argues that in the past, police work could be conducted in relative anonymity; however, due to the proliferation of smart phone technology, the widespread nature of citizen journalism, and the development of online platforms where this footage can be easily shared, police visibility has increased significantly.

In order to understand what has contributed to policing's "new visibility", it is important to consider the distinction between "primary" and "secondary" visibility (Goldsmith, 2010; p. 914). Goldsmith (2010) asserts that in the early days of policing, and prior to the advent of mass media, primary visibility was prevalent among both the public and the police. In other words, visibility was based solely on direct observations and experiences of the police by members of the public (Goldsmith, 2010). Mass media contributed to the development of "secondary visibility" (Goldsmith, 2010; p. 914), which "allowed individuals not spatially connected to the scene of original interaction to access photographic and narrative materials documenting and describing these distant encounters and subsequently pass judgement" (Newell, 2014; p. 82). Media sources such as mass circulation newspapers, television, and ultimately, and likely most significantly, the internet contributed to the development of secondary visibility.

The ubiquity of visual recording technologies has contributed to what Thompson (2005) initially referred to as the 'new visibility'. Thompson (2005) argues that the use of communication media has contributed to the development of "new forms of action and interaction which have their own distinct properties" (p. 32). With the advent of new visibility, "the field of vision is no longer constrained by the spatial and temporal properties of the new and now but is shaped, instead, by the distinctive properties of communication media, by a range of social and technical consideration" (p. 36). In other words, while police officers' visibility was previously based upon direct observations by members of the public, the emergence of the 'new visibility' has created a circumstance in which members of the public can have an increased role in the development of police agencies' narratives. The internet has contributed to the fact that police agencies are increasingly faced with the challenge of controlling the dispersion of "symbolic content" related to their specific members and general organization (Thompson, 2005; p. 38). Further, both accurate and inaccurate information can be disseminated on the internet, and this leaves police agencies with very few options other than engaging in retroactive image management.

While Thompson (2005) applied new visibility to politicians, Goldsmith (2010) expanded on the concept by exploring its relationship to modern day policing. He suggests that new visibility contributes to a new form of police accountability (Goldsmith, 2010). Previously police were accountable to members of the public, but the emergence of new forms of visibility has led to a shift in the way in which they are being held accountable for their actions. While visibility is a central feature of the police profession, Goldsmith (2010) surmises that the new visibility may contribute to two major impacts: first, the increased accountability of police to the public, and

second, the decreased ability of the police to control their public narrative. Police visibility is an important part of the police profession and this visibility has been amplified in recent years due to the emergence of handheld video recording devices and, further, due to the internet (both are examples of Thompson's (2005) new visibility).

Uniforms, marked police vehicles, and other identifying features contribute to the visibility of police officers. Because of their identifying markers, uniformed patrol officers are expected to be visible. It is through their visibility that they are intrinsically linked to public perceptions of the police profession. The intended result of their notable identifiers was, and continues to be, the development of police legitimacy. Legitimacy, according to Reynolds, Estrada-Reynolds, and Nunez (2018), can be defined as "in addition to obligation to authority, trust and confidence that authorities will be honest and are concerned about the best interest of citizens" (p. 120). Modern policing is founded upon the axiomatic link between visibility and legitimacy (Newell, 2014). Adjudication of the police by members of the public is inevitable due to their visibility. As a result, a significant departmental priority is the management and maintenance of officer appearances and of the impressions they generate (Manning, 1999). Goldsmith (2010) suggests that police departments have a vested interest in how their members are perceived by the public and, further, what police members reveal to the public by their actions.

2.5. Surveillance

In 1787, Jeremy Bentham penned the 'Panopticon' or 'The Inspection-House'. The document consisted of a series of letters to a friend written while Bentham was visiting Russia. In the letters, Bentham proposed a new principle of construction which he claimed could apply to any building or establishment that held, or was to hold, individuals under any sort of monitoring or inspection (Bentham, 1787). The letters offered significant detail regarding the manner in which the structures should be built. For instance, specific instructions were provided regarding cell measurements and the corresponding number of individuals said cell could hold. Bentham (1787) suggested his Panopticon be comprised of a central tower and surrounding cells in which institutionalized individuals would be housed. An essential element of his design was the circular structure in which buildings would be constructed. The buildings' circular design would facilitate the surveillance and monitoring Bentham believed was necessary in terms of establishing compliance among residents.

While offering an explanation as to why and how the Panopticon would function, Bentham (1787) wrote, "the person to be inspected should always feel themselves as if under inspection, at least as standing a great chance of being so, yet it is not by any means the *only* one" (p. 11). Essentially, the omnipresent threat of surveillance was intended to elicit compliance among those who were institutionalized. Bentham (1787) speculated that if individuals believed they *might* be watched, they were more likely to act in a manner in keeping with regulations and policies set out by an institution. Although Bentham did not live to see his Panopticon constructed, the concept of the panoptic model is one that has persisted in modern discussions of surveillance and monitoring.

Foucault (1975) further explored Bentham's (1787) concept of the Panopticon in his book Discipline and Punishment. Foucault argues that the primary effect of the Panopticon is "to induce in the inmate a state of conscious and permanent visibility that assures the automatic functioning of power" (p. 201). The resulting "automatic functioning of power", as Foucault (1975) writes, is that those individuals subject to surveillance and visibility will monitor their own behaviour out of fear of punishment. In other words, the constant threat of surveillance will produce in individuals a self-monitoring effect.

2.5.1. The Concept of Self-Monitoring

Snyder (1974, 1979,1987) first put forth the theory of self-monitoring in the 1970s (Snyder and Gangestad, 2011). In later years, Snyder and Gangestad (2011) built upon the original propositions and clearly defined the concept as a theory concerning "differences in the extent to which people value, create, cultivate, and project social images and public appearances" (Snyder and Gangestad, 2011; p. 531). Snyder and Gangestad (2011) note the distinction between what they describe as 'high self-monitors' and 'low self-monitors'. They suggest that high self-monitors are acutely aware of, and respond accordingly to, social and interpersonal cues (Snyder and Gangestad, 2011). Their actions will likely be tailored to consider these cues and their responses in accord with social convention. Conversely, low self-monitors do not share this compulsion to present as situationally appropriate, and instead simply act according to their true form (Snyder and Gangestad, 2011).

Since Snyder and Gangestad (2011) first proposed the theory in the 1970s, some have posed questions and identified limitations regarding self-monitoring (e.g., Briggs, Cheek, and Buss, 1980; Hoyle and Lennox, 1988). Despite this, evidence remains that self-monitoring, or

some form of emotional manipulation does exist (Grieve, 2011; Snyder and Gangestad, 2011). Gangestad and Snyder (2000) write that "some people, out of a concern over the situational appropriateness of their expressive self-presentation, have come to monitor their expressive behaviour and accordingly regulate their self-presentation for the sake of desired public appearances" (p. 530). Self-monitoring is influenced by the extent to which individuals prioritize social image and public appearance (Gangestad and Snyder, 2000).

Police officers have a public role. Their job demands time interacting with and observing the public. Bound by the regulations governing their work, police officers are required to present in a certain way while engaging in their work. They are expected to act in a professional manner, and that expectation is particularly relevant for police officers on the front lines. Because of the visibility associated with their role, police officers must, or at least are expected to, engage in high self-monitoring behaviour.

In *The Presentation of the Self in Everyday Life* (1959), Goffman addressed the way in which social interactions unfold. In particular, Goffman (1959) argued that individuals attempt to control the impressions they make during these interactions. The theory suggests that individuals actively construct and present themselves to others in order to control their image and to maintain a desired social identity. This theory has significant implications for policing because it relates to how police officers present themselves to the public and how they are perceived by the community. Borrowing terms from the theatre, Goffman (1959) identified a variety of characters that might be present in any given social interaction. He suggested that actors' performances can take place on either the front stage or the back stage (Goffman, 1959). Actors perform in order to project and develop a desirable public image (Bullingham and Vasconcelos, 2013). Actors performing on the front stage are "conscious of being observed by an audience and will perform to those watching by observing certain rules in social conventions as failing to do so means losing face" (Bullingham and Vasconcelos, 2013; p. 101). On the back stage, however, actions are private, and thus, there is no need for actors to perform (Bullingham and Vasconcelos, 2013).

When interacting with the public, police officers are on the front stage. This includes patrols, responding to calls, or making arrests. The back stage would be when officers are off-duty or in a private setting, such as at home or in the police station. Police officers are expected to present a professional image when interacting with the public. They must maintain a level of authority and control in order to effectively carry out their duties and maintain public safety. This

requires officers to present themselves in a certain way, such as wearing a uniform, maintaining a serious demeanor, and speaking in a formal tone. The uniform and other symbols of authority, such as a badge and gun, serve as cues to the public that the officer is an authority figure and should be respected and obeyed. However, this presentation of self by police officers can also contribute to negative perceptions of the police by the community. For example, if officers are perceived as overly aggressive or confrontational, this can create tension and mistrust between the police and the community. This can also occur if officers are perceived as unapproachable or unresponsive to the needs of the community.

The role that police have in society, their training, and the certification that is part of their job contribute to their ability to perform on the front stage. Goffman (1959) stressed that, "…licensing bodies require practitioners to absorb a mystical range and period of training…in part to foster the impression that the licensed practitioner is someone who has been reconstituted by his learning experience and is now set apart from other men." (p. 46). The police officer on duty is acting within the role that has been prescribed by law and policy, the authority of their superiors and the organization of which they are a part.

Although police officers are expected to engage in high self-monitoring behaviour while presenting themselves on the front stage, the fact that they may have to employ any number of lawful force options can complicate their image in the eyes of the public. A contradiction emerges: Police officers must present as professional and must engage in self-monitoring in order to facilitate this; however, they will be faced with situations in which their use of force may lead members of the public to perceive their actions as unprofessional. Although the civilian population does not necessarily have the same understanding regarding use of force policies and procedures as police officers have, and although they are likely unaware of the complete scope of the incident, nevertheless, they can, and do, express dissatisfaction with the image presented. Not surprisingly, instances in which police use of force is lawful can be interpreted by the observer, who has a specific idea of the police image, as unlawful use of force.

Given the visible nature of the police role, the misinterpretation by onlookers of a police-public interaction is not unlikely and this raises several important points for consideration. While the literature suggests that individuals monitor their behaviour for the sake of maintaining public appearances (Snyder and Gangestad, 2011), the duality of the police role is not taken into account. Agency policies dictate that police must act professionally, but visible use of force is also

part of their job and often does not appear as professional behaviour to the untrained eye. Given the visible role police officers have in society, and given the emergence of smart phone and social media capabilities, it is essential that police officers consider, even more was usual hitherto, the way in which their actions may be interpreted and misinterpreted by the public.

2.5.2. Citizen Monitoring

Contemporary policing has been marked by various technological advances intended to assist law enforcement. These technological advances have enabled the police to evolve with a rapidly changing society. Manning (1992) notes that the introduction of patrol cars created opportunities for the police to patrol larger regions and allowed them to respond to calls for service more quickly. The emergence of the 911 telephone system "required police to prioritise calls for service based on their level of need and seriousness which altered how the police responded to crimes" (O'Connor, 2015; 900). In the late 1980s, mobile data terminals (MDTs) emerged in policing. They were capable of disseminating and receiving text-based data and marked the "beginning of self-serve data access for patrol officers" (Rataj, 2019; np). In the 1990s, cellphone technology emerged, and the devices became more widely available. Police began employing these devices in order to access data while on the road (Rataj, 2019). In-car video technology emerged around this time, although its initial iterations were cumbersome and unreliable. Since then, there has been increased reliance on video monitoring technologies including CCTV and body worn cameras (BWCs)

In 2019, Silver (2019) reported that an estimated five billion people worldwide owned mobile devices, with 50% of these devices holding the classification of 'smartphone'. In advanced economies such as Canada and the Netherlands, 66% and 87%, respectively, of the adult population own a smartphone. Further, reports indicate that 67% of adults in advanced economies use social media, and 90% use the internet (Silver, 2019).[i] Given the prevalence of both smartphone technology and social media platforms, Goldsmith (2005) suggests that cellphone technology has reached a critical mass. This technology enables the general public to capture images and video footage from almost anywhere and disseminate the material online. All this can be achieved in mere seconds. The wireless transmission of images and video footage to social media platforms such as YouTube, Instagram, Facebook, and TikTok have contributed to a deluge of content exposing police officers interacting with members of the public. Much of this content displays police officers using force, and while some of the force displayed can be classified as excessive, there are many examples in which the force used is lawful.

Once such footage and images are online, the internet serves as a generative system (Li, 2009). This system removes the fundamental means of controlling the flow of information and images from those who have traditionally possessed a strong control of their image management (Li, 2009). The inception of smartphone technology has enabled the public to engage in citizen monitoring in a way that upends the agency and control police have traditionally had with regard to their image management.

In August 2014, Michael Brown was shot and killed by Darren Wilson, a white Ferguson, Missouri police officer (Clark and Nisbett, 2017). Brown was a young, unarmed Black man who was stopped and questioned because he was walking down the middle of a street and blocking traffic (Clark and Nisbett, 2017). Bystanders observed Brown cooperate with Wilson; however, Brown was fatally shot (Clark and Nisbett, 2017). Wilson was later exonerated, but the public backlash to the situation was swift and significant. The 'Hands Up, Don't Shoot' movement mobilized and, soon after, demonstrations began. Although the protest only lasted sixteen days, the sentiments expressed became part of a larger movement aimed at the treatment of Black people and other people of colour by law enforcement (Clark and Nisbett, 2017). According to Deuchar, Ross, Fallik, Wyatt, Crichlow, and Vaughn (2019), this movement and the incidents following the Brown shooting have had significant impacts on police officers. This impact, which is a form of de-policing, is known as the "Ferguson Effect".

The Ferguson effect refers to the idea that increased scrutiny of police following the shooting of Michael Brown in Ferguson, Missouri in 2014 has led to a decrease in proactive policing and an increase in crime. As a result of highly publicized deadly force incidents involving BIPOC individuals, the argument exists that "a 'chill wind' has blown through law enforcement, such that officers have become more distrustful of civilians, fearful of scandal, and are de-policing" (Nix and Pickett, 2017; p. 24). The theory suggests that police officers have become less aggressive in their policing due to fear of being caught on camera or facing disciplinary action, which has led to an increase in crime in certain areas. In addition to being termed the Ferguson Effect, de-policing is sometimes referred to as the "YouTube Effect" and the "Viral Video Effect" (Nix and Pickett, 2017). The literature suggests that the Ferguson Effect is in large part anecdotal; however, some evidence suggests that police officers are fearful of the viral nature of video footage and, further, of the potential ramifications related to the dissemination of such content. Nix and Pickett (2017) found that its impact is far reaching and can contribute to a police legitimacy

crisis, fear among the police regarding false allegations, and that these both impact the perception among the police that crime rates are rising. Peyton, Sierra-Arévalo and Rand (2019) state, "when police lack legitimacy, residents are less likely to contact police or cooperate with their investigation" and add that distrust can serve to unnecessarily escalate situations leading to injuries or fatalities (p. 894-898).

Some studies found evidence of the Ferguson effect, and others found no evidence. The Brennan Center for Justice found that crime rates in the year following the shooting of Michael Brown in Ferguson did not show a significant increase compared to previous years (Grawert and Cullen, 2016). In 2017, the Pew Research Center found that "more than three-quarters of U.S. law enforcement officers say they are reluctant to use force when necessary and nearly as many – 72% -- say they or their colleagues are more reluctant to stop and question people who seem suspicious as a result of increased scrutiny of police" (Madhani, 2017; n.p). The National Bureau of Economic Research found that the effect of the shooting of Michael Brown on crime rates varied by city and that there was a statistically significant and positive relationship between protests and crime (Devi and Freyer, 2020). Sociological explanations of crime and deviance often employ social disorganization theory. The theory asserts that crime and deviance are more likely to occur in a neighbourhood or region characterized by social disorganization. Some factors often associated with social disorganization include residential instability, low socio-economic status, employment uncertainty, and large immigrant populations. Evidence suggests that these populations have more frequent interactions with the police and may also have lower levels of trust in law enforcement (Alang et al., 2017; Schaap, 2021).

In recent years, organizations aimed at targeting police officers and in observing their work have emerged in many large Canadian cities. These organizations are predominantly anti-police and have mission statements including "We strive to help end police misconduct, brutality, and abuse of power through direct observation of the police in the streets and advocating for their victims after the event" (Cop Watch, 2021; np). Some organizations are formally structured and organized, while others have more rudimentary arrangements. Regardless, their anti-police objectives tend to be more overt than those of the average individual engaged in citizen monitoring.

Among the findings of the PI's master's thesis was that Canadian officers, in some instances, altered their decision making regarding the use of force in encounter situations where

there was citizen monitoring. In the master's research, conducted prior to the present study, it was found that officers would, on some occasions, hesitate in their application of justified force when presented with citizen monitoring. Of particular interest is the fact that both police officers and the use of force trainers interviewed said that "hesitation, as a result of citizen monitoring, is a real concern that exists within police departments" (Todd, 2015; p. 77). The study also found that officers would sometimes ignore certain situations that required police attention out of fear around citizen monitoring. Murphy (2014) describes the desire police officers may have to "drive on", suggesting it is "in part, related to fear of departmental reprisal or other consequences of action, including civilian review, negative media attention, and various legal repercussions" (p. 45).

2.6. Contextual Factors

Despite the fact that policing occurs in a variety of contexts, literature on policing tends to focus on the profession in urban settings, and this results in a limited understanding of policing in rural and remote environments (Ruddell, Lithopoulos, and Jones, 2014; Donnermeyer and DeKeseredy, 2014). Rural and remote policing is notably different from urban policing. Mawby and Yarwood (2011) argue that the "nature of public police varies between societies but equally the nature of the public police often varies within societies with the differences between rural and urban areas sometimes being marked." (p. 17). Donnermeyer, DeKeseredy and Dragiewicz (2011) comment on the lack of research on rural and remote policing while arguing that the diverse nature of these environments and their residents coupled with the unique ways in which law enforcement work occurs could offer valuable research insights. While urban governments may have the resources and ability to work with researchers to evaluate and optimize police services, this tends not to be as feasible for rural police departments (Rudell, Lithopoulos, and Jones, 2014). This results in a notable disparity between extant literature on urban versus rural and remote policing arrangements.

2.6.1. Urban Policing

Urban policing is seen as the de-facto policing structure despite the fact that in Canada a large portion of the country can be described as rural or remote. Lippert and Walby (2013), argue that "policing is integral to cities" (p. 1). Modern policing has seen significant changes since the Peelian era of policing. For example, the advancement of new policing models includes private and hybrid models of policing, and is known as the pluralization of policing (Lippert and Walby,

2013). Monkkonen (1992) writes that police officers have historically held a broad range of policing activities and that their role has only recently been more narrowly focused on crime control and order maintenance. In present day, their responsibility is centred around the prevention, deterrence, and investigation of crime, and their maintenance of public order and the preservation of peace (Owens, 2020).

Urban policing has experienced and continues to be in the process of large-scale restructuring. Proponents argue that this restructuring is taking place on a global scale. Waters (2007) describes the process in which police agencies worked to re-legitimize their work in the 1980s and 1990s and made attempts to modernize the profession. Murphy (2014) discusses the modernization process in Canada in particular and argues that the transition from modern to postmodern policing can be observed through a series of key changes, including, "(a) the restructuring and relocation of policing authority and responsibility, (b) the re-conceptualization of public policing, and (c) the rationalization and commodification of public and private policing services." (p. 44). According to the United States Department of Justice (2001), policing "is no longer carried out exclusively by governments." (p. 1). In other words, the emergence and growth of private policing enterprises is rapidly changing the policing landscape, particularly in urban environments. Due to societal demands and needs, urban policing has evolved over time and can be characterized by a number of key features, including technological advancements, community policing initiatives, proactive crime prevention strategies and an emphasis on building positive relationships between law enforcement agencies and the communities they serve.

One of the most prominent features of urban policing is the use of advanced technology. Police agencies work to optimize the use of technology in order to improve their practices (Custers, 2012; Custers and Vergouw, 2015; Koper, Lum, and Willis, 2014). According to Koper et al. (2014), "Technological advancements have shaped policing in many important ways over the years." (p. 212). Custers (2012) adds that technology is used by the police as a measure to increase cost effectiveness and build capacity. Police departments in cities across the Western world are increasingly relying on technology to help them monitor and respond to criminal activity. For example, Fussey, Davies, and Innes (2021) point to the emergence of various technologies with surveillance capacities and the controversial nature of some, including automated facial recognition. Police also rely on sophisticated surveillance systems, such as CCTV cameras and license plate recognition technology, as well as the use of data analytics tools to help identify crime hotspots and predict where crimes are most likely to occur. Despite the technological

advancements present within the field of policing, Custers and Vergouw (2015) found that new technologies can present many challenges: "the legal basis and extent of competences of technologies in policing is often unclear and budget, knowledge, and experience are sometimes lacking." (p. 519).

Another key feature of urban policing is the emphasis on community policing initiatives. According to Zhao, Lovrich, and Thurman (1999), "community policing has become the dominant theme of contemporary policing." (p. 76). It was largely adopted during the mid-1980s as a result of the widely observed limitations of policing at the time (Ong and Jenks, 2004). Despite the heavy reliance on community policing efforts, the results of these initiatives are seen as mixed (Thomas, Hatten, and Connealy, 2022). In fact, because community policing relies on a relationship between the police and the public, Ong and Jenks (2004) indicate that this approach to policing is based on the idea that law enforcement agencies should work closely with members of the community to identify and address issues related to crime and public safety. Skogan (2006) argues that community policing efforts are aimed at cooperation and shared goals between the police and members of the public regarding safety and, as such, require a certain level of decentralization to occur (Thomas et al., 2022). This can include everything from establishing neighborhood watch programs to holding community meetings with law enforcement officials to discuss crime prevention strategies. Thomas et al. (2022) identify the role social media plays in community policing, saying certain social media platforms, such as Twitter, have "the capacity to align with the principles and themes of community policing" (p. 467).

2.6.2. Rural Policing

Rural and remote policing is different from urban policing in that the population is typically less dense, and individuals live farther apart (Weisheit and Donnermeyer, 2000). Residents are likely familiar with one another and often share similar values and customs, and, in Indigenous communities in particular, they share culture (Donnermeyer and Barclay, 2005). According to Donnermeyer and Barclay (2005), cohesion within rural and remote community settings can lead to conflict between law enforcement and, as a result, it is particularly important for the police to exercise discretion when interacting with the public. Intelligence gathering in small communities is often done with assistance from the community and therefore it is important for the police to establish rapport with community members (Donnermeyer and Barclay, 2005). This points again to the need for the use of discretion on the part of the police (Donnermeyer and Barclay, 2005; Griffiths, 2019). While urban policing is relatively anonymous, in rural communities, citizen

monitoring occurs even without the assistance of cell phone cameras. Policing in these communities has been described as "high visibility, high consequences" policing (Griffiths, *Canadian Police Work*).

According to Donnermeyer, DeKeseredy, Dragiewicz (2011) some of the unique challenges of rural and remote policing in North America can be attributed to "large geographic areas that are difficult to patrol, limited resources for the hiring of sufficient, trained personnel, and a general neglect by provincial/state and national leaders who (often) mistakenly believe that crime in rural communities is comparatively much lower than in urban centres" (p. 38). They elaborate, detailing the poverty that exits in some rural and remote areas, stating that this, coupled with social, economic, and racial inequities, and a lack of access to appropriate services for victims of crime, increases the challenges police face (Donnermeyer, DeKeseredy, Dragiewicz, 2011).

The crime rate in rural and remote areas can be higher than average, and access to police services is often limited. Donnermeyer and DeKeseredy (2014) argue that residents of rural and remote communities are not immune to crime and criminality. Ruddell, Lithopoulos and Donnermeyer (2016) address the misguided belief that rural and remote communities have high levels of crime and deviance. They say, "rural communities with high levels of violence are not unique, unusual or few in number", but add that there exists a considerable amount of variability with respect to crime rates in these contexts (Ruddell, Lithopoulos and Donnermeyer , 2016; p. 167). However, despite a growing population, police services have become less accessible to those living in rural and remote areas (Halseth and Ryser, 2006; Donnermeyer, DeKeseredy, Dragiewicz, 2011). Many rural and remote communities are located, on average, a thirty-minute drive from their local police detachment (Donnermeyer, DeKeseredy, Dragiewicz, 2011).

Canada has three northern territories: Nunavut, Northwest Territories, and Yukon. These territories make up almost 40% of Canada's land mass and have a coastline that doubles that of the Atlantic and Pacific coasts combined (Canadian Northern Economic Development Agency (CNEDA), 2020). Despite that, the population in these three territories is far less than it is elsewhere in Canada. In fact, the total number of inhabitants in Nunavut, Northwest Territories, and Yukon combined is approximately 114,000 (Canadian Northern Economic Development Agency, 2020). Additionally, the majority of these residents live in the territories' capital cities, while the small minority live in rural and remote towns and communities. For example, the total population of Yukon Territory in January 2022 was 43,619; however, 34,467 of those residents

lived in the territory's capital city, Whitehorse (Yukon Bureau of Statistics, 2022). Less than 10,000 residents lived in the remaining seventeen communities and towns across the large territory.

A key feature of Canada's northern territories is their large Indigenous population. According to Canada Northern Economic Development Agency (2020), Indigenous peoples comprise more than 86 percent of the population in Nunavut, 51 percent of the population in the Northwest Territories and 23 percent of the population in Yukon. Indigenous peoples are disproportionately represented as victims of crime and have the highest rates of criminal justice system involvement in Canada (Ruddell, Lithopoulos, and Jones, 2014). Indigenous people in Canada represent First Nations people, Métis, and Inuit, and their overrepresentation as both victims and perpetrators of violence can be traced to a link between "past and present colonial policies, including the residential school system, marginalization, and institutional racism" (Statistics Canada, 2022; np). Ruddell et al. (2014) cite Lithopoulos' (2013) findings on crime rates in Indigenous communities, which indicate that these are on average 3.7 times higher than in non-Indigenous communities, with violent crime 6.7 times higher, and homicides 5.9 times higher (Lithopoulos, 2013 as cited in Ruddell et al., 2014). Further, Indigenous peoples in Canada are more likely to be victims of crime, with rates of self-reported violent victimization among Indigenous peoples representing twice those of non-Indigenous people (Statistics Canada, 2022). In 2022, a Statistics Canada report found that 41% of Indigenous people under the age of 15 had experienced sexual or physical violence perpetrated by an adult, while 62% over the age of 15 had experienced at least one sexual or physical assault (Statistics Canada, 2022). In general, Indigenous people were more likely to be the victims of homicide, spousal violence, violent crimes, and more likely to experience social and/or health issues (Statistics Canada, 2022). Many Indigenous people in Canada's north live in rural, remote, and isolated areas, and these factors, coupled with the sometimes-inaccessible nature of police services and the general lack of victim services, tend to create challenging situations for both Indigenous people and the police.

Because the territories are so large particularly in comparison to their relatively small population, law enforcement officers face notable challenges. According to Griffiths (2019), "Many northern communities are isolated, have small populations, and are subjected to harsh climates." (p. 249). Additionally, these areas tend to have various social problems and limited services which can exacerbate the complexity of these contexts (Griffiths, 2019). Canada's northern territories are policed by the Royal Canadian Mounted Police (RCMP) exclusively. Detachments are small, have minimal staffing, can be fly-in, and are sometimes far apart (Griffiths, 2019). Griffiths (2019)

explains that the role of police in these contexts is diverse and tends to "extend far beyond those that are legislatively mandated." (p. 252). Often police officers in these areas engage in work that is not typically considered to fall within the realms of normal police work. This might include activities such as spending time on the land with youth, maintaining trails, delivering firewood for Elders, stepping in to fill the role of emergency medical services or fire services.

The policing structure in Canada's rural and remote areas operates as one of, or a combination of, federal, provincial, municipal/regional, and First Nations (Donnermeyer, DeKeseredy, Dragiewicz, 2011). There are unique policies in each province and territory regarding the structure and delivery of policing services. Despite these differing structures, citizen monitoring of the police is present throughout Canada, and while it may take a slightly different form depending on the environment, its implications should be considered.

2.7. Police Response to Citizen Monitoring

In response to high profile police-civilian encounters and to crises of public perceptions, police departments across the world are increasingly adopting body worn cameras public (Ariel et al., 2015; Goodison and Wilson, 2017; Katz et al., 2014). The use of these cameras provides law enforcement agencies with a tool to control the narrative surrounding incidents that involve police officers. By recording interactions, police aim to provide a visual account that aligns with their version of events. In addition, body worn cameras can act as a deterrent, as individuals may modify their behaviour with the awareness that they are being recorded (Ariel et al., 2015). The adoption of body worn cameras reflects the evolving and dynamic relationship between the police and the public where the use of technology becomes a strategic tool in managing public scrutiny and shaping the narrative.

2.8. Conclusion

The visible nature of the police, coupled with technological advancements and widespread internet usage have resulted in opportunities for increasing public scrutiny and criticism. In order to recognize the role citizen monitoring plays in modern policing, it is necessary to understand key historical aspects of policing, police training, the role use of force plays in the profession, and the development of surveillance of the police. The literature addressed in this chapter identifies

these features and the ways in which they have contributed to the current state of citizen monitoring and the impact it has on policing, including police officers' behaviour and use of force.

Citizen monitoring allows members of the public to have agency over the narrative disseminated about the police. While in the past police agencies have maintained strong control over their image management (O'Connor, 2017), the development and prevalence of citizen monitoring has produced a situation in which the public has the ability to operationalize deviance, effectively bypassing the definitions set out by the laws and regulations governing police conduct. There are notable possible benefits of citizen monitoring, including its ability to identify and bring awareness to instances of police misconduct or abuse of power and its potential to cause officers to monitor their actions to ensure they operate in a manner in keeping with police standards and regulations. However, concern remains that citizen monitoring can be manipulated and may produce situations in which police officers are overly cautious when subject to citizen monitoring in order to prevent possible public backlash resulting from footage captured by civilian bystanders.

Citizen monitoring is a relatively new phenomenon and although it presents possible benefits for the police profession, its current use appears to contribute to the divisive 'us versus them' mentality between the police and members of the public. As such, it is critical that priority should be placed on understanding citizen monitoring and the impact it has on police officers and their use of force. Attention should be paid to the role training and public education has on the impact of citizen monitoring and consideration must be given to the ways in which novel technologies affect behaviour.

Like in my case, okay? I'm filmed, but I was absolved of all wrongdoing. Everything was fine. But that film. I've looked – not recently – but sometimes, and yes, it's still there even though everything was fine. And people see that. I have to live with that. Plus, my son is confronted by that. Nine years old. He came home from school crying. These are the things.

<div style="text-align: right;">Officer 41</div>

Chapter 3. Methodology

In 2013, while a master's student, the Primary Investigator (PI) sought to determine whether citizen monitoring affected front-line police officers. Findings from the master's thesis indicated that Canadian police officers were indeed impacted by the presence of individuals engaged in citizen monitoring (Todd, 2015). In fact, younger, less experienced police officers were particularly affected by the phenomenon (Todd, 2015). However, said findings were based on interviews conducted with 14 participants in a single geographic region. Although the study provided preliminary insights into the impact of citizen monitoring, further research was required. The findings from that initial study provided the foundation for the present study. The same general methodological approach was employed here; however, the current study expanded the Canadian sample and added a comparative dimension, including police officers from the Netherlands.

3.1. Theoretical Orientation

The effective application of theory allows researchers to make sense of criminological phenomena, and, more generally, behaviour. According to Williams and McShane (2002), theories are "generalizations of a sort; they explain how two or more events are related to each other and the conditions under which the relationships take place" (p. 4). Citizen monitoring and the related behaviours of police officers can be explained and understood through several distinct theoretical approaches: first, deterrence theory, and second, rational choice theory. Although each of these theoretical approaches are unique, their main tenants offer complementing explanations regarding citizen monitoring.

The phenomenon of citizen monitoring is based on the assumptions found in deterrence theory. According to findings identified in the PI's master's thesis, citizen monitoring serves to deter police officers in their application of force – both lawful and unlawful. Because of this, the present study was undertaken to better understand the impact of citizen monitoring on law enforcement through the lens of deterrence theory. Rooted in the Classical School of Criminology and its view of human behaviour as a series of rational choices, deterrence theory was originally proposed by Beccaria (1764). After a period of theoretical dominance, deterrence theory was rejected in the early 1900s with the emerging focus on biological explanations of behaviour (Pratt,

Cullen, Blevins, Daigle, and Madensen, 2017; Quackenbush, 2011). In 1968, Becker instigated a renewed interest in deterrence theory through the introduction of his economic perspective, "which was bolstered by policy-related questions concerning the potential crime reduction capacity of rising prison populations" (Pratt et al, 2017; p. 368). This theoretical perspective purports that certain factors deter individuals from engaging in particular behaviours.

Citizen monitoring has certain deterrent properties. As Ariel et al. (2015) argue, "getting caught breaking rules is often registered as a behaviour that can potentially lead to negative consequences such as sanctions, an outcome most individuals wish to avoid" (p. 516). Surveillance conducted by members of the general public via citizen monitoring can capture officers "breaking the rules"; however, it also has the ability to capture officers engaged in legitimate police work which can subsequently be posted in a manner that makes it appear as though these actions were outside of the rules. In other words, the unprecedented visibility currently experienced by law enforcement officials can lead to significant public scrutiny regardless of whether or not an incident caught on film presented an example of justified or unjustified use of police powers. Therefore, when referring to citizen monitoring, Ariel et al.'s (2015) aforementioned statement must be altered to reflect the fact that being captured on film is often registered as having the ability to "potentially lead to negative consequences such as sanctions, an outcome most individuals wish to avoid" (p. 516).

Deterrence theory relies on three individual components: severity, certainty, and celerity (Pratt et al, 2017). First, the more severe the punishment, the less likely a rational individual is willing to engage in questionable behaviour (Pratt et al, 2017). With the emergence of policing's 'new visibility', police officers have increasingly been captured on film, only to find this footage available to the public through the use of social media platforms such as YouTube and Facebook. There have been incidents wherein an officer is captured on film and is criticized publicly for their behaviour, despite the fact that it is justified given the situation. Deterrence theory purports that the public outcry that results from the publication of such footage acts as a deterrent, regardless of the presence or absence of 'rule breaking behaviour' (Pratt et al, 2017). Second, the knowledge that punishment is certain will contribute to individuals refraining from engaging in such behaviour (Pratt et al, 2017). Examples of citizen monitoring are frequently publicised and police officers who are aware of this may feel as though the propagation of such footage is a punishment in itself. Lastly, if the punishment is seen as occurring in a rapid manner, the deterrent capabilities are, once again, bolstered (Pratt et al, 2017). A notable characteristic of citizen monitoring is its

ability to occur in real-time, and for the footage captured to be shared instantaneously. For police, citizen monitoring can easily embody all three of the individual components of deterrence theory.

Rational choice theory also pertains to the discussion around citizen monitoring. Underlying the assumptions made in rational choice theory is the question of why people choose certain behaviour. Rational choice theory suggests that in their determination to engage in certain behaviours, individuals carry out a careful cost-benefit analysis. Essentially, rational choice theory asserts that actors choose to either engage in, or to avoid a certain activity or behaviour after a calculated reasoning process. It is in this process that the actor determines whether the pleasure associated with the activity or behaviour outweighs the pain associated with potential punishment.

Beccaria (1764) contributed to early understandings of rational choice theory in his argument that harsh punishments act as a deterrent. However, Pratt (2008) argues that these original ideas have seen significant development since the mid-1700s. He suggests that, in fact, rational choice theory "has matured into a more comprehensive perspective that appreciates the complexity of the nature of criminal behaviour." (Pratt, 2008; p. 43). Indeed, since Beccaria's (1764) contribution, many have added to the theory's increased complexity. Of note with respect to citizen monitoring are the works of Braithwaite (1989) and Tittle (1977), who both indicate that there can be significant "non-legal" costs associated with a punishment that might include factors such as shame or a loss of respect (as cited in Pratt, 2008; p. 43).

Rational choice theory asserts that individuals hold the decision-making power that allows them to choose between different courses of action (Paternoster, 2017). Rational choice theory is a consequentialist theory and, as such, decision-making is evaluated in terms of the results. Its binary condition is further emphasized in that the explanations resulting from rational choice theory are predicated on two distinct mental states, namely, beliefs and desires (Paternoster, 2017). These beliefs and desires are deemed rational depending on how the agent decides to act, regardless of whether or not the action taken is objectively optimal (Paternoster, 2017). Rational choice theory presupposes that actions are based out of self-interest in a way that satisfies desires (Paternoster, 2017).

According to Boudon (2002), rational choice theory can be described by a series of postulates. First, any social phenomenon is the effect of individual decisions, actions, and attitudes. Second, in principle, an action can be understood. Third, actions are caused by rational

reasons formed within the minds of individuals. Fourth, actors give potential actions and consequences consideration prior to acting. Fifth, actors are concerned with the consequences to themselves of their own action, and lastly, actors are able to distinguish the costs and benefits of alternative lines of action and they tend choose the line of action with the most favourable balance (Boudon, 2002; p. 3-4).

Rational choice theory asserts that actors choose to either engage in or avoid criminal activity after a reasoning process. During this process, the actor will determine whether the pleasure of the crime outweighs the pain of the potential punishment. The phenomenon of citizen monitoring is a modification of the traditional understanding of rational choice. Specifically, police officers subjected to citizen monitoring may weigh the potential costs and benefits associated with their application of force. Those engaged in citizen monitoring may vilify use of force, while in the field of policing, a lack of force in a situation that necessitates it may be similarly disparaged.

While rational choice theory can serve to explain some aspects of citizen monitoring, the theoretical perspective is not without its flaws. The idea of "human rational agency in terms of maximizing over a complete and consistent set of preference orderings is not psychologically realistic" (Satz and Ferejohn, 1994; p. 74). Critics suggest that humans' decision-making processes are too complex to be reduced to a simple theory. Additionally, rational choice theory may be limited in its applicability to citizen monitoring in that it assumes individuals have complete and accurate information in their decision-making process. Police may not be aware that they are the subject of citizen monitoring as surveillance efforts may be covert or intermittent. Further, rational choice theory posits that individuals engage in the cognitive process of weighing costs and benefits; however, this fails to recognize the emotional and psychological factors involved in decision-making processes. For example, police officers may experience various emotions if they are, or when they become aware that they are, being monitored. Rational choice theory also assumes that individuals make decisions independently and therefore fails to recognize the strong organizational culture, power dynamics, and structural constraints that exist in the police profession. Rational choice theory does offer a framework for understanding some aspects of the decision-making process police engage in when subject to citizen monitoring in encounter situations, including those encounters that involve the use of force.

3.2. Research Objectives

Policing has always been a highly visible line of work. Compared to their counterparts in the criminal justice system who have the ability to make their decisions in the confines of their offices or in institutional settings such as correctional centres, and can therefore be more deliberative, police officers have to make decisions 'on the street' and are thus more visible during the process. Police officer decision making occurs in a dynamic environment where events are often unpredictable. Police encounters require decision making despite uncertainties in the environment and present an opportunity for members of the public to engage in citizen monitoring when the police already occupy a visible role. In recent years, with the ubiquity of smart phones and social media usership, the policing profession has experienced unprecedented levels of visibility. BWCs emerged in 2005 as a mechanism to ensure police accountability and, in some ways, to combat the impact of citizen monitoring (Saulnier et al., 2021). While there is considerable literature regarding BWCs and their impact on police officers, including the works of Ariel et al., 2015; Goodison and Wilson, 2017, and Katz et al., 2014, there is a paucity of literature on citizen monitoring. The PI's master's research explored this topic; however, the scope of the study was limited and focused only on police officers working in a single jurisdiction and geographic region. Further, although there may be anecdotal evidence regarding the impact of citizen monitoring on police officers working in a variety of contexts, little formalized research has been done to explore this topic. Therefore, the present study sought to expand upon the ideas examined in the research conducted in 2013 through a broader examination of the topic.

The present study had two main objectives:

1. To better understand the impact citizen monitoring had on the attitudes and experiences of front-line police officers
2. To examine the role context (i.e., policing environment, demographic) played in officers' experiences of citizen monitoring through a comparison of two international jurisdictions.

Given the lack of research on the topic of citizen monitoring both in Canada and elsewhere, the findings outlined in this study will contribute to existing policing literature and will enable a better understanding of police operations. Further, the study presented findings that could contribute to the development of necessary, informed, and effective policy changes.

3.3. Research Questions

This study examined Canadian and Dutch police officers' experiences with and perceptions of citizen monitoring. Three primary questions guided the research:

1. What impact does citizen monitoring have on police officers' experiences and attitudes and behaviour?
2. What impact does citizen monitoring have on police officers' use of justified force?
3. What role does context play in front-line police officers' experiences and perceptions of citizen monitoring?

These questions informed the development of the interview schedule, which was used to gain an understanding of police officers' experiences and perceptions. The interview schedule can be found in Appendix B. The questions covered a variety of themes including citizen monitoring, contextual factors, and the use of force.

3.4. Methods

Policing is carried out in a variety of geographic environments, from remote policing to urban policing and everything in between. It also is conducted in jurisdictions with different legal frameworks, cultures, and socio-political attributes.

The present study examined citizen monitoring in one jurisdiction in Canada, and in the Netherlands. In developing the approach for a multi-site study, it was important to consider and formulate an appropriate methodological procedure. There are notable benefits associated with multi-site studies. Given that multi-site studies provide large, diverse samples, their research findings tend to be more generalizable than the findings of studies that examine a single site.

Despite this, multi-site studies are also subject to certain limitations. Because the policing contexts in Canada and the Netherlands are quite different, the present study does not purport to offer a direct comparison between the two sample groups. Instead, the study's aim was to explore the cross-dimensional features associated with policing in both contexts. In other words, the multi-site research design contributes to the exploratory nature of the study and does not present a direct comparison of subject experiences. While the study does not offer a direct comparison,

certain comparative aspects emerged in the findings and should not be ignored. These are addressed in Chapter 7.

The purpose of the study was to determine whether or not citizen monitoring impacted front-line police officers and their use of force, and further, if this impact varied based on contextual factors, including individual, organizational, and environmental. Officers from various police departments across Canada were asked to participate. Because of Canada's diverse nature—both geographical and cultural—the police officers asked to participate reflected the range of policing contexts. There is one national police force in the Netherlands. In order to obtain a range of perspectives, police officers from different jurisdictions in the country were interviewed.

3.4.1. Design Type

This study employed a qualitative approach and used in-depth, semi-structured interviews as the primary means of data collection. The qualitative approach was the preferred method given that it allowed the participants to be active agents in their own narrative. The interview questions were open-ended, thereby ensuring participants would not feel restrained in their responses. Interviewees were encouraged to share their experiences of citizen monitoring in an authentic manner. The present study is best characterized as descriptive in nature and non-experimental in its design, as the research aimed to understand police officers' experiences and perceptions of citizen monitoring and its impact on their decision making in use of force situations.

The relationship between academics and police members and agencies has traditionally been fraught with conflict. (Bradley and Nixon, 2009). There has been a tendency on the part of police officers to be distrustful of outside researchers, and, while this has changed significantly over the years, remnants of these sentiments exist today. Two factors that continue to contribute to this are "The Blue Wall" and "The Thin Blue Line". Both are well documented phenomena that exist within modern western policing. Shockey-Echkles (2019) suggests that some view the "Blue Wall" as "an impenetrable fortress whereby contemporary police officers protect their own", while others argue that it "enhances their ability to control crime, protect public safety and serves as an added layer of protection for the officers themselves" (p. 292). Whatever the case, these features of policing can create a barrier for police researchers.

Efforts have been made to foster the relationship between police and academics and to expand upon what is presently a limited body of policing literature. Alpert, Rojek, and Hansen

(2013) note that "concerted efforts" have been made to develop relationships and partnerships between police and researchers (p. vi). They reference a 2004 International Association of Chiefs of Police (IACP) report in which there is mention of the fact that such partnerships are necessary in order to implement best practices (Alpert et al., 2013). The importance of research at all levels is considerable, and as such, the potential benefits of the present study were stressed when initial contact with police members and agencies was established for recruitment purposes.

Because of the nature of the in-group solidarity prevalent in policing, it was unreasonable to identify a large sample of potential participants from which to select respondents. Opportunity sampling was used in this study for a number of reasons. First, opportunity sampling allowed the PI to locate officers who were available and willing to participate. Second, given the exploratory nature of this study, opportunity sampling allowed the PI to interview participants for the purpose of obtaining preliminary insights. Third, because police populations can be hesitant to speak with researchers, opportunity sampling allowed the PI to reach this specific population more easily and to gather insight that might otherwise be challenging to obtain. Opportunity sampling can provide useful insights; however, samples obtained in this manner may not be representative of the larger population which may introduce biases and limit the generalizability of the findings.

Participants for this study were identified with the assistance of a number of crucial gatekeepers. The Canadian gatekeepers were instructed that the sample should include police officers working at any level for any Canadian police agencies. The Dutch gatekeepers were similarly instructed that the sample should include police officers working at any level for the Dutch National Police. Initially, there were three main gatekeepers: one from Canada and two from the Netherlands. Dr. Curt Griffiths, the PI's doctoral supervisor, served as a key gatekeeper because of his position as a significant Canadian police researcher with many connections to police services and their members. Additionally, Dutch police officers were recruited with the assistance of two individuals embedded within the Dutch National Police: Aart Garssen and Harry Veneklaas.

As time progressed and more contacts were established, the number of gatekeepers increased, thus contributing to a form of sampling known as exponential non-discriminative snowball sampling (Ilker, Rukayya, and Abudakar, 2015). For example, when the PI first arrived in the Netherlands, Garssen and Veneklaas were the study's only gatekeepers; however, as time progressed, the PI met several other individuals who proved instrumental in terms of recruiting officers willing and able to participate in the study.

Simon Fraser University's policies mandate that studies involving human participants require that ethics approval before the interview process can begin. The PI submitted an ethics application (see Appendix F). Simon Fraser University's Office of Research Ethics board granted ethics approval for this study on March 3, 2017. Additionally, the University's Research Ethics Board (REB) stated the research could be considered "minimal risk" (as cited in the Office of Research Ethics approval letter, see Appendix G).

Simon Fraser University's REB has established clear guidelines regarding the ethical collection of data. One such guideline states that prior to an interview, the PI must receive informed consent from the interview participant. Informed consent can typically be achieved through two means: either an interview participant can provide written consent, or they can provide oral consent. The present study deals with questions of a sensitive nature, and the PI anticipated that, if not all, the majority of the participants would wish to remain anonymous. Written consent has the potential to jeopardize participant confidentiality and anonymity due to the creation of a written record of participants' names. Further, an important part of qualitative research is the development and establishment of rapport.

There were several considerations surrounding study participants' ability to provide consent. Consent was premised on the fact that participants were informed of the study details and that the purpose of the study was to fulfill the requirements of the PI's doctoral dissertation. Further, participants were required to possess adequate reasoning faculties so as to provide consent. The determination that participants possessed adequate reasoning faculties was made by the PI before participants' oral informed consent was obtained. Participants were instructed that informed consent would be reaffirmed should presentations of the interview material be used in further papers, projects, or presentations.

It was determined that before the interview commenced, the PI and the participant would have an opportunity to review the Participant Information Sheet. Although each participant received the document prior to the interview, they were provided the opportunity to pose any questions or express any concerns. Once the PI had addressed any questions or concerns raised, the PI read aloud the oral informed consent script. The key features emphasized in the oral informed consent process were the study's goals and purpose, the benefits expected to result from the research, the voluntary nature of the study, the guarantee that confidentiality would be

upheld, and the possibility of any physical or psychological risks. Following the oral informed consent preamble, the PI asked the participants clearly whether or not they understood the information they had heard, whether or not they had any questions, and whether or not they consented to participate in the interview. Each participant consented to participate in the interview. The oral informed consent process was recorded on a secure recording device. Following the interview, participants were once again asked if they had questions or concerns regarding the interview specifically, or the study more generally.

The study received ethics approval on March 3, 2017, and following this, prospective interviewees were contacted by gatekeepers. Once the interviewees agreed to participate, discussions commenced with the PI. There were a number of steps that took place after consultation with the gatekeeper(s):

1. The gatekeeper(s) indicated that they had contact with a number of police members who might or might not be interested in participating;
2. The gatekeeper(s) contacted potential participants and inquired whether they would be interested in participating in the study. Gatekeeper(s) were provided with a copy of the Participant Information Sheet (See Appendix E) and were asked to provide potential participants with a copy of this document. The document was intended to provide potential participants with an understanding of the study objectives and goals before they requested contact or were contacted by the PI;
3. The potential participants indicated that they were either interested or not;
4. Interested potential participants were either provided with the PI's contact information, or, if consent was given, the gatekeeper provided the PI with the contact information;
5. Either the PI would contact the potential participant via email or phone (based on the preference they indicated), or the potential participant would contact the PI via email or phone.

Once the PI established contact with the potential participants, the details of the study were explained. While participants had been provided with the Participant Information Sheet, the PI took time to address any questions and discuss the participant's anonymity, as well as the requirement of informed consent. Participants were informed that formal approval from their respective organizations/departments had not been obtained and that they had been recruited and approached individually. The PI assured participants that pseudonyms would be used in order to maintain anonymity. Additionally, participants were informed that the names of their police

agencies and the cities in which they policed and/or lived would be redacted from the interview transcripts and from any papers, projects, or theses produced from the data. This was clearly outlined in the informed consent handout; however, to make certain all participants understood, the information was highlighted in correspondence leading up to all interviews.

3.4.2. Participants

Through the sampling process, a relatively large sample of police officers from across Canada and the Netherlands was identified. Although the makeup of the Canadian and Dutch samples differed, there were some notable similarities. The intention of this study was exploratory. Its purpose was not to draw comparisons between the Dutch and Canadian police officers, rather, the study focused on the experiences within the two unique samples and identified similarities and differences for future study.

The policing context in the Netherlands differs from that of the Canadian policing context in several notable ways. Despite this, there are also similarities. These differences and similarities will be discussed at length in Chapter 4. It is important to note that the all the police officers interviewed all had experience working on the front lines as patrol officers. At the time of the interviews, some of them had moved on to work in specialized teams or positions, but each of them had spent time working in patrol at some point in their careers.

The study included 48 participants: 24 representing the Canadian sample, and 24 representing the Dutch sample. Policing is a male-dominated field, and this has had a significant impact on police culture (Archbold and Schulz, 2012). There were four women officers in the Canadian sample and three in the Dutch sample. Based on the PI's master's research which examined citizen monitoring, there was no indication or hypothesis that female police officers would experience citizen monitoring differently than male officers in the present study. The two samples are discussed independently.

Canadian Participants:

The Canadian sample was comprised of 24 police officers, 23 of whom were employed by a police agency at the time of the interview and one of whom was a retired police officer. The police officers who participated in the study were members of both municipal police services and the Royal Canadian Mounted Police.

The officers also held a range of positions within their respective police services, including specialized units. The Canadian officers had worked in or were currently assigned to patrol. There was considerable variation in the environments in which the officers worked. Some had policed or were policing in metropolitan areas with high population density, high call volume, and demographic diversity, while others policed in rural or remote areas of Canada. Additionally, some of the officers who were interviewed had worked only in uniformed patrol, while others had more experience in plainclothes, specialized units.

Dutch Participants:

The Dutch study sample was composed of 24 police officers. In the Netherlands, there is a national police force, the Dutch National Police, or the 'Korps Nationale Politie'. The police force consists of 10 'Regional Units', the 'Central Unit', and the 'Police Services Centre' (Politie NL, 2020). The police officers who participated in the study worked in a variety of regions across the Netherlands, including:

- Amsterdam
- Oost-Nederland (East-Netherlands)
- Oost-Brabant (East-Brabant)
- Den Haag (The Hague)
- Noord-Holland (North-Holland)

Like the Canadian participants, the Dutch participants held a range of positions in the field. Their roles included, dog handler with the Canine Unit, Wijkagent (Community Police Officer), officer in the Riot Police, and use of force trainer.

3.4.3. Research Ethics and Informed Consent

Police officers engage in a range of professional duties and have various responsibilities. These duties and responsibilities can impact members of the public in such a way that if they are not adhering to the law, freedoms and, in some instances, lives can be taken. Because of the sensitive nature of police work and due to the traditionally fractious relationship between law enforcement and academics, the PI recognized the challenges associated with interviewing police

officers. Police officers may be hesitant to speak with a civilian academic regarding issues of a sensitive nature related to their work.

Police officers have the legal authority to use force in certain situations. The present study examined this use of force and asked pointed questions regarding the impact citizen monitoring might or might not have on a police officer's application of force. While force is not frequently used in the policing profession, the possibility of its use is constant. Police officers receive extensive training regarding its application, and the expectation exists that if they are involved in a situation in which its use is necessary, it will be employed.

The purpose of this study was to explore whether police officers' application of force was affected when they were in the presence of individuals engaged in citizen monitoring. Based on the 2013 study findings, the PI anticipated that, at minimum, some findings would indicate that police officers were impacted by citizen monitoring. As suggested in the 2013 study, the presence of citizen monitoring could potentially impact police officers to the point where the officers neglected to use the force they were legally authorized to use in a certain situation. Such a finding would imply that the police duties as outlined during training were not being adhered to.

Given the sensitive nature of police work in general, and the increased sensitivity around issues relating to citizen monitoring, the PI anticipated that a reluctance to divulge information might exist. In order to combat this, it was essential to reassure participants that their anonymity and confidentiality would be strictly maintained. By ensuring that the study itself was ethically sound, this looked to be achievable.

3.5. Research Method: Interviews

3.5.1. Design Rationale

A qualitative methods approach was employed for the present study. Data was collected through the use of in-depth, semi-structured interviews. This research approach was selected for two primary reasons. Qualitative methods, and in particular in-depth interviews, can contribute to the "comprehensive understanding of human action" (Palys and Atchison, 2014; p. 7). Qualitative research "begins with one or more relatively broad research questions that may be revised iteratively as the research is carried out to narrow the research aim or purpose" (Denny and Weckesser, 2022; n.p.). According to Palys and Atchison (2014), Shultz (1970) argued for the

use of qualitative methods, suggesting that quantitative methods fall short in the long run (p. 7). When compared to their quantitative counterparts, however, qualitative studies are often limited in terms of their sample size. Although arguments are made regarding the benefit of sample size compared to richness of data, sample size remains an important issue for consideration.

The in-depth nature of qualitative research can also produce more robust results. Interviews offer research participants the opportunity to describe their experiences in their own words. These data are more descriptive than numerical quantifications of the same experiences. However, this approach gives the participants agency over their contribution to the study and allows them to tell their story using their own unique voices. Because the relationship between police and researchers has historically been strained, the PI felt it was important to ensure that the study participants felt they had control over their contribution. Interviews allow for probing questions, elaboration, and clarification. Each of these can contribute to both a better understanding on behalf of the researcher, but also to confidence among participants that their voice is being heard and honoured.

Palys and Atchison (2014) have stated that interviews "tend to be longer and more detailed, to seek greater depth of response and to be more open-ended in their construction to allow for phenomenological input from respondents." (p. 151). Interviews also have several challenges, including the time commitment from both the participants and the researcher, the potential costs associated with travel to conduct interviews. Of note is the fact that the interviews for this study were conducted prior to the COVID-19 pandemic, and as such, were primarily conducted face-to-face rather than via a platform such as Zoom, which is more readily accepted today.

Collecting data through in-person interviews proved to be invaluable. This approach allowed the PI to establish a strong rapport with the participants and thereby gather insightful information regarding their experiences with citizen monitoring. The PI met participants in locations where they felt most comfortable, and this resulted in diverse interview settings including participants' homes, work environments, and neighbourhood restaurants and cafes. Allowing the participants to choose the setting themselves established a comfortable and familiar atmosphere for them, putting them at ease, and thus fostering a greater willingness on their part to share experiences, insights, and sentiments about citizen monitoring. Rapport building and flexibility in the interview process contributed to and enriched the depth and authenticity of the data collected.

Interviews as a data collection method also contributed significantly to the understanding of context as it pertained to the study participants. The PI was able to gain a comprehensive understanding of cultural influences, nuances, and situational factors unique to each context through the interview process. Participants were able to provide contextual insight that might not have been readily apparent through other data collection approaches. Through the use of probing questions, the PI was able to seek clarification and explore elements of participants' responses to gain a better understanding of the contexts in which they worked.

3.5.2. Interview Process

From July 2017 to July 2018, the PI conducted interviews with 48 police officers in Canada and in the Netherlands. The majority of the Canadian interviews were conducted in-person. Interviews with Canadian police officers occurred sporadically during this time, based on interview participants' various schedules. In-person interviews were conducted with participants who worked and resided in the Lower Mainland[1] region of British Columbia. The interview locations were conducted in locations selected by the participants. Before the interviews took place, participants were asked where they would feel most comfortable answering questions of a sensitive nature. The majority of these interviews occurred at cafes in locales that were convenient for the interview participants.

There were some instances in which an in-person interview was not possible with Canadian participants. Prior to the interview itself, the PI corresponded with interview participants regarding study information, and at this time, possibilities for remote interviews were outlined and discussed. Interviews were conducted with police officers working and living across the nation. Some of these police officers worked in relatively remote locations, and it would have been costly, time-consuming, and challenging for the PI to physically attend each interview. Given this, some interviews were conducted over the telephone, and others were conducted via Skype calls, depending on the interview participant's preference. Although video conferencing platforms such as Skype are considered less secure than face-to-face interviews, the physical distance between the PI and some of the interview participants meant that this was a better option than no interview at all.

---

[1] A geographic region that includes the districts within Metro Vancouver and the Fraser Valley.

Interviews with Dutch police officers took place in the Netherlands between October 17[th,] 2017, and October 31st, 2017. These interviews were all in-person. Some of these interviews were pre-arranged through email correspondence with interview participants in the months and weeks leading up to the PI's trip to the Netherlands. Many of them, however, were scheduled while the PI was in the Netherlands as rapport was established within the police organization. Dutch interview participants were asked about their preference with respect to interview location. Participants were instructed to select a location in which they felt comfortable discussing topics of a sensitive nature. Many participants selected cafes; however, there were several that opted to have their interview take place at their home department. In these instances, interviews took place in quiet and relatively private areas.

Two Dutch participants expressed a desire to be interviewed in their homes. Given that this seemed to be the environment in which they felt most comfortable, this request was met. In allowing participants to select a location in which they felt comfortable, initial rapport between the participants and the researcher was established. Because the PI was visiting the Netherlands, the interview participants seemed to see hospitality as important.

While all interviews conducted in the Netherlands were in-person, several Canadian interviews were not. There were two significant factors that contributed to the rationale underlying this decision. First, Canada is a large nation comprised of 38.13 million residents in an area totalling 9.985 million square kilometres (Statistics Canada, 2021). The Netherlands, conversely, is much smaller, with a population of 17.18 million in an area of 41,543 square kilometres (EuroStats, 2021). Additionally, much of Canada is rural, remote, or uninhabited land. Because the study examined contextual factors associated with citizen monitoring, and thus interviewed officers working in various contexts, some participants resided in rural and remote regions in locations across the country. Logistically, traveling across the Netherlands was much more feasible than traveling across Canada, both in terms of time and cost.

Second, in the Netherlands, the national language is Dutch. Although English is spoken by many, it is not necessarily spoken by all, and there are differences in the extent to which the Dutch speak conversational English. The PI speaks and understands conversational Dutch; however, communication and comprehension would have been challenging had the interviews been conducted via telephone or Skype. This contributed to the decision to travel to Netherlands and conduct the interviews in person.

The interviews were semi-structured and in-depth. The average interview time was approximately 60 minutes; however, the interviews varied in length from 25 minutes to 120 minutes. Upon meeting the interview participant and prior to the interview itself, the PI typically engaged them in light conversation in order to build rapport. Typically, this conversation was brief; however, it did vary in length. Once some level of comfort was established, the PI restated the study details. While the participants had received the Participant Information Sheet via email prior to the interview, there was no assumption that the participant had had the time to review the document.

An important component of the pre-interview discussion was that, with the interviewee's consent, the interview would be tape recorded. The interviewees were assured that the recordings themselves would remain confidential. Interview participants were also informed that written notes might be recorded in a journal during the course of the interview, but only with their consent. All participants were read a statement regarding details of the study, their role as interview participants, their ability to withdraw from the study without consequences, and any potential risks that could be incurred as a result of participating. This process, and their subsequent consent, was digitally recorded.

All participants consented to the interview being recorded. A Sony 4-Gigabyte Direct Voice Recorder was used to record interviews. After the interviews, the interviews and their respective transcriptions and notes were stored separately in a secure location. The audio recordings were stored on an encrypted USB device and were kept in a secure container in the PI's home. In storing and retaining these recordings, the PI ensured the opportunity to revisit and follow-up on the data should that be necessary for either the present study or for future studies and projects. Interview participants were informed of this possibility.

At the beginning of each interview, the PI informed participants that their identity would be kept confidential, and further that any information that could potentially serve to identify them would be redacted. The exception to this would be if a participant wished to publicize their identity. None of the participants interviewed indicated a preference for the latter option, and, as such, all interviews were anonymized during the transcription process.

The interview schedule was developed during the initial phase of the study. These questions were subjected to a number of revisions during the early stages of the research project; however, the interview schedules (Appendices B and C) were finalized in February 2017. An English and a Dutch version of the interview schedule was produced. The English interview schedule was completed first, and the Dutch interview schedule was a direct translation of this document. The interview questions did not include a significant number of technical terms because it was important to ensure that the translation was clear and that all police-related terms were properly translated. To ensure this, the PI was in frequent communication with the translator to field any questions. The translator was also used to assist the formulation of the Dutch version of the interview schedule. The PI's proficiency in Dutch assisted in this process. A copy of the translated interview schedule is contained in Appendix B.

The questions posed in the interview covered a range of topics, including the interviewee's policing experience, police use of force, citizen monitoring of police-citizen encounters, and the impact of the setting in which encounters occurred. Questions were posed in an open-ended manner to allow the interviewee to share their lived experience and perceptions. Semi-structured interviews allow for probing questions which can be particularly useful in the event that a participant has touched on a topic worthy of further exploration. The use of this type of interview allowed the participants to have agency over the conversation. Participants had the ability to navigate the topic as they saw fit—offering anecdotes and elaboration without concern for the scope of the study.

Several of the officers, primarily in the Netherlands, requested a copy of the interview questions in advance of the interview date. Given some concerns regarding language barriers, both English and Dutch versions of the interview schedule were disseminated to participants upon request. Based on subsequent conversations with interview participants, the PI learned that this option was helpful. It provided those who made use of it with the opportunity to review the questions, and to give some preliminary thought to their responses. This, in turn, contributed to the interviewee's level of comfort during the interview.

Approximately half of the total interviews were conducted with Dutch police officers. To mitigate language difficulties, the PI felt it would be necessary to have a translator present for some of the interviews. As a pre-emptive measure the PI referenced this in the ethics application made to Simon Fraser University Research Ethics Board. In the application, the PI included a

confidentiality agreement (see Appendix D) that would be used to ensure said translator would maintain participants' confidentiality. The study was granted ethics approval on March 3, 2017.

Before the interviews took place in the Netherlands, the PI informed potential participants that arrangements for either informal translation, or professional translation services could be made. Although the PI has Dutch heritage and can speak and understand the language, this knowledge is somewhat limited. As such, the PI requested the assistance of a family member who is fluent in both Dutch and English, lives in the Netherlands and, at the time, was in the process of obtaining a law degree so had an understanding of some of the more nuanced terminology. The family member was happy to assist and agreed to sign the confidentiality agreement prior to any interviews. This option was discussed with interview participants. Further, an alternate option was proposed to participants: the PI made it clear that a professional translator could be engaged instead. Two participants requested a translator, and both participants confirmed that they were comfortable with the former option (informal translation services). The translator subsequently participated in two of the interview sessions and, on a few occasions, clarified terminology for the interviewee.

3.5.3. Data Analysis

Following the interviews, the recordings were transcribed. The interview data were anonymized during this process. The data were uploaded to and analyzed using a platform called 'NVivo'. This software was selected for the analysis process due to its versatility and its ability to easily allow analysis of unstructured data. NVivo can "deal with virtually any kind of content" and allows researchers to "import a wide range of data and file formats", and subsequently code the information in a manner that suits the study objectives (Palys and Atchison, 2014; p. 322).

After the interview transcripts were uploaded to NVivo, the coding process commenced. NVivo refers to the coding unit it uses as 'nodes'. The PI developed nodes[2] by carefully reading the interview transcripts. The initial reading involved close line-by-line reading in order ensure a strong understanding of each of the interview responses. Nodes were developed through the use of "in process" creation, which occurs through reading the data (Palys and Atchison, 2014). This contributed to the development of important themes within the data. The particular coding

---

[2] A node is "a short label representing an idea, theme, persona, place, interest, or concept." (Palys and Atchison, 2014; p. 322)

approach which was employed in this study was 'inductive' or 'open' coding. Thomas (2003) defines inductive coding as, "a systematic procedure for analysing qualitative data where the analysis is guided by specific objectives" (p. 2).

Thomas (2003) has noted that there are three primary reasons for using an inductive approach: first, to condense lengthy and varied text data; second, to formulate links between study objectives and findings; and third, to develop a theory or model based on the themes that emerge. In order to provide a deep analysis of the study data, 'parent nodes' or overarching themes were developed, initially. From there, additional nodes, or sub-themes were developed based on each subsequent reading or re-reading of the interview data.

There were several important considerations during the analysis process. The PI had studied this subject in more general terms while completing a master's degree. Because of this, the PI had already developed some basic themes based on this exploratory research. While efforts to remain objective were maintained throughout the coding and analysis process, it was not possible to entirely ignore the themes that had emerged during the 2013 study. Also, during the analysis process, some statements emerged that could be considered outliers. When these emerged, it was important for the PI to ensure personal bias did not influence the research results. These outliers were examined on more than one occasion to determine their purpose and utility within the study.

3.4. Summary

This chapter has set out the framework for the study of police officer perceptions of how civilian monitoring affects the decision to use force among a sample of police officers in Canada and the Netherlands. The study was informed by both rational choice theory and deterrence theory. These theories offer complementing perspectives regarding citizen monitoring and its potential impact on officers. The study employed a qualitative approach in which in-depth, semi-structured interviews were conducted with 24 Canadian police officers employed by municipal police services and the RCMP and 24 police officers who were members of the Dutch National Police. Officers in both countries were identified via opportunity sampling and had varying levels of policing experience and different roles within their respective agencies.

Study participants were provided with information about the study; they gave oral informed consent and were assured of confidentiality and anonymity. The data gathered during the interviews were collated and analyzed using the program NVivo.

And it's very easy to take what we do out of context, so if somebody takes…a snapshot in time and they haven't seen the preamble to what's happened, very easily you could be criticized. In the modern day when everybody has a video camera on their cell phone, it just gives a false perception of what's happening.

Officer 15

Chapter 4. The Contexts of Citizen Monitoring in the Netherlands and in Canada

In order to understand the impact citizen monitoring had on police officers, it was necessary to consider contextual factors, such as geographic environment and population. Police officers carry out their activities in a variety of contexts, including urban, suburban, rural, and remote environments. Additionally, it was important to consider the unique populations within these contexts as these can also influence police work. Understanding the role context played was important in interpreting the results in the present study because citizen monitoring is not an isolated experience among police officers. Contexts can vary significantly. As a result, a consideration of context is generally important because it can influence study design, implementation, and the interpretation of results. Understanding context enables comprehensive interpretation of study results and can assist in the implementation of recommendations. Potential biases and limitations can also be better identified and understood through an examination of context.

The PI's master's research on citizen monitoring found that context can play a role in the way citizen monitoring is experienced; however, those findings were limited in that the scope of the research project was relatively small. The present study sought to remedy that through an examination of citizen monitoring in various contexts, including within two different countries. Participants from a variety of contexts across Canada and the Netherlands were interviewed with the aim of gaining a better understanding of the influence contextual factors can have.

Consideration of policing environments is essential to the understanding of citizen monitoring. During the course of the interviews, participants were asked questions about the contexts in which filming took place. These questions helped explain why citizen monitoring tended to be more common in certain situations and why certain people were more likely to film encounters than others.

In Canada, the policing context is complex and multifaceted, reflecting the country's diverse social, cultural, and political landscape. Policing is primarily the responsibility of municipal and provincial governments, while the RCMP enforce federal law enforcement. The RCMP also provides policing services under contract to municipalities in all of the provinces except Quebec and Ontario are the only police service in the Yukon, Northwest Territories, and Nunavut. The

geography in which policing occurs varies considerably. Police in urban centres like Vancouver, Calgary, and Toronto engage in different forms of law enforcement work than those officers in rural, remote, and northern regions of the country. In addition, policing in Canada's north presents an entirely different set of policing expectations and operational requirements. The policing context in Canada, in general, is characterised by a complex and evolving set of challenges. In order to understand the policing context in the Netherlands, it is important to consider its community oriented and proactive approaches. Organizationally, the Dutch police system operates under one national police force comprised of ten regionalized units and one centralized unit. Compared to Canada, the Netherlands is a small, densely populated nation. Although there are farming communities, the majority of policing occurs within an urban context. Because of this, the Dutch National Police emphasizes its efforts to work in collaboration with and to engage with local communities.

4.1. The Policing Context in Dutch Urban Centres

Officers in the Netherlands were asked a series of questions regarding context, the first of these pertained to the nature of their work in relation to policing in the country as a whole. Responses included details as to city size and the demographics of their jurisdiction. The sample of Dutch participants was comprised of officers from jurisdictions that ranged in size. In order to understand how citizen monitoring played out for the Dutch officers interviewed, it was important to take into consideration both city size and demographics since these affected the nature of policing and could have impact the extent to which citizen monitoring played a role. Several officers interviewed worked in large Dutch cities with dense populations, racial diversity and widely divergent socio-economic statuses.

4.1.1. Socio-Economic Disparities

According to the officers interviewed, a key contextual feature of policing in large Dutch cities was socio-economic disparity. These cities had certain areas that were characterized by high socio-economic status, and others where poverty was widespread. Officer 39 commented on this, saying:

> You can see very large differences between neighborhoods in terms of having very high-income people living for example in one neighborhood and then there's a very strict line and they're like completely different from the next neighbourhood.

Officers noted that in many instances this socio-economic disparity caused stratification and "segregation" (Officer 39) within cities. They pointed to the challenges that could emerge when it came to policing contexts marked by such socio-economic differences.

Several of the police officers interviewed worked in a specific district characterized by extreme poverty. They spoke of the challenging landscape this created. In particular, they noted the high unemployment rate and the impact that had on individuals re-entering society after incarceration. Officers 21, 22 and 7 shared that individuals often returned to the community after incarceration, struggled to find employment and, as a result, fell back into criminality. For example, Officer 46 explained that upon release, individuals had to commit to a program called "declassering"; however, "in the meantime they don't have any work, and it's easy for a group of friends to say join us again because we have far more interesting things to do than going to your next 'appointment'." Similarly, youth in the neighbourhood were often unemployed and because of this, found themselves engaging in illegal activities for financial reasons and, according to some officers, because they lacked other opportunities. Officer 46 shared:

> I mean, if you are 18 or 21 and you don't have a job and you're not trained well, then your days are empty. I once had a discussion with somebody who came to me and had [declassering] appointments Monday morning from 9-10. He left at 10 and he said "Well, now I have nowhere to go. What must I do?" And, actually, he was a criminal and he said to me, "Well, there's nothing to do so after 2 hours, I'll be in a café and people will come up to me because they know. And he said, "I want to get out of the area but there is no system to help me get out of it." You see a lot of people that want to get out of it but it's one of the hardest things to do, to get out of the cycle.

Officers indicated that some of these community members faced significant challenges in their efforts to step away from criminality.

4.1.2. Racial Heterogeneity and External Political Influences

According to participants, another key feature of large Dutch cities related to racial heterogeneity. For several participants, the areas in which they worked housed large and diverse immigrant populations. For example, Officer 39 explained that "we have 110 different nationalities living within the [region]". Officer 32 said, "about 95-98% of the people here are from non-Dutch origins". Officer 39 noted that one implication of this was that "incidents in other countries impact the communities that live here". Certain neighbourhoods in large Dutch cities had a high proportion of immigrant or refugee residents. The countries from which these people originated could be experiencing political unrest or conflict, and the day-to-day issues being faced there

could have an impact on lives in Dutch neighbourhoods. Participants explained that unrest in a nation that was the homeland of a group of residents could cause tension within the community, which in some instances could lead to violence:

> If something happens in Turkey, you know they had this coup then the tensions within the area we work in, the tensions are getting higher. And it also means of course if tensions are getting high people get more in contact with police in one way or another so it could be with demonstrations. It also has an impact in the way they interact with police if they want to do demonstrations. Because also we have quite some tensions and quite some demonstrations from for example people supporting ISIS or ISIL. (Officer 39)

> The hard situation of this, the challenge I think of this is, everything what happens in the world like the wars in Middle East, Afghanistan, it has its impact here. Like I said, if Turkey is champion, everyone here is going crazy. We have now, in the Middle East we have the Kurdish fighters who are now striving for independency, now we have a lot of Kurds here and they have their own buildings for arranging things. But they had last night a party just with loud music, for us that is something to be aware of. Because we got a lot of Turks people also here that do not like the Kurdish independency so much. But that's really political, that's a political matter, but we have to be aware of this. So, it's just a small area, but it goes far beyond that. (Officer 45)

Police working in diverse neighbourhoods noted that political tension in other countries was one of several considerations that had to be taken into account when working with people from a range of cultural backgrounds. Officer 32 explained that working in such an environment had both rewards and challenges:

> There are a lot of different people – a lot of cultures. So yeah, it makes it really interesting working here. It also makes it a little bit different or difficult because you have to be aware that not everyone is living according to the same rules…or the same beliefs.

The varied histories and cultural norms, both personal and political, of residents had the potential to impact interactions with the police. For example, some citizens had immigrated to the Netherlands from countries in which police forces were seen as corrupt and as a result these residents were sometimes reluctant to approach law enforcement officers (Officer 39).

4.1.3. Population Density

A key feature of Dutch urban policing relates to population density. The Netherlands is the sixteenth most densely populated nation in the world with 518 residents per square kilometre (World Bank, 2020). Some areas within the Netherlands are far more densely populated. Officer 39 explained that the area they worked in was 2.5 square kilometres and was home to approximately 33,000 people. Participants employed in this neighbourhood shared that the

number of residents in this area did not include houseless individuals and as such the actual population could have been far greater.

Population density is an important consideration when seeking to understand the context in which policing occurs as it can have a significant impact on police work due to the unique challenges and demands it presents. For participants working in urban locales within the Netherlands, patrol strategies, resource allocation, and crowd management all had to be considered in relation to population density. Participants noted that the density in large Dutch cities profoundly influenced police work and that police departments had to ensure their approaches consider this contextual feature in order to effectively serve and protect communities, while respecting the unique challenges and dynamics they each presented.

4.1.4. Sentiments about the Police

Participants shared that in some of the more densely populated areas characterised by racial heterogeneity and low socio-economic status, residents tended to be less trusting of the police. Officer 38 explained that in these areas, on occasion, eggs and rocks had been thrown at the police. Certain parts of the community "don't like the police and have never, ever liked the police" (Officer 38). This could be due to previous experiences with the police in other countries or the perception that the police were corrupt and/or prone to use excessive force. Some residents were described as being fearful when approached by the police or upon observing police at a community event. Participants expressed that the need to build relationships in these communities was of utmost importance. Some shared that this process was slow and often characterized by a "one step forward, two steps back" progression but that over the course of time, it had been possible to build a level of rapport.

Although the sentiment in some communities was viewed as firmly anti-police, in other areas, the police were seen in a more positive light. Participants employed in larger urban centres explained that there were some residents who supported police activities and who, in some cases, had come to see the police as approachable and trustworthy. Community police officers or wijkagents interviewed felt they were typically seen as a more positive addition to the community than other police officers. Their role was to liaise and communicate with community members and, as a result, they were more likely to have one-on-one relationships with residents and to have an understanding of their particular circumstances. Officer 38 explained that wijkagents were

"in a completely different role than on the street" and as such, they had different opportunities to work and build relationships with the residents in their particular jurisdiction.

4.2. The Policing Context in Dutch Small Cities and Rural Settings

4.2.1. General Characteristics

Aside from its large urban centres, the Netherlands has a broad range of smaller regions. These include small cities, suburban areas, and rural farming towns. The overall dense population means that these smaller cities and towns are still large compared to smaller cities and regions in Canada. Officers involved in the study working in smaller centres were dealing with populations in the range of 70,000 to 120,000 people. In some instances, a single department was responsible for policing several cities. Officer 30 shared that the department in which they worked serviced three different cities and was staffed by approximately 100 officers.

Although these cities and towns were characterized by a smaller population, participants shared that they remained fairly diverse in terms of demographics. Officer 33 stated, "it is very diverse and that's why I like it". The diversity participants spoke of referred to ethnic background in some instances, and in others, they spoke of diversity in the types of calls they responded to, or diversity in age among residents.

4.2.2. Diversity

Participants indicated that the range and kinds of diversity they encountered in their work varied from city to city. For example, Officer 36 said, "In ***[3] there is one minority group. They put this minority group together. They're from one country and they're all together. Yeah, you get a state within a state." Conversely, Officer 29 explained that the city in which they policed was characterized by people from a variety of ethnic and religious backgrounds. Many of these people were either refugees or immigrants seeking employment in the Netherlands due to challenging circumstances in the countries they had moved from (Officer 29).

A particular challenge for participants related to the sentiments some residents had of the police in general. Participants indicated that some people were particularly distrustful of the police and expressed that this was more often the case with individuals who had recently immigrated

---

[3] Name of city.

from countries in which the police might have been corrupt or prone to use excessive force. This historical distrust often resulted in a distrust of the Dutch police as well and could make it difficult for officers to build relationships with these communities. Officer 30 spoke of the challenge in building rapport with groups of people who were suspicious of the police and noted that it could be challenging to break through to them. Officer 27 said, "A lot of people don't speak Dutch or English, so sometimes it's difficult to get to them because they're blocked off culturally." Officer 30 noted that while it could be challenging to build rapport with larger groups of people who might be distrustful of the police, it was easier to develop relationships with individuals in a one-on-one context:

> We had trouble with big groups of around twenty or thirty people. Young males. They just hang out here around the shopping mall and did [sic] a lot of crime, I know. But they also, not when they were in the group, but when you had them alone, they were quite friendly.

A lack of trust among residents can create a challenging dynamic for the police in which it can become difficult to build rapport and establish positive relationships with the community. Distrust may contribute to resistance, tension, potential escalation during interactions, and a challenge in gathering intelligence.

4.2.3. Farming Towns

Many of the smaller cities and towns participants worked in could be described as farming towns. Participants expressed that the sense of community was strong in farming towns. Officer 30 said, "We have a lot of farmers here and everyone is used to saying hello to each other in the morning. Everyone knows each other here." Officer 34 joked that these regions were populated by "50% people and 50% cows". Participants employed in these types of regions spoke fondly of the connection residents shared and indicated that the people were eager to come together and support one another. Officer 30 said:

> People know that we need each other here. When you're somewhere in the middle of nowhere and you have a flat tire or something, you know that the next [person] will stop to help you because if you don't, everyone loses each other.

Participants expressed that the sense of community was strong, and this differed slightly from the way those working in larger cities spoke of the sense of connection that existed among the residents.

4.2.4. Economic Disparity

Participants noted that there was some economic disparity extant within the regions they worked. Some worked in wealthier suburbs, while others worked in areas characterized by poverty and instability. The participants who spoke of economic disparity noted that typically citizens who lived in wealthier neighbourhoods had fewer interactions with the police and over all had a more positive view of law enforcement. Conversely, those who worked in areas characterized by residential instability and poverty tended to interact with residents more frequently. In these areas, participants noted that there were some people who experienced homelessness, and many people who faced joblessness and were thus likely to congregate on the streets. For example:

> There are a lot of people who still live outdoors and are still low income. They are looking for fun on the streets…People from some cultures don't have trust in the police. That's the standard from where they come. If they go onto the streets and they see a fellow arrested and the police use force, they don't connect the dots that lead to the police force, but they just see that and they have confirmation for themselves that the police are using force here as well (Officer 27).

Although participants indicated that it was typically more challenging to establish rapport with marginalized people, they noted that they had and continued to make progress in that area.

4.2.5. Lack of Anonymity

Similar to their Canadian counterparts, several Dutch officers spoke of the lack of anonymity that existed in small town and rural policing in comparison to policing in larger cities. They felt that in larger cities, there were more inhabitants and there was a larger population of police officers. Although some people might become familiar with particular officers, in general, there was a sense of anonymity among officers and the general public in such settings. In small towns and rural settings that same anonymity did not exist. Officer 36, who worked in a small town, shared thoughts about this, saying, "Big city policing is different…[Here] they want to know my name, of course." Anonymity had both benefits and limitations. In small towns and communities, where anonymity was less likely, officers were able to use their presence and visibility to build rapport with community members and to establish themselves as trusted members of the community. Contrarily, the lack of anonymity that existed in these settings could produce situations in which specific officers were targeted, as Officer 36 explained.

4.2.6. Sentiments about Police

As in larger urban settings, officers perceived that sentiments about the police varied in small or rural environments. Some of the participants employed in small or rural settings expressed that they experienced anti-police sentiments, while others felt as though the population was largely pro-police. Officer 36, for example, indicated that their jurisdiction experienced high rates of crime, and as a result, members of the public felt as though the police were not actively managing the situation:

> The public thinks we're doing nothing about it. We're doing a lot, but we have to prove something without a doubt to the judge and that's a big problem for us. We're doing a lot but we can't prove it so because of that, the public opinion is that the police are doing nothing and the general thought of the police is very negative. If you do something normal or good, that's ok, but if you're doing something wrong it's: "You see! You see!" Things like that. (Officer 36)

Participants noted that sentiments about the police varied widely within communities. Attitudes toward the police were shaped by a complex interplay of factors including personal interactions, cultural background, socio-economic status, and citizens' perceptions of fairness and justice.

4.2.7. Type of Crime

Participants explained the range of crimes they typically dealt with in the small towns and communities where they were employed. Typically, resources existed for the management of less serious crimes; however, when more serious crimes occurred, there might be a lack of resources to properly manage the incident. Officer 36 said, "If it's a big incident, we [might not be able to] handle it. We can't help the people like we should or would because it's already too big."

Participants noted that certain types of crime appeared more prevalent in particular areas. For instance, domestic violence calls occurred more frequently in neighbourhoods characterized by a lower socioeconomic status. Officer 33 explained that the higher frequency of such calls for service could be due to a variety of factors but was likely due to population density. Officer 33 said:

> That will happen in the [area with lower socio-economic status]. It happens in the [area with higher socio-economic status] too but the [latter] is more quiet [sic]. We think it happens a lot there too, but it's in the house so no one sees it or talks about it. Where people have lower socio-economic status, everyone knows about it because their houses are closer together. Smaller walls. Thinner walls.

Some participants worked in 'university towns' and they spoke to the specific types of crimes that were more common in these areas. University towns were characterized by participants as juxtapositions of expensive homes with student residences and boarding homes. Officer 42 said, "On one side of ***[4] there are million-dollar villas where professors or the people who studied at ***[5] live…and on the other side are people with a lot of social problems." In addition to these areas being characterized by certain crimes, participants noted that university students tended to be less accepting of the police. Officer 41 said that university students "see it black and white…They ask the same thing the whole time. They just keep going. They know their rights and they just don't agree and say they don't agree. They want to argue." Participants viewed the style of policing in these environments as different from that of larger cities or places that did not revolve around student lives and ideals.

4.3. Citizen Monitoring and Dutch Policing Contexts

4.3.1. Demographics Associated with Filming in Urban Areas

Participants indicated that there were a number of key demographic considerations related to filming. Generally speaking, those who engaged in filming were young (Officers 46 and 45: "age 16-24") and had a keen understanding of technology and social media. Officer 39 explained that people in the younger demographic understood the impacts of filming:

> They know filming is allowed. But they are also clever because they know how far they can go. So, it makes it really difficult. We're doing our job well, so we don't mind. If they back off when we say it, not in the film like I say, then there is no problem, they can film whatever they want.

Officer 31 explained that young people, particularly young men, were more likely to engage in citizen monitoring in a way that pushed boundaries in their interactions with the police. Officer 48 stated that those who participated in citizen monitoring were most often "young guys with a lot of testosterone" and added that they filmed the police as a way to satiate their curiosity, test police limits, and exert dominance.

---

[4] Town name
[5] University name

Although participants generally felt that young people were more likely to engage in citizen monitoring, some noted that people of all ages were inclined to film the police. When asked who participated in citizen monitoring, Officer 28 said:

> The young and old. Everyone. Everyone with a cell phone when there's something happening from a fire to patrol in an area or a situation when someone's getting a ticket. Young, old, black, white, everyone is filming because everyone has a mobile phone in their pocket.

While participants were certainly more likely to attribute the majority of citizen monitoring to younger people, there were clear indications that people of all ages participated.

There were certain situations that participants mentioned as fuelling citizen monitoring, particularly among younger people. Primarily, citizen monitoring seemed more likely to take place when people were under the influence of alcohol. Intoxicated individuals were seen to lack the inhibitions a sober person might have and as a result, were reported to film in a more aggressive or "annoying" manner. Officer 28:

> They film in a different way. They're more annoying. They don't stop when you ask. They film in front of your face, or they don't give you a break. They go further than when they're not drunk. They have no inhibitions.

Inebriation resulted in a tendency to begin filming more quickly, and commonly meant there was a more brazen attitude toward the police.

4.3.2. Where Filming Takes Place in Urban Areas

Participants noted that filming could happen anywhere and at any time. Young people were particularly quick to film. There was speculation that this was because young people typically spent more time on their phones and tended to have a higher level of social media literacy. Officer 37 said that for young people filming was normal; they are "always filming". Officer 48 reiterated this: "The younger guys around the ages of 13 to 20. They're always filming. They're always walking around with a cell phone, taking pictures." Officers noted that filming tended to be more common in situations with a significant police presence. Officer 38 explained that these situations might include incidents that involve "a car crash or an accident or a fight". In such situations, the police presence was more significant and as a result, more people were drawn to the scene. Officer 27 said that members of the public were quick to activate their cameras when they encountered such situations ("They're always filming. They always have the cameras on.").

Participants expressed that these situations were difficult to manage ordinarily, and sometimes the significant presence of cameras contributed to this difficulty.

4.3.3. Demographics Associated with Filming in Small Cities or Rural Areas

Typically, people who participated in citizen monitoring, whether in smaller towns or larger urban centres, were young. According to participants, they were generally between the ages of 10 and 25. Officer 42 shared that people who filmed the police tended to be "between 10 and 20", while Officer 38 said that they were "mostly young people between 14 and 25", and Officer 29 stated that "the youth are active with filming". Officer 42 explained that young people were more likely to film because of their technological dependencies:

> [The youth] live with their cell phones in their hands and there is a movement to record everything they see. There aren't always bad intentions. It's just for action or to show what they've seen. But yeah, it influences our work.

Similarly, Officer 38 explained that young people engaged in citizen monitoring:

> If they see something happening, they film. It's not always negative. They film because they like it and they show their friends, but if it's not interesting, they [delete it]. Some of the boys that film—some of the bad guys—They're always that guy. So, they're always going to annoy you and get in your way. They'll always try to show the police in a negative light. But mostly it's for amusement and to show their friends. And if it's not anything serious it just blows over. They go, "Look, look! But the next person says, "Yeah don't believe it."

Participants also noted that people of all ages engaged in citizen monitoring. For instance, when asked who was most likely to engage in citizen monitoring, Officer 42 said, "Everyone! Really! Everyone from age 16 to 50." Elderly people, too, occasionally engage in citizen monitoring, but overall, they tended not to have the technological competence required to record police-civilian interactions and then upload them to the internet.

Participants indicated that in small towns like in larger centres, intoxicating substances tended to affect citizen monitoring. Intoxicated individuals behaved in a less inhibited manner and so were more likely to film the police. Further, the way in which they engaged in citizen monitoring tended to be more aggressive, abrasive, and difficult to manage. Officer 42 said intoxicated people, "give us the hardest time". Their unpredictability was challenging and could contribute to difficult police-citizen encounters. Participant responses indicated that in both urban and suburban or rural areas, intoxication accelerated citizen monitoring events in both aggressiveness and

prevalence. Officer 25 said that citizen monitoring often occurred in nightclubs where intoxication was a common feature: "Of course it happens at nightclubs because there you have the younger guys with smart phones, and they are filming all the time."

Participants also spoke specifically about the Moroccan population and their relationship to citizen monitoring and to police. According to participants, some Moroccan immigrants experienced conflicts with and lacked trust in the police. Some participants said that, in their districts, it appeared that as a result of this historical relationship, Moroccans were more likely to engage in citizen monitoring. Officer 29 said, "People from Morocco – they're used to filming us. I think the Moroccan people are quicker to grab their telephone". There are a variety of reasons why the police may have had more interactions with Moroccan people, and although those were not explored in this dissertation, it is important to note that these findings were based on observations of the police and did not consider the role, if any, race played in police-citizen encounters.

4.3.4. Where Filming Takes Place in Small Cities or Rural Areas

Participants shared information regarding where citizen monitoring was most likely to occur. Underlying these findings was the fact that participants indicated certain neighbourhoods housed residents who were less trusting of the police, and as a result tended to engage in citizen monitoring more readily. For instance, Officer 41 explained that certain areas were inhabited by people who were more trusting of the police. When asked about where citizen monitoring occurred most often, Officer 41 said:

> I think it depends on the area. ***[6] is better and richer and it's more positive there toward the police. In ***[7], there are more immigrants and they're absolutely not positive toward the police. And in ***[8] it's often people going out and they might behave differently. In incidents and ticketing, someone will film, and they try to get a reaction from [the police].

Similarly, Officer 33 shared that the manner in which filming occurred varied from location to location. One neighbourhood, for instance, had a very anti-police sentiment according to Officer 33 and as a result, people there tended to be quicker to film the police.

Most participants indicated that filming took place everywhere; however, a common theme emerged regarding entertainment districts and sporting venues. Participants shared that citizen

---

[6] Particular area.
[7] Particular area.
[8] Particular area.

monitoring was particularly prevalent in these areas. Officer 40, for instance, said: "Oh, in entertainment districts, you get filmed every weekend. Even when it's a simple question they ask you. A simple question like, you know "Where are the toilets?"" Officer 34 added:

> They'll grab a camera just to film and hopefully film police violence to make their case stronger. Youth. It's very easy for them to grab a camera and make sure you don't notice it and then they hope you'll make a mistake, and you'll go on YouTube, Facebook, or Dumpert. And, yeah, they'll make fun of you.

Officer 30 said that citizen monitoring occurred frequently "when you're in the [entertainment area] with a lot of bars and that sort of thing" and added that the encounters in these areas were not often positive. The frequency and manner of filming might be related to substance use as intoxication can contribute to a lack of inhibition. Participants explained that in these environments, filming was rampant. Officer 35 said that individuals under the influence of drugs and/or alcohol were quick to activate their cameras when they witnessed a police incident: "Natuurlijk als je ergens met een zwaii-licht met je auto in de straat komt dan gaan ze filmen, he?"[9]. Participants shared that interactions in the entertainment district were unpredictable and had the potential to be volatile. When cameras were also present, a police incident was likely to be more challenging.

The interviewees made clear that citizen monitoring occurred frequently and in a variety of contexts. While some contexts, like entertainment districts and sporting events, were anticipated, others were not. Officer 30 shared that, for them, positive instances of citizen monitoring often occurred in interactions with immigrant and refugee populations:

> In the refugee area, I get filmed a lot but they always ask me. "I want to take a selfie with you. Can we do that?" – especially women from Africa or those countries, they say, "You're a female officer! You're an example! Can I film you and [share] the picture or the film with all my friends?" I have hundreds of selfies with these people and I really like it.

The examples provided by Officer 30 offered positive encounters with citizen monitoring. These represented a small proportion of the overall perception officers had with regard to citizen monitoring.

---

[9] "Naturally, if you arrive in your car with the lights flashing, people are going to start filming."

4.4. The Policing Context in Canadian Urban Centres

In an effort to better understand whether citizen monitoring might be impacted by context, the PI asked participants questions regarding the environments in which they worked. The information they provided revealed the different contexts in which citizen monitoring occurs. Participants provided details about the city in which they worked. Their responses included wealthy neighbourhoods, mixed neighbourhoods, neighbourhoods characterized by low SES and residential instability, business districts, and entertainment districts. Some participants worked in one specific context only, while others worked in a variety of settings over the course of their shift. For example, Officer 10, who worked in a suburban setting, shared that the city in which they worked was "split up into three very distinct communities." Each of these communities had identifying and somewhat homogenic characteristics: one with a blue collar feel, one that was more culturally diverse and transient in nature and one that was characterized by an overall higher socio-economic status. Officer 16 provided general information regarding the context in which they worked, saying: "It's a huge area. [The district] is a big area and the demographic is wealthy people for the most part, some older families that have been around, so you've got high end cars, high end." Similarly, Officer 7 indicated that the area in which they worked was generally populated by people of higher socio-economic status, and as a result, their calls for service were often for "simple matters" such as disputes between landlords and tenants. Officer 12 offered insight into their work context, explaining that most people living in the area held jobs, but some were on income assistance. Conversely, 17 shared that the context in which they worked was primarily an area where people congregated at bars and nightclubs:

> [It's a] downtown area where people congregate for social functions or the bars or group events or sporting events. I mean, it's pretty consistent across the board. Those places are known for larger groups of people, and they all have devices, right. It's not like a domestic disturbance where you're dealing with somebody that's drinking, intoxicated and they're not likely thinking well I'm going to film the police, maybe they are but. If you're at a Rocket's concert or a football game and you're having to deal with somebody guaranteed everybody around them has a phone. You're going to be recorded so. Those types of situations— I would say, in the context of what you're asking me—would be higher risk.

Like their Dutch counterparts, the Canadian officers interviewed described varied aspects of policing regarding context. The responses to these questions provided a foundation for the questions regarding citizen monitoring.

4.4.1. Socio-Economic Disparity

Participants employed in large urban centres spoke of the socioeconomic variances that existed in their work contexts. The socioeconomic status of the area tended, to a large extent, to determine the nature of the calls for service and thus affected the type of work police officers engaged in, whether varied or typical. Officer 12 spoke of the differences in socioeconomic status and shared that interacting with people from various backgrounds was a positive aspect of the job: "I like how I get to deal with people from different socioeconomic statuses and different types of calls." Some participants explained that the contexts in which they worked were characterized by people with generally higher socio-economic status who might own their homes or live in single family detached homes, often with back yards and ample space. In those environments, calls for service included landlord/tenant issues and break-ins. Officer 7 said:

> You have an owner of a home and then you have renters that are having issues. A lot of the time, this doesn't concern us, but because of where they live and how much they're paying for rent, they seem to think that every time they have an altercation, they think it's police worthy and it's not.

Officer 16, who worked in a similar environment, shared that the socio-economic status within their area resulted in theft from auto, and the investigation and apprehension of "B and E guys, sophisticated guys where they're monitoring empty houses." Some officers working in environments characterized by higher socio-economic status explained that certain pockets within the district were typically populated by low-income individuals. For example, Officer 7 said that recently, there had been an increase of Single Occupant Residencies (SROs) in the area, and as a result, there are more individuals with low socio-economic status in areas historically populated by the wealthy.

Some participants shared that they worked in areas experiencing significant gentrification. In the past, these contexts had been largely populated by people with low socio-economic status, but due to efforts to gentrify the areas, they were now inhabited by a range of individuals. According to participants, this had an impact on the types of calls for service and the way in which members of the public viewed the police. For example, Officer 23 described their work context, stating that the district had previously been a less desirable place to live, but was now an area that could be considered "a very nice community".

4.4.2. Racial Heterogeneity

Interviews yielded results regarding racial heterogeneity in large cities. Participants employed in urban centres noted that racial heterogeneity was a typical feature of the contexts in which they worked. In some contexts, the racial diversity was characterized by enclaves of racialized groups, whereas in other contexts, neighbourhoods seemed to be more diverse. Officer 10 shared that the context in which they worked was characterized by both neighbourhoods that were diverse and those that could be seen as more of an enclave of sorts:

> You've got the **** road corridor and much more cultural diversity. Massive south Asian population. It's much more diverse, a lot more transient. A lot more going on. It's a very small geographical area.

The racial heterogeneity described by Officer 10 and others depicted the work environments for many officers in urban settings. Participants working in areas such as these explained that certain challenges tended to present themselves because of the racial heterogeneity. For example, Officer 10 explained that in areas characterized by large immigrant populations, there was often a significant level of distrust of the police:

> South Asian families, in general, are very distrustful of the police. We have some barriers that way and we do have some officers who are South Asian or speak Punjabi and they are massive assets. I will show up and sometimes they will absolutely refuse to speak to me, and my [South Asian] partner walks in and will basically say cut it out and they will. They'll tell me. That's huge. You have some barriers like that.

Officer 7 also described working in an area characterized by racial diversity, indicating that efforts had been made by the police to engage and build rapport with people from differing cultural backgrounds:

> Even in [one specific neighbourhood characterized by cultural heterogeneity], I think our department has been working really hard to develop those partnerships. We have a full-time officer down there. They deal with the day-to-day issues and the youth and all of that.

Participants expressed hopefulness that the specific efforts being taken by law enforcement in such contexts would improve relationships between police and civilians.

4.5. The Policing Context in Small Canadian Cities and Rural and Remote Locations

Canadian participants who worked in suburban, rural, or remote settings, were also asked about context. The intention was to determine if and how citizen monitoring experienced and perceived in those environments differed from what was experienced in urban settings. Responses to these questions indicated that these workplaces were both similar and different from what was experienced by police officers in urban contexts. Their broad policing mandate was consistent – to serve and protect – but their day-to-day tasks could be significantly different. In rural locations and remote settings, visibility in particular takes different forms. Sometimes these areas were policed by a handful of officers and so they tended to be familiar to members of the public. They lacked the anonymity that urban officers experienced.

Because of population and density, suburban areas tended to be fairly diverse in both neighbourhood characteristics and demographics. Officer 13 shared:

> We have some fairly wealthy and middle-class families. What used to be a farming neighbourhood is now a wealthy suburb in ***[10]. They're predominantly white communities. And then you have ***[11] which is also known as ***[12] where you have a heavy, heavy [racialized] population, and some of the same challenges that ***[13] has. Those don't, they rarely mix, the south and north groups. You stay in south, or you stay in north. The north side has more gang problems. The south side doesn't. The south side has some of the challenges that are up north…say, drugs. Drugs are perhaps flaunted up north.

Suburban contexts typically encompassed a range of socio-economic statuses. The regions had a variety of housing types, from farmland to single family detached residences, townhomes, and apartments. Residential instability was sometimes a factor.

For those in rural and remote settings, population and density ranged widely. One participant had worked in both a rural and a remote setting and explained that the population in the rural setting was around 15,000, while the population of the remote setting was approximately 200. Officer 14 explained that the remote setting was a fly-in location:

---

[10] Name of neighbourhood
[11] Name of neighbourhood
[12] Name of neighbourhood
[13] Name of neighbourhood

Officer 14: I went to ***[14], which is a fly-in post. You can only fly in there so there is no access by car or anything like that. The population there was probably around 200-300.

Primary Investigator: How many officers?

Officer 14: Four.

Although most of the participants interviewed worked in urban areas, the experiences and perceptions of officers who worked or had worked in rural and remote settings were critical to the understanding of citizen monitoring. Because these locations had fewer residents, the way in which citizen monitoring occurred and the impact it had were important to consider, particularly given the size and extent of Canada's rural and remote areas. Rural and remote residents comprised a range of socio-economic statuses and divergent living situations. In some remote communities, there were significant challenges related to housing, so residential instability could be a reality for many living in such contexts.

4.5.1. Socio-Economic Disparity

Some participants spoke of the socio-economic disparity that could exist in their work locations and explained that it could have had an impact on their police work. Officer 1 indicated that socio-economic disparity was a reality in the remote context in which they worked and offered an illustration as to how it impacted citizen monitoring, saying, "…most people don't have phones or cell service." Through this comment, Officer 1 explained that in this context, citizen monitoring manifested in various forms particularly when residents did not necessarily have access to cell phone technology. While citizen monitoring via cellphone technology existed in small communities, for those who did not have access to those devices, direct observations and word of mouth could play a significant role in spreading information about the police. This form of citizen monitoring could still have a pronounced impact on the police reputation and on the public perception of the police. Observations of misconduct or abuse could serve to erode trust and credibility which might, in turn, strain the relationship between community members and the police and might negatively impact the reputation of individual police officers, groups of police officers, or the entire department.

4.6. Citizen Monitoring and Canadian Policing Contexts

4.6.1. Demographics Associated with Filming in Urban Areas

---

[14] Name of community

Participants were asked questions regarding the contexts in which filming was likely to take place. While some participants expressed that filming happened in a variety of contexts and was often indiscriminate in nature, others explained that filming was much more prevalent in particular environments. In some instances, filming was more likely to be initiated by certain demographics, which was an interesting and important finding in itself. Younger people were often seen as more technologically adept and more likely to have smart phones and be social media users and participants spoke to this when they described that youth were typically more likely to engage in citizen monitoring.

Young, affluent, white people were seen by some participants as the most likely group to engage in citizen monitoring when involved in, or watching, an interaction with the police. Officer 10, explained that encounters that involved this demographic typically played out in the following manner:

> They're primarily white and they're primarily affluent. If I am going to get video recorded doing anything, I am going to get recorded there. We always say, it's the [location] teenager we need to worry about because they're going to say, "Do you know who my dad is?" It's that kind of thing which is almost worse because they have a sense of entitlement. "I pay your salary." "You owe me." "Why are you putting me under arrest." You get that more from an affluent community. There is a bit of a dynamic that you wouldn't really think of right away… On the occasion you pull someone over and you suspect they're impaired, and you give him them breath demand, they're like screw you I am not doing that, I'm going to call my lawyer. Do you know who my dad is? No, I don't care. Well…and then they're recording the whole thing and they're trying to bait you into it. That happens WAY more often with the kind of affluent person…The bad guys aren't who you have to deal with being videotaped by.

In those interactions, attempts were made to intimidate the police officers through threatening language and the use of citizen monitoring. The implication was that citizen monitoring was being weaponized or used for retaliatory behaviour.

A key finding relating to demographics and citizen monitoring was the fact that the majority of filming was perpetrated by young people. When asked about filming and the typical demographic of those engaged in citizen monitoring, participants shared that generally speaking, young people were most likely to film police-citizen interactions. Some participants expressed that this was likely the case because young people tended to be more technologically literate and were more likely to use social media ("Young people [are more likely to film] because they know

how to do it!"). For young people, social media use is relatively ubiquitous and as a result, they were often more comfortable using it than older demographics tended to be.

Interviews also yielded results that indicated individuals who were under the influence of drugs or alcohol were more likely to engage in citizen monitoring. According to participants, people under the influence seemed to reach for and activate their devices more quickly than others might. Because of their alcohol or drug consumption, individuals under the influence have decreased inhibitions and this could sometimes mean that the ways in which they engaged in citizen monitoring were more disruptive and potentially problematic.

Participants also reported being filmed more frequently in their interactions with minority groups. Those encounters were often subject to increased levels of outside scrutiny given the historic relationship between the police and people of colour, in particular marginalized people of colour. In recent years, there have been numerous highly publicized police encounters with BIPOC individuals, including those that have culminated in civilian fatalities. As a result, participants perceived they were subject to increased monitoring when interacting with BIPOC individuals. Additionally, instances of citizen monitoring were often coupled with verbal calls for rights, using phrases such as 'Black Lives Matter'.

Other groups of people likely to engage in citizen monitoring of police incidents identified by participants were members of organised crime groups or with those associated with organised crime. Participants explained that those individuals often had a strong understanding of the law and were likely to film their interactions with the police in a pre-emptive effort to protect themselves legally. Officer 17 described citizen monitoring and its use among organised criminals saying that it was prevalent: "I mean it definitely happens with [organised criminals]. They've learned the system. They're coached through legal counsel. They're uh, they're going to be recording you for sure." Some participants shared that when they conducted vehicle stops involving organised criminals, the vehicle occupants filmed every part of the encounter. It seemed organised criminals found a benefit in citizen monitoring in that they felt it offered them some protection from encounters with law enforcement.

4.6.2. Where Filming Takes Place in Urban Areas

In discussions related to context, participants explained that citizen monitoring occurred in a wide range of places. It was highly likely to occur in vehicle stops and in environments that

involved large numbers of people, particularly when combined with the consumption of drugs and alcohol. This included entertainment districts, broadly, and specifically, bars and nightclubs, and sporting venues like arenas or stadiums where large numbers of people congregated, adrenalin tended to be high, and drugs and alcohol had been consumed.

Vehicle stops frequently involved citizen monitoring. It was not uncommon for the driver or a passenger to activate a camera as soon as the police officer approached the vehicle. Participants indicated that this was a fairly recent phenomena and suggested it might have begun as a result of American footage of vehicle stops. Participants felt that the proliferation of this type of footage on the internet tended to accelerate the frequency of the monitoring incidents.

Interactions between members of the public and the police in entertainment districts or sports venues were often subject to citizen monitoring and participants working in urban areas provided considerable information regarding such situations.

> You know I think uh you see it more frequently when there are larger crowds. That's just kind of my experience, say at ***[15], people are filming and they're getting arrested while drunk. Then yeah, all the phones are out and they're recording. Things like other special events like you know [the stadium] or something like that. Yeah, in ***[16] just seems like it's constant. There is a lot of it. A lot of recording. I think it depends. Oh yeah, and Friday and Saturday night at the kind of bar scene you see a lot of it. It seems more prevalent at certain times and at certain occasions. (Officer 5)

> I mean the ***[17] draws belligerent assholes. It's a crockpot for those types of people. You'll get a lot of the young adults that have now bought into a lot of this. Some of them, like I have had some teenagers start pulling out their phones being like what are you stopping us for. They're like the experts and think they're like lawyers and stuff like that. But those guys, you know, you know that they're unaware of exactly what they're talking about. They have no knowledge. No experience. Really no police history at all. They're just doing it because they saw someone else do it on TV. (Officer 7)

Participants indicated that entertainment and sporting venues tended to draw young people who were stimulated by adrenalin and possible drugs and alcohol, and, given that young people were already highly likely to carry and use their phones and were inclined to use social media readily, their filming was often brazen and sometimes aggressive.

---

[15] Specific festival
[16] Certain district
[17] Certain area

Although certain settings were more likely to involve citizen monitoring, participants expressed that no encounter was immune. Officer 10 said that citizen monitoring could occur in a location as benign as a coffee shop. Some civilians, Officer 10 explained, saw themselves as having a certain level of ownership over the police. That is, the police are public servants, and therefore should be accountable to civilians in matters as small as when, where and how long they choose to have shift breaks. Officer 10 said that citizen monitoring could occur in such situations and expressed that these individuals might hold the belief that the police were "just harassing me and I own you." Officer 10 added that individuals with these views might question or monitor police when they did something like take a coffee break at a public coffee shop: "They say: "What do you mean you're getting a coffee?". [I say], "Well, I work 12-hour shifts." Interview results indicated that citizen monitoring could occur anywhere and was not necessarily limited to police incidents.

4.6.3. Demographics Associated with Filming in Small Cities, Rural, and Remote Areas

Rural and remote officer responses offered insight into demographics as they related to citizen monitoring, indicating that those who engaged in citizen monitoring in rural and remote settings were similar to those who engaged in urban settings. Typically, those individuals were young. Often intoxication played a role. Additionally, gang involved individuals were also likely to engage in citizen monitoring. Officer 13 shared that citizen monitoring was most often perpetrated by young people: "…probably the teens. Teens and young adults. Sometimes they're trying to flex their muscles too. In front of their buddies. They've got a group of 'em, so yeah, it's probably that group." Because young people tended to be more familiar with social media and were active technology users, they often engaged in citizen monitoring during interactions with the police. This was the same whether rural, remote, suburban or urban.

Participants also indicated that citizen monitoring occurred more frequently among individuals who were intoxicated. Here again the trend was the same regardless of context. For example, Officer 5 said: "people are filming and they're getting arrested while drunk. All the phones are out and they're recording." This participant added that citizen monitoring was common at large events or at the "bar scene" and that alcohol consumption played a significant role. Officer 6 noted that citizen monitoring typically "happens when they're high on drugs or alcohol and they're not really themselves." According to participants, alcohol, in particular, was often a factor in situations that involved citizen monitoring.

Gang-involved individuals were identified as individuals who were more likely to engage in citizen monitoring. Those findings were consistent with the themes that emerged in interviews with officers working in urban areas. Officer 13, who worked in a suburban area, offered this explanation for gang-involved individuals' proclivity to record incidents:

> Officer 13: Gang members [are most likely to film]. They try to push us away, trying to intimidate the police, probably, and to you know, for all the problems that they find themselves in, it's a good way to point the blame at somebody else. The cops are good because they may find small fault in what we're doing.
>
> Primary Investigator: Oh, so legal.
>
> Officer 13: Yeah, they're probably getting that advice from their lawyers as well. So, those are probably a few reasons why. Sometimes they're more overt about it than others. Um, usually it's in a proactive incidence, like a proactive incident, something like that.

Although not all participants who worked in suburban, rural, and remote contexts had experience interacting with gang members, those who did, shared Officer 13's perspective.

4.6.4. Where Filming Takes Place in Small Cities, Rural and Remote Areas

Filming in small cities, rural, and remote locations was somewhat similar to that in larger cities, but participant responses did reveal some significant differences. Generally, citizen monitoring was likely to occur in environments that involved the congregation of groups of people and in which individuals appeared under the influence of drugs and/or alcohol; however, specific to the smaller, rural, or remote setting was the overall visibility of officers. In urban settings, there are, necessarily, large numbers of police officers, corresponding to the density of the population. Although these officers may work in a particular district and in the way do have the opportunity to establish rapport with some residents of the district, nevertheless, anonymity is largely the norm.

Conversely, in smaller cities, rural, and remote settings, there are fewer officers and fewer residents. As a result, police officers in these environments have an added level of familiarity with the residents. Anonymity is limited and the line between professional and personal interactions can occasionally become blurred. Because of this lack of anonymity, citizen monitoring had an added dimension in these settings. Officers 1 and 15 both worked in remote settings and shared the ways in which visibility and citizen monitoring differed from larger settings they had worked in.

Because you have no anonymity, you're a cop 24/7. ***** is the cop's daughter 24/7[18]. There's no escaping it. That will never change. There's no such thing as privacy when you're in that kind of position. (Officer 15)

Even if [members of the public] are still around they are monitoring the situation in a sense. (Officer 1)

This could contribute to a challenging dynamic for these officers. Although citizen monitoring still occurred in its typical sense, officers also experienced a kind of physical monitoring that was part of their daily lives and could impact their work.

Some rural and remote officers explained that citizen monitoring was less obvious in their jurisdictions than it might have been in a larger city. These participants indicated that while citizen monitoring happened, it was neither as frequent nor as severe as it might have been in larger and more populated contexts. Officer 1 said:

I never really thought about it. I never had to be concerned really. There weren't many times where people would pull out their phone and record you or make comments. Most the time the police showed up and did their thing and that's it.

Officer 14 provided an example of an incident that would have been subject to significant citizen monitoring in an urban context, but in the small rural community in which they worked, it was not:

We are not supposed to do a high-speed pursuit in an unmarked police car. If it were to happen [in an urban setting], it would go high up and people would be filming. Back in [rural setting] I did get into a chase in the [area] in an unmarked car. It's a big no-no in the [department] but I broke policy because there wasn't a marked car nearby because we don't have the resources. There were just two of us on. So, I was pursuing. We went through soccer fields and school fields and stuff. That was the only thing I have actually noticed. It was a Sunday afternoon, super nice out. We were going around for like 15 minutes. People obviously saw it and filmed it and posted it to Facebook and stuff like that. Stuff flies more [in a rural setting]. Because a, there is not much of a population there, and because it's easier to do it [in a rural setting], whereas [in an urban setting] everyone will find out within seconds. Citizens in [an urban setting] will know so it will be easier to spread the word. (Officer 14)

According to these participants, citizen monitoring did occur in remote and rural settings; however, because of the population size, it often did not happen in the same way. Further, these participants felt that the ability of citizen monitoring footage to experience viral growth was less likely than it might be in an urban setting.

---

[18] Officer's daughter's name

4.7. Conclusion

Police work is heavily impacted by contextual factors, including demographics and geography. Context shapes the ways in which police engage in both proactive and reactive police work, the manner in which they allocate resources, policy development and the evaluation of operational police work, and police engagement and rapport building with communities. Citizen monitoring is similarly impacted by context. According to participants, contextual factors such as population age, socio-economic status, and geographical location played a role in the frequency of citizen monitoring and the way it was conducted.

The evidence presented in this chapter served to explain why citizen monitoring occurred more frequently in certain areas and why it tended to be conducted by certain groups of people (i.e., youth). It identified that the characteristics of citizen monitoring were different in rural and remote parts of Canada compared to densely populated cities in the Netherlands. The findings indicated that in some areas, where access to the internet might be limited or cellphone usership was low, citizen monitoring might involve more direct observations and dissemination via word of mouth. This information provided the critical link between the impact citizen monitoring had on police officers and the efforts that could be taken by police agencies to adequately prepare their officers for encounters involving this form of surveillance. Citizen monitoring is unlikely to cease. In fact, technological advancements and their widespread adoption and use may only serve to improve citizen monitoring's generative capabilities. Because of this, it is critical to understand citizen monitoring and its impacts. Recognizing the impact context has was a crucial first step.

"You just realise how quickly something can be taken the wrong way…You're always one step away from being on YouTube."

Chapter 5. Canadian Findings

This study involved conducting interviews with police officers in Canada and the Netherlands. This chapter presents the materials gathered in interviews with a sample of 24 Canadian police officers. These officers worked in municipal police services across the county and also for the Royal Canadian Mounted Police. Some of the officers policed in large urban centres, while other worked, or had previously worked, in rural and remote posts. During the interview, each participant (both Canadian and Dutch) was asked a series of pre-determined interview questions. For the Interview Guide, refer to Appendix B. Each question was carefully developed, and many of the questions had a series of prompts. These prompts were included in order to provide additional direction for interviewees, should they deem this necessary. However, there were deviations from the Interview Guide. Often participants volunteered additional information or identified other important points. The interviews were structured in such a manner that a natural and organic conversation was likely to occur. Deviations were expected, and in fact, they were seen as an indication rapport had been established with the interview participants.

After the interview process took place, interview recordings were transcribed and subsequently coded to determine key themes. The PI had previously explored this topic in less depth in a master's thesis. In that study, several overarching themes emerged: use of force training, interactions with the public, the impact of citizen monitoring, and police attitudes toward the advent of police instigated technological advances such as body worn cameras. The themes that emerged in the present study were similar; however, because this research project explored the topic in greater depth, additional themes were also uncovered. The themes explored in this chapter were prevalent in each interview, but of note is the presence of a variety of sub-themes which were also discussed in Chapters 4, and 6.

This analysis sought to understand the perceived impact of citizen monitoring on police officers who were working in an increasingly technological society. Further, given Canada's vast landscape and the diversity in policing environments, the themes that emerged can serve to elucidate the impact monitoring can have on police in a variety of contexts. The richness of qualitative data, and the interview participants' candour contributed to an analysis that identified important considerations regarding the visibility of police.

5.1. Frontline Police Work

Frontline work is a keystone of the police profession. Patrol work is inherently frontline work, meaning that officers are tasked with responding to calls for service; they must process and gather intelligence and information, and, when time permits, engage in proactive police work. Frontline work demands visibility and frequent interaction with members of the public. While frontline patrol work has always been a fundamental component of policing, technological advancements made in recent years have significantly altered the level of police visibility. The present study examined citizen monitoring and its impact on patrol officers; however, before drawing conclusions, it was necessary to explore the nature of frontline police work. Through an in-depth examination of this theme, important topics emerged regarding the challenges associated with frontline police work and the way in which interactions with the public shaped the role.

5.1.1. "It's very dynamic."

One of the early questions in the interview schedule referred to the nature of frontline patrol police work. Participants shared a range of opinions regarding frontline work, but a common response related to the ever-changing nature of their work. Participants were quick to note the dynamic nature of police work. One participant stated, "You never know what to expect" (Officer 6). Another said, "You're experiencing the most dynamic and changing situation when you're responding." A common phrase used to describe the nature of policing was, "policing can go from zero to 100 very quickly". Some participants suggested that their decision to enter policing was because of this. Rather than working at a desk job for their entire career, participants expressed excitement at the prospect of working in various environments, while interacting with a variety of individuals on a range of tasks. Based on responses, it seemed clear that the dynamic nature of frontline policing was something that drew individuals into the line of work. However, participants also noted that this aspect of the work could be challenging.

> Regarding the unpredictability of police work, Officer 6 stated:
>
> The main challenge is you never know what to expect. You go to even the most like…it's just a cause disturbance[19] you know, it could turn into a deadly force call in a blink of an eye. You go into every situation not being 100% open. You're blind in some ways. You don't know how they're going to react.

---

[19] This participant is referring to "causing a disturbance" which is often called disorderly conduct.

The unpredictability of frontline policing is due to the variety of calls police officers can attend in the span of a single shift. Officer 6 was one of the individuals who spoke of this, saying:

> You can go from a situation where, you know, you're helping an old lady to all of a sudden going to a call where a guy just beat the crap out of his wife and sent her to the hospital. The next thing you know, you're taking a shoplifter at Save On Foods or whatever. There is such a change, and every call is different… You can't really rest until your shift is over.

This diversity in calls potentially adds to the excitement and challenge that officers experience in their jobs; however, participants frequently noted that it could cause mental and physical fatigue. As Officer 6 stated, rest only came after the shift was completed. Officer 11 noted that their officers could experience "a ton of fatigue". The varied nature of the calls could contribute to a heightened level of awareness among officers, which, in turn, could lead to exhaustion. Officer 11 alluded to this challenge when stating, "You don't plan your day. You don't plan your work. You're responsive…"

The diversity in calls required that frontline officers had a multi-faceted and broad skill set. This assisted them in becoming what one officer referred to as "masters of all." Officer 10 stated:

> Whatever gets dispatched to you is never what you're going to. The information is right about half the time. It either sounds way worse than it actually is, or it will sound like a nothing call and it's really a disaster.

The lack of information provided to officers prior to arriving at the scene was viewed as problematic. Officer 6 said, "that would be the most challenging…dealing with the unknown all the time."

It was not infrequent for the frontline officers to be called to emotionally fraught scenarios. Participants noted that this type of situation could be particularly challenging as officers were required to remain neutral and objective, while simultaneously able to navigate a range of emotions, Officer 13, for example, stated, "you're always gauging compliance and building rapport." Further, officers spoke to the fact that they were required to be alert and aware during a call for service and had to ensure their focus did not waver despite the multifaceted nature of their work. Police typically must work actively to ensure emotions do not interfere with their work. To this point, Officer 3 stated, "…you have to fight to remain sensitive to the humanity of it all without just getting pulled…like that old caricature of 'Joe-Friday'." Officer 5 confirmed that, "first responders are the first people to deal with distraught individuals". This officer further noted that

being present, involved, and actively working while managing various individuals' emotions along with one's own emotions could be "stressful" (Officer 5).

Adding to the complexity of their role was the fact that police officers had to work through the emotionally charged nature of an incident to ultimately determine who a suspect might be. Officer 5 commented:

> When you're on the front line, you are the first person the public sees when they're making a complaint or needing assistance…The fact is that first responders are the first people to deal with distraught individuals and complaints. That can be stressful because you're dealing with things when you're right in the mix, as it happens. I think that's what makes it stressful along with the scrutiny and the fact that people are constantly watching so you have to make sure you're constantly being professional, with whatever you do…how you're talking to people, how you look and that sort of thing.

Additionally, the individuals most frequently dealt with were often familiar with the criminal justice system and "don't want to go back to jail" (Officer 22).

The diverse nature of calls for service was further complicated because of the way police were required to respond to certain situations. To de-escalate certain situations, police officers has to act decisively and without hesitation. This was often referred to as making decisions in a "split second". Their actions could, however, result in significant public criticism. Officer 22 discussed the impact of split-second decision making in frontline police work, saying, "You have to make split-second decisions that can be analyzed and criticized for years after…You are really forced into split-second life and death decisions, and you have no special resources to depend on." Officer 19 also shared their views of split-second decision making, noting that these are decisions made in "real time", with significant consequences yet often with limited information.

5.1.2. Wearing Many Hats

Policing has always been complex by its very nature, but in today's world, it is arguably more so. While the traditional police officer's mandated responsibilities included crime control and order maintenance, a modern police officer may be required to take on more assumed responsibilities. This expansion of police responsibilities is known as 'downloading', given that tasks are 'downloaded' onto police agencies despite the lack of their presence within their mandated responsibilities.

It was noted in Chapter Two that there has been a significant expansion of police responsibilities. This has resulted in police services and their officers responding to events and persons whose situation falls within the mandate of provincial or state agencies. This is manifested in increased police contact with persons with mental illness, those suffering from substance abuse issues, and persons experiencing homelessness. This was a common theme in the comments of the Canadian officers. Participants explained that downloading introduced specific challenges to the police role. Speaking about the challenges that came with downloading, Officer 12 said:

> A lot of issues I find aren't necessarily criminal but relate to a lot of social aspects. Sometimes we are a de-facto mental health worker or a social worker or working for different parts of the government. It drains out resources because we are supposed to be dealing with the criminal. Part of the issue is that there are underlying factors that we have to address before we can deal with the criminal side of our job. Even if it's a lot of issues that are like landlord tenancy issues. It's not criminal but citizens in ***[20] expect that their needs are going to be addressed and ultimately it falls on the police because we are the most visible. That's the most easy person or individual to get a hold of from the city. If you had any issues with landlord or development it's hard to get a city official to come from your house whereas you can just call 911 or the non-emergency line and an officer will come to your house or give you a phone call and probably explain to you whether it's criminal or not.

This officer's experience was shared by many of the other officers in the sample.

While mandated responsibilities were considered important, public perception of the police was intimately linked to downloaded responsibilities. Participants explained that they were increasingly expected to work as mental health professionals given the prevalence of mental illness and the large number of interactions police had with mentally ill individuals. Despite a notable lack of training as mental health workers, the officers were often tasked with this responsibility. Officer 20 addressed this, saying:

> It's that I think the police problems are moving towards more training in say the area of mental health where we can try to identify someone with schizophrenia, someone who is bipolar or depressed. Maybe they have autism, or they have other medical issues going on. You might not know. It might be the first time dealing with this individual and you might see that this individual is not listening to my response, or to my command: "Ok. You need to put the knife down or put the bat down. Or, ok, you need to calm down." Because they just don't understand. So, I think in the back of your mind you always need to think, "Is this person being aggressive to the police because they don't like the police or is there something else going on?"

---

[20] Name of city

94

Further, Officer 22 shared that oftentimes individuals undergoing mental health crises became violent. Doctors and nurses might call on the police to attend a situation in which an individual experiencing a mental health crisis had become violent; however, the individual might not welcome a police presence (Officer 22). The manner in which police officers are able to manage assumed responsibilities or downloaded tasks may correlate with public approval ratings and, in some instances, result it criticisms of how the police responded to a particular situation. As Officer 15 stated, "It's very easy for the public to cherry pick what they want and make a complaint about that."

Since the interviews, there were entreaties to defund, and in some instances, abolish the police. The movement citing this need actively protested across both Canada and the United States because of a number of fatal high-profile police shootings involving, primarily, Black men. Foundational to the push to defund the police was the argument that resources should be diverted to social and mental health workers. Although the interview process for this project and the defunding movement did not occur concurrently, in relation to this, it is important to note the ever-mounting consideration given to downloading, and the impact on police officers in terms of their ability to manage assumed responsibilities, often without the necessary support.

As indicated in Chapter Two, another important consideration with respect to assumed responsibilities relates to the role officers have in rural and remote communities. Typically, a small number of officers are responsible for vast geographic regions; however, these numbers are justified due to low population levels. Police officers employed in rural and remote areas are also often 'on-call' when not on shift and generally live in the small communities in which they work. This can contribute significantly to the multiplicity of their roles. One participant who spent some years working in a remote setting, stated:

> ***[21] has different units, so, like, if it's something related to sex crimes, it goes to a Sex Crimes Unit. Whereas I worked for a smaller community, and they don't have recourses like that so […] well, you know, you take calls and readily attend at the same time you're trying to be proactive and engaged in the community. It's very crucial for a small community to like you, because you're going to run into them everywhere. (Officer 14)

While Officer 14 referred to taking on a variety of tasks, this was not entirely due to downloading of responsibilities. Rather, the officer was speaking to the fact that small communities typically

---

[21] Referring to a larger municipality.

had fewer resources and less staffing power, and, as a result, were required to "wear many hats" in a similar manner to those managing downloaded responsibilities.

5.1.3. Managing a "jaundiced view of humanity"

A previously noted key feature of uniformed patrol policing was near-constant interaction with the general public. While police were exposed to law abiding individuals, most of their dealings were with individuals who had broken the law or were at risk of breaking the law. Indeed, they might be exposed to law-breaking individuals on a regular basis, which, as participants alluded, could have a fatiguing effect on the officers. Officer 23 noted that "interactions aren't always pleasant", while Officer 21 shared that the work could "make you more suspicious of people."

Many of the officers who were interviewed discussed the fact that when they began their career in law enforcement, they had a certain naiveté regarding the individuals they would be interacting with on a regular basis. Officer 10 shared an experience in which this naiveté was exposed. Officer 10 was on the road with a Field Training Officer (FTO) during training and initiated a lawful traffic stop. Throughout the interaction, Officer 10 indicated they were inclined to take the statements made by the vehicle's driver and passenger at 'face value'. After being told by the FTO to "go run the girl's name", Officer 10 stated "She's 10-10 which is what they say when she's got no criminal history." However, after being instructed by the FTO that the female subject had not provided her legal name, Officer 10 learned that, indeed, the subject had two outstanding warrants, and had breached numerous conditions. Officer 10 stated:

> "It was one of those moments—I remember driving away and thinking "Oh my God, people lie!" This is not dealing with normal people anymore. This is not the average person who kind of blushes and you can tell when they're lying. These are people who have nothing to lose and will lie to you until they have no other option because they don't want to go back to jail and that's a great motivator!"

Other officers shared similar experiences. Officer 6, for example, stated, "…people just lie so much and at the beginning, yeah, you do trust everyone, but with experience you can kind of tell the bullshit", and Officer 8 said, "I think you go in very naïve and very trusting." Similarly, Officer 24 said, "I don't take people at face value anymore; I don't trust them." Officer 24 also worked as a first responder in a different field. In that field, they noted "people actually smile at me and say thank you." However, though their experience with the public, they learned not to "take people at face value anymore". Many participants spoke of a singular experience or a series of experiences that resulted in a shift or change in their view of the public, particularly of individuals

with whom they had frequent interactions. It is important to understand this shift or change as it related to the experience police officers had with members of the public. Given that members of the public were those who engaged in citizen monitoring, the shift the police officers described was significant and contributed to a greater understanding for the PI of how citizen monitoring might affect police use of force in encounter situations. The change participants experienced was related to the way they perceived the impact of citizens monitoring on their decision making with respect to use of force.

Participants spoke of seeing members of the public at their worst and expressed that the residual effect of witnessing this day after day could be challenging. Officer 4 said, "…a lot of people that are seemingly normal, under certain situations, like whether it's drugs or alcohol, that's when we see them at their worst. It's definitely a little disheartening sometimes." Officer 5 spoke of similar experiences, and definitively indicated that these experiences had long-term consequences on their view of the public:

> The criminal elements lie to police. They don't like the police. They're confrontational. They're negative, and when you're dealing with that on a daily basis, day in and day out, I think it's kind of natural to start developing that armour, if you will. That kind of jadedness.

Officer 7 shared this view, "I am definitely more cynical". Officer 15 described being naïve when they first joined the police force, believing "that people would think the police are amazing, wonderful people and you know want you to come over and kiss your baby and stuff." Respondents indicated that they tended to start their careers with the belief that police would be respected members of society, and they indicated that they had a desire to "see the good in people" (Officer 8). However, over time, for many officers this view shifted ("I had one interaction that jaded me…" Officer 18) because of interactions with the public.

The officers indicated that, over time, their view of the public, particularly those populations with whom they had frequent encounters, typically became increasingly 'jaundiced'. This perspective was fostered not only by the recognition that not all the public is honest with the police, but also that the public often had unrealistic expectations of the police. Officers spoke of the misconceptions members of the public had regarding the police role and the limits of their authority. For example, when speaking of the public's views of police authority, Officer 3 stated, "People have unreasonable expectations. Like: "Why didn't you shoot him in the head?"" This participant was referring to a commonly held view of police officers' authority with respect to use of force, and to the training they received to shoot a subject at centre mass rather than in the

head or in an extremity. Officer 1 noted the complicated demands placed on police by members of the public: "There is not much buy-in to the justice system from the public until they are a victim, and they want something done." Officer 20 added to this theme, suggesting that the public thinks "you [the police] should have or ought to have known, but we do the best with what we have." Anti-police sentiments are typically felt within law enforcement, and these views were challenging for police officers to negotiate, particularly when they were also faced with demands, and, on occasion, unrealistic demands for service.

5.1.4. Public Perception of the Police

Public perception of the police is a complex and important topic. Public approval of the police can vary depending on the neighbourhood, the district, the city, and even the nation. It can change over time and is often based on current events. Some participants spoke of seeing a shift in public perception of the police over the course of their career. Particularly germane to this study was the fact that public approval impacted and was impacted by citizen monitoring. Participants had much to share regarding their opinions of and beliefs about the way in which the public perceived them. Among the Canadian officers, views of how the public saw the police tended to fall into three broad categories: (1) officers who felt there had been a shift in public perception of police during the course of their career; (2) officers who felt public perception of the police was primarily positive; and (3) officers who felt public perceptions of the police were variable depending on circumstances.

Officers who had witnessed a shift in public perception of
police over the course of their career

In the discussion of the study method in Chapter Three, it was noted that there was variation in the years of policing experience among the Canadian officers. In an effort to obtain a representative sample, interviews were conducted with officers who had varying degrees of service. Those who had more than five years' service often remarked that they had seen a shift in public perception of the police over the course of their careers. Some interviewees had served as police officers for as many as 25 years. Officer 15, a member with over 25 years of experience stated, "I think I found the reception on the on the street from the public was not as complimentary as it had been 25 years earlier." This officer remarked that public respect of the police was more common in the early days of their career. A similar view was expressed by Officer 11: "I saw a real shift in the anti-police/less-trust thing", and Participant 5 said, "I have noticed that we're under

a lot more scrutiny." In general, those who had been in policing for longer periods of time felt that, as Officer 11 stated, there had "been a level of erosion in trust in the police": "It's a feeling that you get that there is more animosity and less trust and less easily gained compliance from the public as a result of you know the prevailing media attention from, mostly from the states but it has a trickle-down effect to our culture as well" (Officer 11). Officer 13 added:

> In general, how have things changed? People are more cynical and less trusting because of mass media, if you will. They hear these stories and these anecdotal pieces that may or not be true and may or may not have any substance behind them. They automatically…you have to earn trust from people, they don't give it to you right away. Which is fine but perhaps when that used to be the case, you have to earn it that much more these days. In a very general sense that's probably the big difference I have seen over the course of 11 years. People are less trusting. They're…it takes a lot more to earn their trust. (Officer 13)

Most of the officers felt that the internet and social media had contributed to this change. Officer 18, for example, noted that social media had increased global connectedness, stating, "use of force issues anywhere in the world are now local issues," and Officer 3 commented, "Every 14-year-old kid that's walking around with a smart phone has more access—immediate access—to information than all senior government officials had 20 years ago."

<div align="center">

Officers who felt public perception of the police was
primarily positive

</div>

Several of the officers felt that, in general, the public had positive views of the police. For officers who felt the public perception of the police was largely negative or had shifted toward a negative perception over time, responses tended to suggest that they anticipated citizen monitoring or were perhaps more concerned that citizen monitoring would occur. Conversely, responses from those who felt the public perception of the police was primarily positive conveyed the belief that positive perceptions of the police might mitigate citizen monitoring of the police and their use of force. For example, Officer 10 stated:

> I get quite a few people in **** where I get, like, if I drop off a driver's license that's been left at the department and we get a big, long email from someone who is so happy with the department…In the most part it's my experience on the day to day that are generally pretty good, but that's just because I am in a city that really likes their police. (Participant 10)

However, this officer also noted that, in their view, this was "an anomaly", and further, that political and departmental support contributed to the positive perception: "Our mayor is very pro-police

<div align="center">

</div>

and is willing to throw a lot of money at us, so we have a visible presence which shows that we are doing things."

Other officers mentioned that, although the media often portrayed the police in a negative light, their experiences with the general public were generally positive. Officer 14 stated, "I think it's usually positive, as much as the media says it's negative. I think it's still positive." Officer 23 agreed, stating:

> I can't speak for everyone in Canada, but I feel like the community really appreciates the work that we've been doing. I get thank-yous every day from the citizens of ***[22]. I have never really felt like the people were kind of against the police which is very important.

Officer 23's response indicated that the positive perception they felt from the public meant they felt less concerned about judgement and perhaps citizen monitoring.

Officers who felt that public perceptions of the police fluctuated depending on various factors

Many of the officers expressed the view that public perceptions of the police fluctuated. These officers cited geography (e.g., rural vs. urban), the age group and cultural background of community members, and media influences. Regarding the geographic context, several of the officers identified the neighbourhood in which an officer worked as impacting how they were perceived by the public. Officer 2 stated, "It's a mix [depending on] where you go," and Officer 14 commented, "It definitely depends on the location or the city that you're in…whether they like the police". These sentiments were echoed by Officer 15:

> You know what, I think sometimes it really comes down to the area or neighbourhood. I wouldn't notice it so much in an area like say ***[23]. You don't get people that are constantly challenging you or coming up to you with video cameras and things like that, whereas if you work somewhere like the ***[24] there is a lot more special interest groups and people like ***[25] and things like this that make it their mandate to follow us around and make sure we are conducting ourselves appropriately in their eyes.

Officer 14, who had been posted to a remote community, stated:

---

[22] Name of area.
[23] Names a neighbourhood with higher average SES.
[24] Names a neighbourhood with lower average SES.
[25] Names a local legal society focused on social justice issues.

The population was different. It was 100% First Nation up there, whereas here it's multi-cultural, right. Yeah, it was perceived differently. They didn't like the police as much but at the same time it was easier to connect with people because it was a smaller community so just to overcome that was easier, but the initial stage was different. It was kind of an us versus them mentality.

As noted in Chapter Two, persons who resided in areas characterized by lower socio-economic status tended to exhibit less trust in the police. For example, Officer 22 noted that in some communities, members of the public might have a particularly strong anti-police sentiment. This officer commented that, while on patrol in one area, "You might run into some anarchists and their perception wouldn't be good", while in another area, "there are individuals who are going through the revolving door of the court system" and as a result, their perception of the police would be negative as well.

Typically, younger individuals tended to be wary of police authority, while older generations were more likely to support law enforcement as discussed in Chapter Two. This was dependent on a variety of factors, including geographic location, as noted in the previous paragraph. Several of the officers also noted that the age or generation of community residents might affect their perceptions of the police. Officer 8 stated:

I think it really depends on the generation. I have had very positive dealings with generally people that are over 50-60 years old. People that are a little older. Most of the time it's, 'thank you for what you do. We really appreciate you protecting us.'"

Older generations may have a more traditional view of law enforcement and therefore, may value their role in order maintenance. Younger generations tend to prioritize police accountability and social justice which may result in a more critical view of the police. Understanding and bridging the generational divide is important in order to foster effective communication and collaboration between the public and the police.

5.1.5. "You're always being watched."

It was previously noted that a key attribute of uniformed police work was the high visibility of officers and their decision making, including the decision to use force. While visibility is an important part of the police role, it is also at the crux of some of the challenges they can face, particularly with respect to citizen monitoring. Although the notion of "being watched" will be addressed later in this chapter, because of its link to frontline policing, some exposition of the phenomenon here will serve as an introduction.

Nearly all of the officers commented on the visibility factor. Frontline patrol police officers are visible for a variety of reasons. Their visibility is intended to provide the general public with a sense of security – they know they can approach the police because they know who they are, and they know the police are patrolling because they can clearly see them. Officer 18 shared an anecdote that related to this: "I have had a number of people want to come up and take pictures with me and a lot of my job is spent playing tour guide." Officer 5 added to this point, noting that, "when you're on the frontline you are the first person that the public sees when they're making a complaint or needing assistance." Officers who had served in rural and remote settings also spoke of the importance their visibility played in terms of building and fostering community relations. Often such communities were largely Indigenous, and the police tended to be viewed as outsiders. Because of this it was important for officers working in these communities to work toward the development of positive relationships with the residents. Officer 21, who at the time of the interview was working in a small and predominately Indigenous community, addressed the marked differences between the style of police work in this setting as opposed to an urban area:

> It's not like in big cities where police officers are just a number and when they are on their day-off they are on their day-off and no one knows anything about them. Whereas people know who [I am] here. You have to get involved in the community. *You have to be involved…*It all helps in achieving a pro-police outlook.

In many ways, the officers in remote locations with small populations were always subject to monitoring by the community, even if that monitoring did not involve the use of cell phone technology.

Officer 14 had also spent a portion of their career in a small, rural community before moving to work in a larger metropolitan area. Although both environments required a certain level of visibility among frontline patrol officers, this officer spoke of the unique visibility afforded to police officers working in rural and remote settings:

> I worked for a smaller community and they don't have resources like that so frontline officers, you know, execute search warrants and take calls at the same time. Well, you know, on the frontline, you take calls and attend and at the same time you're trying to be proactive and engaged with the community. It's very crucial for a small community to like you, because you're going to run into them everywhere. Whereas here in ***[26] I most likely won't run into anyone I deal with. (Officer 14)

---

[26] Referring to a large urban centre.

The specific type of visibility that police officers faced when policing in rural and remote settings is the topic of more in-depth discussion later in this chapter; however, it is important to note the significance of police visibility in settings and the implications for citizen monitoring of police use of force.

Several of the officers expanded on the issue of visibility. For some, it was merely a characteristic of frontline policing, but for others it was pervasive and posed unique challenges. Officers who felt that visibility was a challenge noted that it resulted in them being heavily scrutinized by the public:

> I think frontline policing has always been more difficult just from the public perception point of view in light of the fact that everything we do as police officers can very easily be scrutinised by a multitude of either witnesses or suspects who have a vested interested in saying something bad to by the general public. They might see the police maybe speeding down the road with no lights and sirens on and the member of the public might call in a complaint and say, 'I saw this fucking asshole police car going down the road at 90 miles an hour with no lights or sirens on, breaking the law' without really understanding the aspect that perhaps they're going to a break and enter in progress, they were driving safely even though they were exceeding the speed limit and they couldn't have lights and sirens on because they didn't want to alert the bad guys that they were coming to the scene, right? (Officer 15)

This officer was alluding to the challenges that could result from a lack of public knowledge of the police role, police procedures, and authorities. There could be instances in which the police were required to attend a scene quickly; however, it might not be appropriate for them to have their lights and/or sirens engaged. Because of the visible nature of frontline police officers, this could be perceived by the public as constituting misconduct, when in fact it was entirely acceptable police work. Officer 23 expanded on this point saying that because of their visible role, appropriate routine activities, such as taking a rest break, can be seen as problematic behaviour by the public. For Officer 21, this was especially relevant given their position in a small community: "I guess the challenge is sometimes that you are so well known that it's tough to separate that work-life balance." Further, the constant visibility sometimes proved to be an added strain for new members already working to manage the responsibilities of frontline patrol policing:

> You know…you're always being watched. With something as simple as going to a coffee shop and buying coffee—you know you're being watched. You have to be on your best behaviour. That's the easy stuff. You know, that's just like you have to be aware. Over time it gets easier and easier but particularly when you're new, you're always worried because you're still trying to figure things out. (Officer 4)

Officer 12 also discussed the omnipresent threat visibility posed when an officer's actions were on video: "You just realise how quickly something can be taken the wrong way…You're always one step away from being on YouTube." While visibility is intended to act as a protective factor for both the public and the police, there were consequences that seemed to have an impact on the police officers. This phenomenon had significant implications for citizen monitoring of police use of force.

5.2. Use of Force and Use of Force Training

It was noted in Chapter Two that the authority to use force, including lethal force, is an important, yet challenging, feature of police work. Many of the officers discussed citizen monitoring and its impact on use of force. They noted that, even without citizen monitoring present, use of force "doesn't look pretty" (Officer 23). In policing, the use of force is intended to gain compliance, ensure safety, and prevent a situation from escalating further. Citizen monitoring had the capacity to further complicate incidents that required use of force. Officer 9 provided an explanation for this:

> It's fair to assume that the average percentage of people that are watching [a use of force situation] have never seen that…People say, "Oh my God! I can't believe this is happening! And, oh is that person ok?" They don't understand. They don't have the information we have. They don't have the training we have. They don't have the knowledge we have…So it might look like some days I have a short fuse, but by and large there's a reason for that.

5.2.1. "Could we use more training? Always."

Chapter Two addressed the importance of police training, in particular, with respect to the changed police landscape and increased prevalence of citizen monitoring. Those interviewed expressed the need for training to keep up with these changes so that police officers could be adequately prepared for the challenges of patrol work. The officers reflected on the challenges associated with the use of force in the context of citizen monitoring. They indicated that when interactions involved some form of citizen monitoring, it was important to refer back to lessons learned during training. For example, Officer 19 noted that, when faced with citizen monitoring, it was important to "stick to my training and deal with what is in front of me." Reference was also

made by several officers to the use of force continuum, which is the framework within which decisions on the use of force are to be made. Officer 11, for example, stated:

> I think I always try to rely on my training, and I try to rely on my faith in the use of force options training and the legal training and that when I am exposed to a certain subject behaviour I respond in a certain way and that is an absolute. I mean the thing about it, is that the beauty of use of force option continuum is that it is a continuum, it can go up or it can go down. In this moment right now, if a guy is acting in a grievous bodily harm or in that kind of way and I need to you know respond with lethal force, but if I employ the proper de-escalation techniques, suddenly now it's just verbal and uniform presence that's required. I put my faith in that, and I try to delete from my mind that there could be somebody viewing this on something, you know, on a camera, like there could be a surveillance camera somewhere. I don't care because I am conducting myself on the way I was trained.

It was noteworthy that Officer 11 referenced "faith" on more than one occasion in the quote above. This respondent suggested that the training officers receive, coupled with the guidance provided in the use of force continuum enables police to feel a sense of security when interacting with members of the public. Some respondents felt that if police officers acted in a manner that was in keeping with their training, they did not need to fear the potentially negative ramifications of citizen monitoring (e.g., Officer 19: "I'm confident that my use of force in a moment would be cleared at the end of the day.")

The officers were asked whether they felt the training they received prepared them to manage the challenges associated with citizen monitoring, and further, whether they felt it prepared them for the lawful application of force in a situation involving citizen monitoring. When questioned about the quality of training they had received, the responses were that the training they received was sufficient or that it was insufficient. Several participants spoke of the strengths associated with the training they received. Officer 2 referred to the stress tolerance training police officers are put through and indicated that this proved useful when interacting with individuals engaged in citizen monitoring:

> So, they teach us at the academy to be able to figure out whatever the situation is that they throw at us, when they cross that line. Most of the time they didn't because they wanted to test our stress tolerance. That's kind of where it stands with the training. It sounds like it's good. It was really good. I enjoyed it.

This officer added that, although the scenarios recruits were put through during training seemed "far-fetched", these were useful in preparing officers for encounters on the street (Officer 1). Officer 7 shared a similar opinion, stating, "They're chirping while filming, and you just do what you're taught to do." While these scenarios did include examples of citizen monitoring, some

participants noted that they failed to prepare them for situations in which use of force was required and citizen monitoring was present.

Several of the Canadian officers felt that the training they had received was not sufficient to prepare them for managing situations in which there was citizen monitoring. Officer 19 stated, "When you're at the range in your training, you know when it's going to happen and you're taught when to pull the trigger…but when it's live, you don't want to shoot somebody, so you end up waiting and waiting and waiting." Officer 3 said:

> It's never enough. It's a fine balance. We have a job to do. There're logistical challenges. We can't train all day long and you can only train to a certain level, certain skill sets and challenges. But, could we use more training? Always.

There was a widespread view among the officer that further training in use of force situations where there was citizen monitoring would have been beneficial. As Officer 3 stated, "My general impression is that we could generally use more training. The aspects of the job that hinge around social media and the impacts, and how to manage those things better."

For some officers with more years on the job, the training they received was viewed as outdated. As Officer 6 commented, ""Like what we did 20 years ago, we don't do now. What we're going to do in five years we probably don't do today but that's because we live in a changing world. We just change with it." The rapid technological advancements and the rapidity with which smart phone footage can be disseminated online is an important consideration in modern policing. As such, the study indicated that it is imperative that training considers citizen monitoring and that recruits receive sufficient instruction.

5.3. Citizen Monitoring

The primary focus of this study was to understand the impact citizen monitoring had on the attitudes and experiences of frontline police officers. In sections 5.1 and 5.2 of this chapter, a variety of themes pertaining to the foundation upon which this study was built were explored and discussed. It is essential to understand the dynamic and demanding nature of frontline policing and of use of force training to understand whether and how citizen monitoring impacted patrol officers. In the present section, section 5.3, citizen monitoring and its impacts are explored in depth. Using the data collected in the 24 interviews with Canadian participants, this study sought

to describe the impact citizen monitoring had on frontline police officers, and, further, the way in which citizen monitoring impacted use of justified force.

As previously stated, this study was based on the PI's master's thesis which was an exploratory examination of the impact of citizen monitoring on police use of force. Among the major findings of that study critical for this study was that police officers were impacted by citizen monitoring. Specifically, the research found that citizen monitoring might cause police officers to hesitate in their application of force or to avoid the use of force and/or, by extension, an incident entirely.

Frontline police officers have a challenging role. They are tasked with the immense responsibility of maintaining order in society, and in doing so, must frequently interact with difficult and dangerous members of the public. They have the legal authority to use force to manage non-compliant subjects, and if the interaction necessitates, police can and do use lethal force. Frontline policing involves psychological stressors that can make an already dynamic situation more challenging. The first two sections of this chapter identified some of the challenges associated with frontline policing and with the use of force. It was important to introduce these challenges first, so as to maintain a distinction between this kind of challenge and the particular challenge of citizen monitoring. Although these are often intertwined, the intention there was to indicate that, according to interview participants, citizen monitoring could add a layer of complexity to the role of frontline police patrol officers.

5.3.1. Defining Citizen Monitoring

Study participants were asked a variety of questions about citizen monitoring. These questions focused on interviewees' personal experiences with, perceptions of, and behaviour around, citizen monitoring. However, before delving into the topic, it was essential to understand how participants defined the phenomenon. Although there was general agreement among the officers about citizen monitoring, there were a few notable differences. The following selected comments illustrate how the officers viewed the concept:

> Citizen monitoring? I would say, like, citizen monitoring to me or where I would really be paying any attention is if either the person, I am interacting with is video or audio taping the encounter, or if a member of the public starts audio or video taping the encounter. We get used to the fact that we are likely on camera anyway. You get used to that, but when it comes to the…the only stuff that I think kind of causes that change in mindset or what I would kind

of consider citizen monitoring is when you actively have someone coming up and actively…
(Officer 10)

And all they see is this one part of it but they don't see the firearm that was in the guy's pocket, they don't see the initial setup, the initial contact, because it takes people time to get their phones out, it take time for people to get their video out, it takes time to get that cued up and that can be 15, 20 seconds but in that 15, 20 seconds you missed the—you almost lose the instigator portion of it. Right, like when the NHL referee doesn't see the first infraction, but their attention is drawn to it and then they see the second interaction (Officer 18)

It's this, this impromptu production of cameras with their own commentary of nurturing the story by giving their own commentary of it, by saying this is police brutality and giving their play by play which is completely false. (Officer 11)

It's like an audience watching a concert. We have that subconsciously. We feel like we have to put on our best show so that we don't get into trouble but at the same time, we have to deal with it. If we don't deal with it, we will get in trouble, but if we use excessive force we will also get in trouble. It's a balance between the two. It's too bad because it's just another thing we need to think about. Even with the ***[27] thinking like, if I shoot this guy, they're going to investigate me. (Officer 14)

There are thousands of cameras everywhere. So, people will review their footage if they see something that could be wrong in a police encounter, they can email it off or worst case they'll give it to like a media outlet and then it will get blown up a bit and then come back. The public will have their perception based off of that, but they won't have the whole entire story. (Officer 1)

I guess it's pretty broad because it can be as simple as somebody pulling out their phone and recording what's going on in front of them and going and uploading it to social media and it can go as far as an investigative body that investigates us. (Officer 23)

[Citizen monitoring] is like just looking at an individual and just almost judging them based on how they look, how they walk, how they act. If there is something that I don't like, and a lot of people will call it something about that individual, I am going to…my focus is going to be on them until either I am proven right or I am satisfied that there is nothing that is going to happen in the time that I am watching that those individuals and if they've left my view. So, that's kind of how I think of it. (Officer 24)

All of the officers agreed that citizen monitoring was conducted by members of the public for the purpose of monitoring police activities and generally involved individuals recording the actions of police officers in encounter situations. It was perpetrated by "an audience" (Officer 4), for the purpose of producing a "commentary" (Officer 11) of police interactions with members of the public. Officer 22 suggested that perhaps citizen monitoring should be considered "observation" because the word monitoring implied a certain level of organization, whereas observations were

---

[27] Oversight body.

"less informed" and tended to be perpetrated by individuals more likely to "make a split-second opinion" regarding police activities.

Officer 22 spoke of their first recollection of a high-profile case of citizen monitoring, and specifically addressed the challenges associated with the phenomenon. For instance, Officer 22 spoke of the split-second decision making that police officers engaged in and acknowledged that the footage taken of officers engaged in their work could be used to publicly vilify them. Officer 22 said:

> That's the first time I remember cameras being involved to really heavily criticize police. My initial thoughts were: "people aren't understanding the dangers here from what they are seeing". They are making split-second decisions and that is something that has been captured on video, but they don't have the full picture they don't have the information that the officers have going into the call first. They don't have the context that sort of leading up to the decisions to use force. They don't have any of that sort of stuff. And that all plays into our minds or police officers minds in making those split-second decisions the totality of the call so it's what we are getting on scene. It's experiences I've had in the years before that that will cause to make those decisions. It's the training I've had. It's the whole totality. It's not just those 20 seconds on video.

Participants like Officer 22 addressed the complex nature of police work and argued that citizen monitoring and the individuals engaged in filming cannot be expected to understand the intricacies of police work.

Several of the officers commented on the motivation for citizen monitoring. There were strong indications that the way in which interviewees felt about the phenomenon depended on the intentions behind the individual(s) engaged in citizen monitoring. Some suggested that citizen monitoring was most likely to occur when bystanders saw "something interesting" (Officer 3), because of the "cool factor" associated with police work (Officer 1), or because "our presence creates curiosity" (Officer 13). Many participants felt that the intention behind citizen monitoring was, more often than not, malicious: e.g., "if they see something wrong" (Officer 1); "if they feel the need to report it" (Officer 18). Officer 4 stated, "I think citizen monitoring…rarely does it come at a good place." Officer 23 said "I think people that are monitoring [via citizen monitoring] tend to do it for self-interest." Citizen monitoring was rarely seen as an effort to assist the police, instead, cameras tended to be activated in an effort to capture police officers in compromised positions, rather than in an effort to assist them in their work:

> What I have a problem with is when you start off so negative as a citizen. You don't even know me and I haven't treated you poorly. It's because of whatever previous interactions

you've had. That's their perception. That all police are bad. That all police treat you poorly so, "I need to video tape this interaction". (Officer 20)

They purposefully turn on a camera in situations that might be hostile or a serious situation. (Officer12)

10/10 times, everyone who is filming is trying to find dirt on us. I have not met a single person filming who is trying to help us out. You know? Never. (Officer 4)

I don't like it because we're not just police officers, we're citizens as well. So there comes a time and a place where we will be out of uniform and interacting with our families or going through the city or what have you and then people start to go, "I recognize you". (Officer 19)

In sum, the officers generally felt that citizen monitoring was conducted with negative intentions and rarely did a bystander activate their camera for the purpose of assisting the police.

That said, there were mixed views among the officers regarding citizen monitoring. They offered a variety of themes and frequently vacillated between positive and negative sentiments, with Officer 21 stating, "I'm a little bit mixed." It seemed that the interview questions and the subject matter gave interviewees the opportunity to verbalize some of the internal dilemmas they had with respect to citizen monitoring. While a number of the officers suggested that the monitoring was necessary within the police profession, e.g., Officer 10 stating, "You need monitoring. Absolutely.", on the other hand, the same officer who expressed sentiments like that, noted that cameras tended to be activated in an effort to implicate police officers in wrongdoing. Officer 10 stated, "…you're just trying to wait for me to make a mistake.". These conflicting feelings were expressed in a number of interviews. The following selected quotes are illustrative of these sentiments:

Yeah, I mean, I find it's like the news cameras, like the ones that have that influence on the rest of the population that will really kind of make you second guess or think harder about what you're about to do if you're going to do it at all. You could just stand there and do nothing. Right? Really? Sometimes it's the safest route. I mean, like ok if you're going to film me, you can let them rip your camera off your shoulder if you're going to complain about me helping you. But like…and that's, that's kind of like what I was talking about earlier. You realise there are different levels of cameras. The cell phone, the handheld, the camera over the shoulder. You get the cop watch. You know those guys are idiots. Most of the public knows they're idiots, so you've got greater leeway with that as opposed to maybe some other incidents that you'd be dealing with. (Officer 7)

I get two sides of me that war on this issue. I come from an academic background and that kind of view. You need monitoring. I will never be one of those people who says give

us free reign. We need monitoring. Absolutely. We make mistakes. We are human. We need to be making sure we are held accountable. That is an absolute fact. I don't think that I have ever seen a citizen monitored clip that ever accurately depicts what occurred. That is the big challenge. So, I don't think that that is holding police accountable. I think it is just causing issues and if you really want to hold police accountable, then you need to figure out body cams. Forget that whole side of things because citizen monitoring is completely inaccurate 99% of the time. That is where the problems stem from. You don't want to say no you can't record because that causes issues in itself. And that's the whole thing. Even the clips that don't look bad, they still don't show the whole thing that's happened. (Officer 10)

I think that can be difficult. But at the same time, we all understood when we signed the dotted line to get into this job that those are the risks that we were going to take. So, I've got really not a lot of mercy for us because we knew going into it. (Officer 19)

Clearly, sentiments surrounding citizen monitoring were complicated for participants of the study. Interviewees largely spoke of their professionalism and expressed pride in carrying out their duties in accordance with their training. They felt as though their actions were justified, and thus citizens filming should not present a problem; however, the conflicted feelings arose when participants acknowledged that video footage could be misrepresented, may not capture the entire incident, and could be accompanied by negative commentary.

When they discussed citizen monitoring's defining features, participants often spoke of the generational features associated with the phenomenon. Although many Canadians have smart phones, usership tends to be more heavily distributed among the younger population. Further, individuals aged 20-24 are typically more likely to be active on the social media platforms that are most often associated with citizen monitoring, such as YouTube, Facebook, Instagram, TikTok, and Snapchat (Statistics Canada, 2021).

The interviewees indicated that this widespread social media and smartphone usage among youth and young adults contributed to the perpetuation of citizen monitoring. In particular, participants spoke of the younger generation as more likely to activate their cellphone cameras and less likely to show support for the police by way of offering assistance or sharing captured footage as a form of evidence. This view was reflected in the following selected comments:

If you see someone struggling on the ground…if I saw a police officer struggling on the ground, I would jump in to help. That's not my generation, though. My generation's first instinct is to pull out their phone and record it so they can YouTube hits and Instagram hits and money from a movie that wants to play this and say look what we found. It is just a sad state of affairs. (Officer 8)

We are at a place where out of habit we get our phones out and start filming like, 'here we go'...without perhaps a full understanding or recognition of the bigger picture. (Officer 13)

Citizen monitoring exists in its current form because of social media platforms. It is through the internet, and more specifically, social media platforms, that an instance of citizen monitoring gains traction and can be shared around the world. Without the internet, citizen monitoring would likely cease to exist or be considerably diminished. Given widespread usage among youth and young adults, it is understandable that the interviewees viewed this age group as most likely to engage in citizen monitoring. The prevalence of young people actively engaging in citizen monitoring of the police has been responsible for bringing attention to various incidents of police misconduct. Despite this, it is important to acknowledge the limitations of video footage in capturing the entirety of an incident.

Video footage is largely appreciated for its evidentiary capabilities; however, it often fails to capture the entirety of any incident. Officer 20 addressed this in their comments, stating:

Say police are trying to arrest someone and a citizen comes around a corner and thinks, "Oh my god! The police are on top of someone!" and starts videotaping. They have missed this whole interaction, the whole first 5, 10, 20 minutes, or even 3 seconds of what happened before. You miss that. You haven't seen the whole thing. You don't even know the history. You haven't heard the information on the radio. We have earpieces so we are hearing what's happening the whole time cause it's an earpiece. You don't even have a clue what the call is about. All you see is all you see. You have no information about what kind of call it is or what happened before you showed up and started videotaping.

It is generally accepted that when experiencing an incident firsthand, an individual or individuals have an understanding of the entirety of the incident; nevertheless, their perspective of the event will likely be based on their own personal experience and on the way in which they perceived what took place. While an individual who engages in citizen monitoring may be indirectly involved in and therefore a participant in an incident, the act of filming from the vantage point of a bystander serves to remove them from the actual event. Despite the limitations associated with footage captured through citizen monitoring, it does capture one perspective. If it is recognized as evidence that can elucidate the manner in which an event unfolded. In essence, the footage can serve as an important evidentiary 'puzzle piece'.

Despite the evidentiary capabilities footage captured via citizen monitoring could offer, it seemed rare that individuals engaged in the phenomenon recognized, acknowledged, or understood this. As Officer 8 stated, "Yeah, I have never had anyone filming to help me gather evidence." The footage certainly could be useful to police officers; however, participants tended to indicate that it often appeared to be captured with malevolent intent. This was noted by several officers:

> So, I welcome video monitoring to a degree, but only when it's done right. When the whole story is shown, but usually that's not the case. It's the five seconds the 10 seconds that everyone wants to see. And unfortunately, the police are the mercy of that individual that has the cell phone. (Officer 21)

> You've now walked away with a piece of my evidence. I don't know what you're going to do with that video, I don't know where that video's going, I don't know who you are; I don't know where you've taken it; and I don't even know what the real intent or purpose of you videotaping that was for, right? Are you involved in the crime? Or are you genuinely just a completely random bystander that just happened to walk across something that happened that you thought was worthy of videotaping? I don't know. Right? My biggest concern is that is people walking away with evidence and me having no knowledge and what is people's intent behind it? (Officer 9)

For Officer 9 and others, a significant concern surrounding citizen monitoring was the fact that individuals filming were absconding with potentially useful evidence, and further, that the intention behind the filming was not always abundantly apparent and could be used for malicious purposes.

The officers' definitions of citizen monitoring were generally comparable. However, several participants felt as though organized groups dedicated to filming and monitoring police officers constituted examples of citizen monitoring as well. It was noted in Chapter Two that certain groups might have specific intent to monitor the actions of police officers. Several officers offered descriptions of these groups:

> People watching the police set out to intentionally do it. That's certainly one thing for people – you know you have your cop watch people; people who in the heat of the moment see something occurring and feel the need to report it either for the media or for accountability. (Officer 18)

> It might have been ***[28]. They wore orange shirts and they'd follow us around and take pictures of us. We'd just be conducting our regular business, walking the beat, and they'd come around and take pictures of us and post them online, right. (Officer 5)

---

[28] The names of these groups have not been included as they are associated with specific cities and can be considered identifying information.

So, when I hear the word monitor, I think of civilians in ***[29] that are a part of cop watch. So, they are anti-police. Their whole goal is to monitor police interaction in the ***[30]. (Officer 25)

You know those ***[31] guys, uh ***[32] yeah, so there are those people, I think that's more of an extreme example of people like kind of waiting. It's organized. It's more of an extreme example but I mean, there are a lot of people that understand what their rights are, and they can kind of give their advice or opinions based on certain things and if they're dealing with the police, they know exactly what to say. Sovereign citizens, kind of. (Officer 1)

The officers who spoke of these groups indicated that due to their anti-police sentiment, the individuals engaged in citizen monitoring largely had negative intentions.

Organized citizen monitoring groups were one component. Another became apparent to the PI, in discussions with police officers who worked or had at some time worked in remote settings. In an urban setting, citizen monitoring might manifest as an individual or group of individuals filming police officers in the course of their duty, but in a remote area, citizen monitoring manifested in a different way. Police are a visible branch of the criminal justice system. As referred to on numerous occasions in this thesis, their marked vehicles and uniforms ensure, necessarily, that police officers can be easily identified by members of the public. As officer 21 stated, "People know who [I] am here." In urban settings, policing is more anonymous, and, off shift, police officers can live in the community in relative anonymity. This is not the case in remote settings. One officer stated:

So, if you work in the lower mainland or you work in Ottawa or Toronto, you go home at the end of your shift and your neighbours don't know who you are, they don't know what you do, you don't have a police car in your driveway either marked or unmarked. But if you're in a rural environment everybody knows who you are. (Officer 15)

Officer 23 shared their perspective on this topic:

Qualitatively, in a place like the ***[33], it's everything and it's all the time. So, you know, [someone will say], "I saw a police car going too fast down the street today." "I saw, you know, a police officer in uniform not saying hello to somebody." It's non-stop.

In fact, over the course of the PI's discussions with police officers, many urban-based officers noted that their neighbours were not aware of their occupation. This, in contrast to rural settings

---

[29] Certain area.
[30] Certain area.
[31] Name of group.
[32] Name of group.
[33] Remote location.

where off-duty officers were recognizable as on-duty officers due to the small size of the communities. Officer 15 alluded to this, stating, "Citizen monitoring for me is much more comprehensive than just electronic and I think that's probably more common in rural environments where you're not anonymous, right." This officer provided several examples about the unique nature of citizen monitoring in a rural setting:

> When we lived in ****[34], when ****[35] was very young we moved up there when she was 6 months old and left when she was three and a half. But we lived right next door to the police station in a government owned house, so people knew where I was 24/7. And it was a community of 300 people, there were 2 police officers. So, "OK, ****[36] not home, so we're going to go do this", or they'd come to the house when I was there. So constantly monitoring my activities. If I had a day off and I sat out on the deck, I'd be having, you know maybe I'd have a beer if I wasn't on call, and then the next time you arrest the bad guy who walked by while you were having a beer,

> Well, I see you fucking around chief drinking beer on your front yard, eh?" That kind of stuff, right. I would say that's citizen monitoring. And then more specifically in a place like *****[37], which had a population, the first time I was there, of probably about 3000, I very specifically remember when I was in charge or all the plain clothes sections, having a public complaint that there were two unmarked police vehicles at the ****[38] and the police officers were inside drinking.

> They had their weapons with them, but they were in plain clothes. "Why are the police using government vehicles to go drinking and why do they have weapons with them when they're drinking?" So those types of monitoring things I think are far more prevalent in smaller communities. And that in fact ended up on public complaint where I disciplined the guys informally where I said, "Don't do that anymore. Like, fuck use your head. You're in a small town. Don't be drinking with your guns on and park the police truck outside… you have no anonymity, you're a cop 24/7."

The lack of anonymity in rural and remote settings meant that police officers' family members were often known to the community as well. This contributed to an extension of citizen monitoring in which individuals related to the police either inadvertently or intentionally were more visible, Officer 15 stated, "***[39] is the cop's daughter 24/7. There is no escaping it. That will never change." While police officers, particularly those working in rural and remote settings, might have been able to anticipate the visible nature of their role, it was apparent that the effect citizen monitoring would have on their family was often unanticipated. Officer 15 spoke of a particular

---

[34] A remote Canadian location.
[35] Participant 15's daughter's name.
[36] Participant 15's name.
[37] Remote northern Canadian location.
[38] An establishment in the community.
[39] Participant 15's daughter's name.

incident in which an interaction with an individual became violent and ultimately led to a serious altercation, stating: "I mean it was the absolute worst fight of my life. I thought I was going to die." Following the altercation, the subject was arrested, but subsequently issued repeated threats against Officer 15's family members: "Anyway, during the drive in[40], prior to that, he had made threats to my family, threatening that he was going to kill ****[41], threatening that he was going kill my wife at the time, ****[42] mother."

In contrast, in an urban setting, it was less likely that a subject had this level of familiarity with a police officer and their family. Although not a direct example of citizen monitoring, Officer 15's experience illustrated how citizen monitoring could affect an officer and, potentially, their family.

5.3.2. The Perceived Benefits of Citizen Monitoring

Notwithstanding the negative aspects of citizen monitoring, many of the officers commented that there were benefits as well. One of these was that citizen monitoring could show police officers in a positive light. Officer 8 shared the following account:

> I think I have had one interaction and they filmed me, and it was a positive encounter. It was a family of little ducklings trying to get onto the sidewalk and they couldn't make it, so my partner and I helped them. People filmed that but it's the only positive social media interaction I have had. Normally it's a spur of the moment thing where a fight breaks out.

Many of the officers felt that, at least at the conceptual level, there was no reason to be apprehensive about citizen monitoring given the high standard to which most police officers held themselves. Officer 18, for example, spoke of welcoming citizen monitoring: "It doesn't bother me, Sometimes I even hand out my name and I say, "Go ahead. Actually, can you do me a favour and switch angles?" Police are accountable to the public, and reference to this was noted on more than one occasion by officers in the interviews. Officer 11, expressed concerns about the intentions of persons who monitored the police; they expressed pride in the work of police officers and felt that the public should be able to observe police interactions:

> But whatever, I think people should be able to see where their tax dollars are going and I am proud of what we do and I think we do a very, very good job. I don't have an issue with

---

[40] The subject was arrested and transported to a city as the rural community did not have the capacity to hold him.
[41] Participant's daughter's name.
[42] Ibid

that. When it's done to sort of create a distrust or something like that or maybe not with that being their first intention but ultimately causing a dissatisfaction or a distrust in the police. That's something and I do have problems with that, but you know, you can't stop that.

Officer 21 spoke of the significant responsibility police officers held, including to arrest and to use lethal force, and noted that, "I welcome video monitoring to a degree, but only when it's done right." However, the officers who spoke of these benefits also noted that the intentions behind the citizen monitoring, and the manner in which it was captured, presented, and touted as fact were important considerations in terms of assessing the value. Several of the officers recalled occasions on which video footage taken by civilians had contributed to officers being exonerated from accusations of the excessive use of force.

Participants spoke of the potential benefits of citizen monitoring and expressed the need for public accountability. Equally, all participants acknowledged the negative aspects associated with citizen monitoring, and they recognized that technology is inherent to modern society. To that end, most participants spoke to the fact that citizen monitoring would likely be a constant in police work going forward. Some were adamantly opposed to the fact that citizen monitoring was a reality of modern policing; however, the majority, although expressing discontent or concern about the phenomenon, did acknowledge the now ubiquitous nature of citizen monitoring. An example of this perspective was expressed by Officer 2, who said, "Well, I feel that it's a contemporary problem that we're better off to embrace and manage than try and deny…because it's going to happen."

5.3.3. The Impact of Citizen Monitoring

The long-term consequences of sustained scrutiny was expressed by participants as significant, impacting officers' mental health and wellbeing:

> So certainly–my PTSD is cumulative, it's not based on one instance, it's cumulative. So, certainly if you look at the things that have happened to me it's a conglomeration not only of going to horrible specific incidents, but it's also that stress of being in the public eye 24/7 and feeling almost paranoid to a degree that no matter what you do, even when you're doing your absolute best in serving the public, somebody out there is not going to be happy with you. And it wears on you, right? (Officer 15)

> I'm confident that my use of force in the moment would be cleared at the end of the day…but it may be a nightmare for the two years it would take to do the investigation. That stinks. That is brutal, because that's a lot of internal stress and you can't put a value on what that does to your mind and body. (Officer 19)

Because of vantage point and personal biases, it is inevitable that there are limitations in the quality and objectivity of any one person's observations. In their training, police officers were taught about the various limitations of perception and cognition. Members of the public might not be aware of these limitations, and as such, could assess police performance in a manner that was not evidence based.

Often referenced was the fact that the general public did not have an in-depth knowledge of police work. Participants expressed concern that citizen monitoring could further complicate the public's already limited knowledge related to their role. For example, Officer 9 said, "I think that people are educated on like what their rights are when they're talking to the police, but they're not educated on what the police rights are when they're talking to the public." This statement indicated that members of the public tend not to understand the totality of the police role, leading to confusion and misinterpretation when footage obtained through citizen monitoring was disseminated. Officer 2 said:

> [Citizen monitoring] makes me feel separate from the public…I wish there could be more education and you don't get the full aspect or story. You don't get a 360-degree view, whereas the people that we're dealing with…like I could deal with someone in ***[43] and someone could come in near the end. They might just see the take down, but they don't have the rest of the story. People will judge me based on my actions, but they don't see the whole thing. So, it kind of bothers me when people have…when they might feel like they know everything, or they have a better idea and judge me based on that. Like I mean, I wish people would take into account that they don't have the whole story, and that maybe there might be a bit more than what they think it is.

Participants expressed concern that citizen monitoring was limited in that it could not adequately show the 'whole picture' and thus might contribute to confusing narratives and misinterpretation among members of the public. Officer 2 added that they felt a certain responsibility regarding educating the public but acknowledged that this expectation was not reasonable.

5.3.4. Frequency of Citizen Monitoring

The officers were also queried about the frequency of their experiences with citizen monitoring. All of the interviewees indicated that they encountered monitoring on a regular basis. Among the comments of the officers were ""It's been quite often." (Officer 1); "There have been many times, yeah" (Officer 5);" You're videotaped all the time", (Officer 9), and "We get filmed all

---

[43] Name of city.

the time." (Officer 20). There were certain factors, including the context or environment in which the officers were working, that contributed to the frequency of citizen monitoring. These factors were discussed in detail in Chapter Four. Several of the officers revealed that monitoring most often occurred during traffic stops or at major incidents, particularly those that involved media or more than two police vehicles. In sum, the interviews revealed that citizen monitoring was a regular occurrence for frontline patrol officers.

5.3.5. Being Filmed

During the interviews, the officers were asked a series of questions regarding their feelings around being filmed and/or being watched. While there was some variation in the responses, a majority of the officers expressed feelings of uneasiness with respect to being filmed and/or watched. During the data analysis' coding portion, it became evident that responses could fit into a series of categories. These were 1) the desire to be perceived positively; 2) feeling vulnerable or scared; 3) feeling bothered or as though the filming was unusual; 4) feeling apprehensive; 5) and welcoming citizens filming and/or observing.

"Want to be perceived better"

Among the officers, there was a desire to be perceived in a positive light. To this end, the officers indicated that the monitoring resulted in them being able to showcase their training to present a positive image of the police and the actions they took in encounter situations. As Officer 12 stated:

> Nobody wants to look bad. So, if you know you're being filmed, subconsciously, I think we have been trained or groomed as a society to say I want to be perceived better and I don't know why but that's in the back of your mind. So, when you're being filmed, I don't think you're necessarily being filmed but you think ok I just want to make sure I am doing everything I'm supposed to.

Several of the officers noted that when they were being filmed, they sometimes altered their behaviour, including the decision to use force when justified. This view was reflected in the following selected comments:

> "I perhaps dress it up a little better when I'm on camera. You know, if it's there, I would ask questions in a certain way…". (Officer 13)

> "I think it's more just because they're, like, you know, they have like their insecurities, their learning experiences masked by the fact that they don't want to be viewed, you know, less than stellar, right?". (Officer 17)

"Yeah, I guess you're not going to go at it too much knowing that you're being scrutinized." (Officer 5)

Officer 8 spoke to changing tactics for the purpose of maintaining public appearances, (i.e., the use of a pressure point, as opposed to a knee strike):

It's not because you're trying to hide anything or be subversive, but public appearance is everything these days and if you can save yourself the headache of going through a year-long complaint that goes nowhere but takes up to a year of your life, then why not?

These discussions revealed that in many situations involving citizen monitoring, officers tended to alter their behaviour to create a favourable impression. This raised the possibility that citizen monitoring might have had a positive impact in terms of officers modifying their behaviour, including not using excessive force in encounter situations.

The need to be perceived positively went beyond a simple desire for public approval. Indeed, it spoke to the complex linkages between the public and the police. The police act as an extension of the government and exist in a dual role with the communities they serve. As Sir Robert Peel stated, "The police are the public and the public are the police." Proper policing practices can impact public perception, and by the same logic, improper policing practice or those perceived to be improper can similarly impact public perception. Therefore, the statements made by police officers interviewed regarding filming and its bearing on public perception might, in fact, be linked to concerns around complaints and subsequent discipline, both internally and in the "court of public opinion".

"Vulnerable", "Scared" and "Apprehensive"

In the interviews, the officers frequently mentioned feelings of vulnerability, apprehension and/or fear at the knowledge they were being watched and/or filmed. Officer 13 stated, ""I think vulnerable is probably the best way to put it. You don't know where it's going to go or what their intentions are." Officer 20 described "hating" citizen monitoring, stating, "I feel like I am being judged and it's like I don't even know you." This officer continued by noting that, in situations wherein the police simply wished to talk to someone, they were often immediately met with both hostility and citizen monitoring.

Two officers spoke of a particular incident in which a police officer was wrongfully targeted by a citizen vigilante group. The interaction, which was filmed, involved members of the group and a misidentified police officer. It was not until after the interaction was captured on film, disseminated online, tarnishing the wrong police officer's reputation, that the correct police officer was identified. This incident seemed to have left an indelible impression upon each of the participants who mentioned it. Officer 14 discussed feelings of vulnerability regarding the fact that a simple misidentification could lead to one's reputation being sullied:

> I think [policing] is getting worse and worse. Especially with that ***[44] thing. That went super viral with the wrong officer's name. I knew that officer. The name wasn't his name.

> It said it was 'Officer Something', but it wasn't actually his name. It was actually 'Officer So and So'. So now ***[45] went on media right away and said, "'t's not him.", but now everything is going to think he's the guy. And it was just like that (officer snaps their fingers). So, when you Google his name now, it's all attached to that news article. You could get skewered just like *that.*

Officers expressed concern about the misinterpretation of video footage and the potential for this information to go viral. Officer 21 remarked that there was always the possibility that what an officers said during an encounter "could be taken out of context." Officer 24 added that citizen monitoring brings with it the "feeling that you're automatically guilty until proven innocent because of the uniform we wear."

The feelings of vulnerability and fear expressed by the officers were often associated with the use of force. Several officers revealed that this fear impacted their decision to use force in an encounter situation. When Officer 14 was queried how they felt when they noticed "members of the public "whip out their phones", they responded, "Yes, I am not used to that yet. And it's too bad because now officers are too scared to use force because they're going to get scrutinized." And Officer 5 stated, "…yeah, it may impact the actions you take, knowing that you're being watched." Most of the officers suggested that they were acutely aware when members of the public engaged in citizen monitoring, and while not all indicated this impacted their decision to use justified force, some indicated that this was the case.

Feelings of apprehension, which might also affect the officers' decision to use force, were also emphasized throughout the interviews. Officer 7 noted that this apprehension contributed to not knowing "exactly what to do". In discussing their feelings of apprehension, Officer 7 stated

---

[44] Names incident.
[45] Names senior ranking police officer.

that they made a subconscious evaluation about the potential negative impact of citizen monitoring vis à vis handheld cameras (i.e., smartphones, cameras) versus TV news outlet cameras. This officer made a clear distinction between possible surveillance by TV news outlet cameras and handheld cameras. When asked "How does it make you feel when you're on cameras?" the officer replied:

> Super apprehensive. Yeah. Especially the news cameras. Like, TV or the handheld camera…it's funny how you distinguish between the two. You start to think, ok, what's going to look worse here. Someone who has the outlet to ***[46] or Canada, or the world. Or someone who has a YouTube channel. Yeah, I was super apprehensive, and I didn't know exactly what to do.

<div align="center">"Bothers me" and "Feels odd" or "Weird"</div>

Several of the officers expressed that they were bothered and irritated when members of the public filmed them for the purpose of citizen monitoring. This was reflected in the following selected comments:

> "It's a little bit weird… It does bother me a little bit and I am aware of it." (Officer 2)
> "It's an odd feeling." (Officer 1)
>
> "I don't like it to be honest because I have no say." (Officer 21)

In general, the officers stated they were quick to note their awareness of citizen monitoring. Officer 16 said, "It's a heightened awareness." It was important for police officers to be aware of their surroundings, including the individuals with whom they were interacting, but also those who might be spectators, possibly engaged in citizen monitoring. This awareness was part of the job and could contribute to police interactions unfolding in a safe manner.

However, when awareness of what was happening in a given situation was coupled with concern regarding the intentions behind the filming, officers felt it was possible citizen monitoring might detract from police officers' concentration. For instance, Officer 1 stated, "When it first started happening, it's like 'why are you recording?'…There's the other side of it where they make this video, and you wonder what they are going to do with it. They may just show that clip and it can be taken the wrong way." Officer 3 also alluded to this, commenting, "You just never know. Anything can be taken out of context. It's out of your control, right. But I try not to be paranoid

---

[46] Name of province.

about it or overly cautious." Similarly, Officer 21 described feeling uneasy when being filmed, noting that: "everything you say could come back to bite you."

<p style="text-align:center">"I welcome it unless you interfere with my work"</p>

Several of the police officers interviewed accepted or, in some instances, welcomed citizen monitoring. They acknowledged that they were aware of the phenomenon but that it did not bother them, and, in fact, they appreciated it. Officer 15, for example, stated:

> At the ***[47] there were riots so I was just filmed in the course of my duties. I wasn't actually involved in the riots, but I was there in plain clothes. I have been filmed at the ***[48] and I, you know, primarily it's just been citizens or media, but really, if you're not doing anything wrong, it doesn't really brother me."

For many of the officers, citizen monitoring was a contemporary phenomenon they felt had to be embraced by the police profession.

However, these officers were also quick to note that, should citizen monitoring interfere with their work, it would be seen as problematic and no longer be tolerated. Officer 9 stated:

> That is my only concern. At the end of the day the actual filming portion, I really…it's not an issue for me. It is an issue when you interfere with the work that I'm doing. When you're shoving a phone in my face and you're trying to do that as an intimidation. And now you're taking my attention away from the subject that I'm dealing with to you and a lot of the times in the negative, a lot of the negative interactions I've had with members of the public that have videotaped me personally in my interactions and calls that I go on, the negative videotaping has come as a result of someone interfering in my investigations and interfering in my call and interfering in my ability to actually provide the service that I was originally going to do anyways, right? It's an added thing, it's a safety thing and by and large the ones that are aggressively videotaping, they're usually doing it as a distraction and now that's another variable that I have to control for, right?

Those participants who shared this view felt overwhelmingly that while citizen monitoring was tolerable, it would become problematic if it interfered with the course of their duty. Policing is a dynamic profession, and because of this, interactions with the public can escalate quickly and with little overt warning or obvious provocation. Police officers must carefully watch and listen for both verbal and nonverbal cues to anticipate any escalation in a given situation. A bystander engaged in citizen monitoring becomes an added variable that police officers must be aware of.

---

[47] Name of event.
[48] Name of event.

Further, should a bystander engaged in citizen monitoring in some way interfere with a police officer's or officers' work, this would become problematic in that it could impede the ability of police to properly carry out their duties.

5.3.6. Citizen Monitoring and Confidence

A key finding from the PI's master's thesis research was that citizen monitoring had an impact on officers' self-confidence. The Canadian officers in that study felt that being aware of citizen monitoring could contribute to a lack of confidence. Some suggested that knowledge of or experience in an incident that involved footage obtained through citizen monitoring that was subsequently shared could impact a police officer's level of confidence as well. Confidence is seen as an important aspect of police work. A lack of confidence can contribute to behaviours such as hesitancy, as well as uncertainty regarding policing's legal underpinnings and operational standards. It is necessary for police actions to be decisive, and it is equally critical that their knowledge of the legal authority of police actions is sound.

The present study produced similar findings regarding police confidence with respect to citizen monitoring. Many of the officers who were interviewed spoke of the impact that citizen monitoring had on their confidence. For example, Officer 23 stated, "Yeah, it does, for sure." Several of the officers recounted specific situations which had a significant impact on their self-confidence. Officer 10, for example, recalled a situation in which they had been called to a high school, where a fight had ensued in the school field and attracted hundreds of high school student spectators. Recalling the event, the officer stated:

> So, we get out of my car and close the door and look over and one kid, I watch as he just sprints over to another kid and just decks him and I am like UGHH, crap! I have to get in there as this kid gets beating on another kid. I am alone. I am by myself and I am in a field with 200 students. What does every high school kid do when there is a fight? They've all got their phones ready to go. I've got literally 100 phones video recording me taking down a 14-year-old kid. I was like ugh, this probably doesn't look great. This was one of those moments when you're like well I am still going to do it because he's beating the other kid, but the whole time I am thinking oh my god, PLEASE don't end up on YouTube. You're thinking ok, get the kid to the ground and he pops right up, and you say, don't move. Thinking do I take him to the ground again, or is he going to be cooperative. Ok what do I do, right? You're conscious of the fact that there are 100 kids there and you don't know if they're going to keep recording or if they're going to get involved or if there is going to be another fight or what's going on. That's the worst one I have been in. High school kids you're like, ok I am pretty confident in a fight, but not when there are 100 of them and one of me.

In this instance, Officer 10's otherwise confident demeanour was shaken due to the sheer number of spectators and the prevalence of cell phone cameras that were recording the incident, including his behaviour. The officer was cognizant of the image of a police officer "taking down" a teenager and how this would look once posted to YouTube.

Other officers shared the impact of citizen monitoring on their self-confidence and, in some instances, leading officers to second-guess their decision making: "It's just an extra level of stress…You're like, they're watching, and it's going to end up on YouTube." (Officer 4). Officer 8 shared their thoughts on the dynamic nature of police interactions with members of the public. In any given interaction, the police might be tasked with crowd control, questioning witnesses and/or suspect(s), apprehension of said suspect(s), and more. In some instances, these tasks occur simultaneously. When citizen monitoring was added to the existing variables police officers were required to manage, it sometimes impacted a police officer's confidence. As Officer 20 stated, "It catches you off guard…who knows what kind of individual [is filming] or where [the footage] is going to land."

While many of the officers felt that citizen monitoring impacted their self-confidence during the course of an incident or interaction with a member of the public, some revealed that their self-confidence was most impacted after incidents in which there was self-monitoring. Officer 20 spoke of ruminating on interactions that involved citizen monitoring days after the incident. Similarly, Officer 4 stated that the weight of an interaction wherein citizen monitoring played a role had the ability to carry over and "take away from your energy on the road." This officer explained that, during an encounter, citizen monitoring was "in the back of your mind" and their focus was more on their safety, the safety of their partner, and the public's safety. However, when speaking of the impact after an incident had occurred, Officer 4 stated:

> …it's all the stuff afterwards. When you're done writing the report and you're home and you're having a casual conversation and you think, "Oh, this guy is going to complain." and "I am going to have to talk to ***[49] and you know all of these things. That's where it hurts your confidence. Maybe in a few years, after I have had a few more complaints, it might hurt my confidence more over time.

Officer 5 also spoke of the impact that citizen monitoring could have on police confidence following an incident. Speaking of the potential long-term consequences of this, the officer stated, "One

---

[49] The departmental police standards unit

little incident that's been videoed can impact someone's personal and psychological life and everything, you know?" Given the importance of self-confidence in police work, sentiments like these exemplified the significant impact that citizen monitoring can bring to day-to-day police work.

5.3.7. Citizen Monitoring and its Impact on Use of Force

The impact of citizen monitoring on the police use of force was the primary focus of the study. To this end, questions surrounding the use of force were posed to the officers. The questions pertained to the ways in which their force may or may not change when in the presence of citizen monitoring. The objectives of the interview questions were to identify what impact, if any, citizen monitoring had on police officers' application of justified force. The master's research that preceded this study found that among the police officers interviewed, some used less force than legally justified in situations where they were subjected to citizen monitoring. Similar findings emerged from the interviews with Canadian police officers in the present study, with many of the officers indicating that they found themselves using less force than they were legally authorized to use in a situation when citizen monitoring was present.

Police interactions with members of the public are complex and this complexity was at the crux of any participant-PI discussions about the defining elements of citizen monitoring. The general public does not, and in many ways cannot, be expected to understand the complexity of police-citizen interactions, and, generally, of the police profession as a whole. Aspects of the police role can appear straight-forward at first glance; however, often, there are unknown elements that serve to complicate the role. Because the police are visible, the public is provided with an opportunity to see certain aspects of the police role unfold before them. Using social media and other platforms, they have the opportunity to weigh-in and critique the profession, typically with little knowledge of the nuances of the job. Officers 15 and 25 spoke to this issue:

> It's just taking that little snapshot and whether it's use of force is justified or not justified as some people get themselves in trouble, it's that perception that there's a uniformed police officer laying a shit-kicking on a poor innocent civilian, right (Officer 15)

> It's just the perception of what people are observing. Just not fully understanding it. With use of force interactions, people assume it's excessive or its wrongdoing. (Officer 25)

The use of force, in particular, is an aspect of policing subject to considerable critique, and yet, the public is generally unaware of the various policies and procedures relating to use of force.

Changes in police tactics

Several officers stated that they considered using less force than legally justified during an encounter situation where citizen monitoring was present. Despite this, they stated that they had not acted upon this. Instead, in situations where citizen monitoring was present, they sometimes used a different and more visually appealing force tactic than they may have been selected to employ had citizen monitoring not been a factor. In other words, these officers indicated that they changed their use of force tactics in order to appear 'better' on camera. Officer 5 stressed this point, noting, "in the grand scheme of things, if you know you're being recorded or you are recorded, I think it, yeah it impacts you and how you're going to act and make your decisions." In speaking about the use of force, Officer 11 explained the challenges that existed when citizen monitoring was present. This officer noted that, while there were aware of the monitoring, it did not change their decision making regarding the use of justified levels of force: "No. I haven't, but I have given thought to that. I have definitely turned my mind to that."

Rather than altering the level of force applied to a subject in an encounter situation, officers explained they would be more likely to change their behaviour, more specifically making a concerted attempt to communicate with the subject(s) and any bystanders to ensure that their actions were understood if being videotaped. Officer 16 stated: "Maybe people's language is a little more, like, you know, 'The chief is maybe going to see me.' …So, you always go back to "my chief, my sergeant or my staff sergeant could see it." Similarly, Officer 21 related that they issued verbal commands and openly communicated the rationale for their actions because "I want the recorder to know" and Officer 8 stated, "I spend more time articulating to the camera." Officer 11 expanded on this, stating:

> I would fully support the notion of speaking loud enough that the camera can hear you. We do it anyway. Every police officer is trained in that too. When you arrest someone and they're not complying. Yell out what they're doing so that you cultivate witnesses. They will hear you yelling, "show me your hands, show me your hands, show me your hands", so that people will understand that the reason I am doing this is because he is not complying with me. So, if you can do that and preserve it on somebody else's camera, then that might actually remove the intrigue for them as well so that it's boring because this guy was totally non-compliant and yeah. So again, I have not done [that], but I can completely understand it. The speaking loud is just a twist on a notion that has already existed. You're trying to cultivate witnesses so that people understand why you're doing it.

Communication was a powerful tool used by the police officers in the attempt to ensure footage captured displayed their actions in a favourable light. Officer 6 noted, "With any kind of use of

force you need to have crazy articulation." The officers felt that clear communication could dispel any assumptions that by-standers might be making about the use of force decisions being made in the encounter situation.

Articulation and communication, often dubbed "verbal judo" within the realm of policing, are skills that police educators work to develop among recruits. Through in-class instruction and simulations, police recruits are taught the importance of effective communication. Some of the more experienced officers in the sample noted that, with the advent of smartphone technology, there had been warnings from use of force trainers regarding communication and that it was important for effective incident de-escalation. Further, participants shared that clear communication helped subjects and bystanders understand why police officers were making the decisions they made in the situation. Officer 16 stated:

> We teach them to do that. Absolutely. We want people to hear us giving commands. Our witnesses are the best witnesses ever and they come forward and say, "No, the cop said get on the ground and show me your hands. You're not complying. Show me your hands." As you knee strike him, you're saying show me your hands.

Based on the aforementioned comment and others, it was clear that communication was an important consideration in police training, and that it played a significant role once recruits were working in the field. Participants suggested that its emphasis in training proved useful for officers. Officer 6 commented:

> I do and I think I do that without even thinking about it because I am trying to like, I know why I am using the force, and the bad guy probably knows why, so if I know there are no cameras, I don't need to articulate to the bad guy why I am knee striking him or why I am having to put him in handcuffs. So, if I know there is a camera there, I tend to vocalize what I am doing so that anyone watching can understand what's going on and it helps me focus on what I need to do, right. So, yeah, definitely it plays a part and I do it without even thinking about it. I am just like, "Hey I am putting you in cuffs because you stole or because you beat up your wife."

Officer 4 noted that, while the police were authorized to use knee strikes on a subject when they were resisting arrest, when this action was being recorded, officers tended to think twice about using this tactic: "If it wasn't for cameras…I think we would be a lot more comfortable with it.").

Officer 21 stated: "Sometimes you can be talking to somebody, and you use words that they can relate to, but I won't do that when I am being monitored. I will speak in a professional way." In addition, some police officers discussed the ways in which they used force when they knew or believed they were being monitored by members of the public. Several interviewees

explained that they might use one particular use of force strategy over another in a given situation because it had better 'optics'. For example, Officer 13 discussed the difference in optics between going "hands on" versus employing use of force tools: "I would rather get into a scrap if you will. Just hands on, because it looks better. In part because it looks better than the use of tools because I think tools are really what draws attention to the camera." When describing the optics of different use of force strategies, Officer 6 said:

> Instead of a knee strike, you can use a pressure point. The whole point of a knee strike is to gain compliance. Like if he's on the ground and you're trying to gain his hand, a knee strike could work, but so could a pressure point like a trap squeeze or a knuckle behind the ear. If someone is filming, it doesn't look like anything. It's the same result but it looks better. That's kind of the result of the cameras because you know, a police officer punching somebody in the face just doesn't look good. Even if you have the full context. It doesn't look good so that is changing. I think it's probably for the better, too.

Officer 8 spoke of the different tactics that could be used in order to gain compliance and stressed that some might be better perceived than others. Like Officer 6, Officer 8 discussed the similarities between a knee strike and the use of a pressure point in terms of efficacy and the differences in terms of public optics. During our interview, this officer spoke at length about the knee strike as a compliance tactic. In Officer 8's view, the knee strike is highly effective, mildly painful, and mostly used as a technique to distract the subject. The officer stated, ""It's mostly used as a distraction technique to get them from stopping clenching." This officer noted that, when citizen monitoring was present, they might be more likely to use pressure points to gain compliance rather than a knee strike, although the officer noted that, in general, knee strikes were more effective in gaining control over an uncooperative subject. Officer 21 discussed the impact of citizen monitoring on use of force tactics when describing an incident in which a non-compliant subject pulled away during an arrest. This participant noted that they would have been justified in grabbing the subject; however, "it's your word against this 20 second video and videos are very powerful." Indeed, a number of the officers expressed that the sole reason for using one tactic over the other, despite the slight differences in their effectiveness, was for the preservation of positive optics.

Officer 12 noted that when in the presence of a camera, they wished to be perceived in a certain way: "I take a quick second to step back and rethink the situation, especially if you know potentially this video [will go viral]". Many of the officers who were interviewed spoke of the added attention they had to pay when cameras were present. It was not only were they seen as an added variable in an interaction, but also the fact that the footage cameras captured could be both misleading and misrepresented. In order to limit the impact of cameras, interviewees discussed

changes they made in their behaviour so that their actions could be both better understood and seen in a positive light.

Since the police carry out much of their work in the public realm, and because the ways in which they are perceived by the public can have a direct impact on their approval ratings, it seems their compliance strategies might change based on certain factors including the presence of citizen monitoring. Interviews with the Canadian officers revealed that, in the presence of citizen monitoring, some officers used marginally less effective, but optically more palatable, police compliance tactics rather a the more effective use of force option.

Police tactics vary in their efficacy and, while some might be better employed in certain situations, others might be better suited to other occasions. However, given that police-civilian encounters are dynamic and unpredictable in nature, it is paramount that police employ the appropriate tactic or tactics for a given situation. When citizen monitoring was present, it seemed police tended to opt to use a less effective tactic due to how the tactic would be presented on video. Officer 8 stated:

> [The subject will] be like, "oh, there is a [knee] strike to my thigh". It's not causing them damage. It's not breaking bones. It's a quick knee strike. But to the public, I can see how this looks like, "Oh my God. They're kicking this person. They're beating him." That's how the lay person would describe it but it's not what we are doing. We are really focusing on getting the person under control. Another way to do that it is to go to pressure points. Pressure points behind the ear or under the nose. It's a compliance technique. You distract them with that and get their hands out from underneath them. It definitely changes their focus. If there are cameras out, it definitely changes my focus. I am going to be using that. The knee strike is more effective. I have always found it more effective. But I will use a pressure point because it doesn't look, you're doing anything. It's not because you're trying to hide anything or be subversive but public appearance is everything these days and if you can save yourself the headache of going through a year-long complaint that goes nowhere but takes up a year of your life, then why not?

The comments of Officer 8 illustrated the complexities that surrounded their use of force in encounter situations. It is important for police officers to employ an appropriate and lawful level of force to effectively manage a situation and prevent further escalation. Officer 8's comments revealed that this officer might opt to use a potentially less-effective compliance tool (pressure points) due to optics.

Reference to hesitation and avoidance related to use of force emerged during the interviews and are discussed in the coming sections. These themes were also present during the PI's master's research; however, unlike in this study, discussion there related to changes in verbal

communication. Specific use of force tactics did not emerge in that work. In the current study, many of the officers spoke about their behaviour changes in the presence of cameras. These changes in behaviour were particularly interesting because of their stated purpose. The phrase 'CYA' (Cover Your Ass) came up frequently during interviews. CYA is a term often used in policing circles. The acronym can be defined as taking certain actions, measures, and precautions in order to avoid repercussions. Officer 10 stated, "That was a CYA incident…we did everything so that if something happens, we've covered our asses." 'It seemed the police officers, recognizing the potentially significant implications of citizen monitoring, adopted certain tactics that could be categorized as 'CYA' behaviour.

With respect to citizen monitoring, some of the most notable repercussions seemed to be public scrutiny and police or oversight body investigations. Some participants shared that when presented with certain situations, they were likely to hesitate, and that this hesitation was often done in an effort to 'CYA'. In an effort to protect their professional and sometimes personal reputation, they avoided a situation that could otherwise incite criticism. Officer 14 shared that some officers were "too scared to use force because they're going to get scrutinized" and further, noted that "we're scared to go into scenes now". Of course, while avoiding certain situations or avoiding the use of force might have prevented immediate and long-term scrutiny, it nonetheless meant police officers were not carrying out their role in the manner expected of them.

Participants indicated that CYA could cause police officers to avoid engaging with members of the public, which is a critical part of their role. Further, Officer 10 stated that police officers also tended to "do certain things [in situations wherein they] are most noticeable". In other words, some police officers took extra precautions like over-articulation and explanation to explain their action in an effort to protect their professional reputation when citizen monitoring was present. The officers shared that they took these extra precautions out of concern that their actions might be shared by news media outlets and/or on social media. These precautions caused participants who spoke about this to take additional time in calculating their response to certain incidents. This delay was sometimes termed 'hesitation'. The contradiction between hesitation and CYA efforts is that hesitation is inherently dangerous in policing, while CYA is intended to protect the police officer engaged therein. When discussing hesitation, participants frequently noted the potential dangers associated with hesitation and the need for police officers' split-second and decisive decision making. While CYA can cause hesitation, its intention is to protect the officer rather than to put them at an increased risk.

5.3.8. Citizen Monitoring Contributing to Hesitation in the Use of Force

Police officers are subjected to both psychological and physiological stressors while working. Police officers interviewed frequently discussed the importance of acting swiftly and with certainty when applying justified force. In situations where use of force was required, the decision to employ force and the determination as to which use of force tactic was required had to be made in "a split second". The research serving as the foundation for the present study found that citizen monitoring could be seen as an added stressor for police, and that the addition of this added stressor could cause a hesitation factor[50] among police officers faced with having to apply force.

"Hesitation" as described by police officers

It was noted in Chapter Two that there can be serious consequences when police officers hesitate to exercise their lawful authority in encounter situations. Hesitation can have serious, detrimental impacts. Any hesitation in the use of appropriate force can contribute to a situation which is more dangerous for the police officer(s), for the citizen(s) in the proximal areas, and for the suspect(s). A series of questions in the interview schedule focused on hesitation and many of the participants shared thoughtful accounts of personal hesitation, observations of hesitation, or thoughts of hesitation. The officers were asked to discuss whether or not the presence of an individual or individuals engaged in citizen monitoring would impact their ability to act decisively in selecting a force option to gain compliance.

The officers spoke at length about the impact hesitation could have on a police encounter with a member or members of the public:

> The longer it takes you to control a subject, the longer they have to injure themselves or somebody else, right? Really, that's as simple as it gets. The longer a person remains out of control, the bigger the risk they are. Once the situation arises where you need to use force, which again is just a super small subset, when you do need to use force, you need to use it and you need to use it now. The longer you wait, the higher the chance that something is going to go sideways and that someone is going to get smacked or hit. (Officer 10)

> When it's live, you don't want to shoot somebody, so you end up waiting and waiting and waiting. Sometimes that person gets way too close, or they get too close and now you're fighting and your gun's gone. (Officer 19).

---

[50] "The hesitation factor can be defined as a marked pause among police officers in their response to a particular situation wherein use of force is not only warranted, but necessary." (Todd, 2015; p. 77).

The officers shared their view that an escalation of violence was more likely to occur in situations where the officer hesitated in exercising their lawful authority to gain compliance. In some instances, the officers noted, this initial hesitation might have resulted in the officer needing to use a higher level of force to gain control of the situation. For example, one officer indicated that police officers who were afraid to exercise the appropriate level of force out of fear of public scrutiny might present "a danger to us as police officers and to the public" (Officer 19). Other officers noted that hesitation could have potentially lethal consequences. Officer 3 stated: "I'm sure there're officers that will say there're times when they should have pulled the trigger, but they didn't, and they risked being stabbed or shot by hesitating for a second." The potential impact of hesitation, according to the officers, could be serious and could prove to be problematic for both the police officer(s) and subject(s) involved in the situation. Participants suggested that proper training was essential to ensure that hesitation did not occur in high stress situations.

5.3.9. Reasons Hesitation Occurs

There were two major themes in the reasons given by officers for why hesitation might occur: 1) a lack of experience. First, participants indicated that they lacked experience and/or had only had limited time on the job.; and 2) concerns regarding potential internal investigations, outside scrutiny, and external oversight. These reasons were often viewed as being interrelated; that is, the officers indicated that those with less time on the job might experience a compounding situation. For example, officers with less time on the job were more likely to hesitate in their application of force and this could be compounded by the presence of citizen monitoring.

Younger and Less Experienced Officers

The younger and more junior-level officers who were interviewed shared their experiences. A key theme in their narrative was they often lacked self-confidence due to their limited time as an officer. This, in turn, contributed to their hesitancy in encounter situations. As Officer 8 stated: "I am still hesitant to use force because I am junior. When I got on the road, I was very hesitant to go hands on." Similarly, police officers with more experience remarked that their less experienced counterparts seemed more likely to hesitate. Officer 23 observed that "newer officers are more apprehensive", while Officer 20 stated, "You do notice hesitation among younger officers. That comes back to confidence and experience." Similarly, Officer 22 noted that younger and less experienced officers seemed to be 'gun shy':

I think the newer officers are gun shy. I don't use the term gun shy in shooting. I mean in gun shy in use of force. In potentially doing more proactive policing. The consequences are higher are now. The risks are higher for sticking your neck out there. Stopping someone on the side of the road they maybe wouldn't have had to, it's not a call, you don't have to, so why do it? I do worry about that. Now, it's that much easier to be in the front page of the paper than to be criticized by your peers. To be criticized by the public, media, go through an internal investigation. I think newer officers are more apprehensive.

Officer 22 referenced the concerns younger and less experienced officers had in the field of policing given citizen monitoring and oversight bodies. The hesitation and lack of confidence these officers noted pose significant threats to the safety and wellbeing of police officers, subjects, and members of the public alike.

Police recruits are provided with legal training during their time at the police academy. It is critical that recruits have a firm understanding of legal intricacies once they begin working "on the road." Despite this, many of the officers felt that the legal training they had received was not sufficient. Veteran police officers have had many years to develop a strong understanding of their legal authority; however, less experienced police officers may not have a similarly well-developed comprehension level. Because of this, some participants suggested that less experienced officers' lack of legal knowledge could contribute to hesitation.

The more experienced officers in the sample shared their perspectives on the challenges faced by more junior officers. Officer 4, for example, noted that younger officers often hesitated, and that this could be problematic because "…someone is going to get hurt if you don't intervene." In certain instances, this lack of self-confidence was the result of insufficient legal knowledge that could be applied in situations that required immediate and decisive decision making. Officer 10 described this type of encounter, stating, "I've had to go up and say, 'let's go arrest those people', but I think it's because it's a lack of understanding about their legal grounds." Officer 1 also provided perspective on this:

As a junior officer you haven't been exposed to certain situations in different times. I think experiences definitely helps. Junior officers I have worked with have been hesitant or unsure of how to do something when it comes to arresting or entering a house or even with use of force, they are unsure sometimes on how to handle the situation.

These quotes illustrated situations in which some police officers with more experience were forced to provide instruction that otherwise should not be necessary due to a lack of understanding on the part of the novice in the area of legal authority. The importance of officers having sufficient

legal knowledge was noted by Officer 17 who stated," "[police officers] have to know the laws around force and they have to be able to apply it."

Hesitation for Race Related Reasons

Several of the officers discussed feeling apprehensive and hesitating in encounters that involved Black, Indigenous, and other people of colour (BIPOC). This hesitation was ascribed to the increased scrutiny of police interactions with the BIPOC community. For example, Officer 3 stated:

> But I'm sure, I'm positive, that many officers when they're on their way to a man with a gun call, they're probably, say it's a young man with a gun in Winnipeg, I'm sure that they're saying internally and maybe even to their partners, like oh my god I hope it's not a young aboriginal man. Or in Toronto, I hope it's not a black man. Because they're going to hesitate, because they know that the level of scrutiny is going to be that much higher.

Officer 8 shared a similar perspective, noting a hesitancy to interact with BIPOC individuals out of fear of being perceived in a certain way: "I was hesitant to approach [BIPOC people] because I was afraid of being perceived as a racist. I was afraid of being filmed." In the years since these interviews were conducted, police interactions with BIPOC individuals have led to protests, and calls to defund the police.

Hesitation in Extreme Situations

The officers who spoke of hesitation often noted that it was less likely to occur in situations that were extreme or serious. Officers noted that they and their fellow officers were more likely to hesitate in a situation that was less serious. The majority of officers stated that they would be able to act decisively in a serious situation even in the presence of citizen monitoring. Officer 10, for example, stated:

> I think in the most extreme situations, you're going to do what you're going to do. I don't think anyone is not going to pull the trigger if there is someone running at you with the knife because they're thinking this is going to be an [oversight] thing.

Similarly, Officer 4 commented that in serious situations, "You go right back to your training". There were, however, officers who were experienced who stated that they hesitated in serious situations. These officers provided candid accounts of hesitation during such incidents. Given the significance of this issue, the lived experiences shared by the officers are presented in considerable detail.

The first example was shared by an officer in relation to a situation involving a in a 'suicide by cop'[51] attempt. The participant described that the encounter caused hesitation, particularly because the subject's weapon was not immediately visible:

> I can't really see what the guy is doing and I don't want to stick my head in because I don't know how fast he's going to get his hand out of the pocket. Then he pulls his hand out, his right hand out of his pocket, and he's got an about that long flashlight and he's holding it by the flash, lightbulb side. He goes to point it at me, like he wants me to shoot. The whole time I didn't know what he had, I was saying to my partner I don't know what he's got but he's got something. I don't know what he's got. (Officer 11)

A second incident related by an officer also involved a 'suicide-by-cop' attempt:

> Officer 11: Well, I had one…it was probably like the scariest moment of my life. I had a guy basically jay-walk in front of me. I almost hit him with my car. It was on ***[52] in peak hour traffic so that's like two lanes west two lanes east, no parking, actually three I guess cause no parking at peak hour. And this guy like jay walked right in front of me and that was from the other side, and that's like 5 lanes now and he's coming into the 6th and through the 6th and on to the sidewalk. I was like, "You fucker, how could you do that!" I flipped on my lights and stopped my car right in the middle of traffic. I got out and next thing, I called at him, and next thing, he charged at me with his hand at his hip, and basically, he's like yelling at me as he's charging at me, "I'm going to shoot you, I'm going to shoot you, I'm going to shoot you, I'm going to shoot you". And he starts drawing like his empty hands and I was really lucky because I could see like kind of that there was nothing there.
>
> And really, I had people coming up to me after, say like "I saw him charge you, what happened?" I was like blown away. It was weird how it worked out but eventually I was like you're an idiot and I put him in handcuffs, but honestly, would I have been justified in killing him? In my mind, yes. 100% he's telling me he's got his actions and he's charging me.
>
> What scares me more is that I didn't even draw my weapon. Right? I'm still trying to figure out why I didn't. Was it because I saw him with nothing in his waistband or nothing in his hands or was it because I was in the middle of traffic and everyone was watching me and it was hesitancy? I am still wrestling with that one.

Officer 7 disclosed that his hesitation in that instance affected him following the incident and was the source of considerable self-doubt: "You can't help but doubt yourself in a sense. Was it because the traffic? Everyone watching me? Yeah. I don't know." The experience described by Officer 7 was profound. This encounter took place on a major street in a large Canadian city

---

[51] Suicide by cop refers to an incident in which a suicidal individual forces the police to use lethal force on them.
[52] Name of major street in an urban centre.

during rush hour. The encounter was visible to pedestrians and motorists alike. In the era of policing's 'new visibility', it is likely that most of these passers-by had their smart phones or mobile phones on their person and had the ability to activate their cameras with relative ease. While Officer 7 acknowledged that there were various factors that likely contributed to the act of hesitating, citizen monitoring was among those factors.

Officer 19 shared an account of an incident in which hesitation occurred. In this situation, the officer and a fellow officer had been dispatched to a busy mall parking lot where a man was wielding a knife and a gun. The other officer in the encounter "had frozen", so the participant was "trying to protect" them. Officer 19 stated, "I started to question myself in that moment: 'Should I have my gun out? How does that look on me?' The officer continued:

> It was concerning to me because I thought if I end up shooting him and I have the wrong use of force out, I'll be done, in my mind. And it sucks that you have to think about that at that moment, but I did. So, at the end of the day, it didn't change my decision, but it delayed my clarity of mind at the moment. I think that's dangerous too. Because all it would have taken is that split second. That one second while I was in La-La Land thinking for him to crack the shotgun and be done. Luckily nobody got hurt. Well, I did. I broke my thumb.

This officer highlighted the importance of split-second decision making and also the impact of second-guessing one's actions. The moments Officer 19 spent considering the encounter's optics could have had fatal consequences.

Examples of Hesitation in Less Serious Incidents

Serious police-citizen encounters subject police officers, particularly those working on the frontlines, to numerous layers of psychological and physiological stressors. It appeared that citizen monitoring might be a significant contributor to these stressors. Officer 21 provided an example of this, sharing that they hesitated to "grab hold of" a non-compliant individual resisting arrest because "We may deem it to be an appropriate level of force…but not in the court of public opinion." The findings here were significant in that the prevalence of citizen monitoring was confirmed by many participants. Interviewees also shared that hesitation due to citizen monitoring occurred out of concern for both public and internal/agency scrutiny.

5.3.10. Citizen Monitoring Contributing to the FIDO Effect

Police officers are often subjected to public scrutiny because of their highly visible role. Certain calls for service may contribute to higher levels of scrutiny, for example, calls involving BIPOC people. In an effort to avoid public scrutiny that can result from certain calls for service, some police officers deliberately disregard situations that may, potentially, involve the use of force. FIDO (Fuck It, Drive On) is a term used to describe this phenomenon within policing circles. In recent years, likely due, at least in part, to the proliferation of cellphone technology and social media usership, there has been a marked increase in use of force incidents and fatal police encounters that have been shared on the Internet. This caused some police officers to feel a certain weight and risk associated with their participation in certain police-citizen encounters. Instead of attending a call, some of the police officers interviewed stated that they elected to bypass a situation that they felt could have had the potential to tarnish their professional or personal reputation. In bypassing the situation, their hope was that the incident would resolve itself, that it would unfold in a safe manner despite a lack of police intervention. Further, they might engage in a benefit analysis, of sorts, in an effort to weigh the risks of involvement in protecting the community versus protecting their career, professional and personal reputation.

In recent years, there have been many highly publicized police citizen encounters involving BIPOC individuals. Although police-race relations have been contentious throughout history, particularly in the United States, the prevalence of citizen monitoring has served to magnify incidents that have occurred in recent years. Some of these highly publicized incidents have involved fatalities and the public backlash has been intense. In May 2020, following the police involved death of George Floyd, protests and riots broke out across the United States. In some cities, the unrest was so serious that curfews were imposed, and the National Guard was deployed. Activists and the Black Lives Matter movement developed the 'Defund the Police' slogan which soon became synonymous with calls for widespread and sweeping police reform across the United States and Canada. This movement sought to identify racial inequity and point out the challenges associated with police encounters involving BIPOC individuals.

In Chapter Two, it was noted that there are key features of the policing landscape as well as a number of high-profile events that have placed police behaviour in encounter situations under close scrutiny. The interviews conducted for the present study took place prior to 2020. However, similar social movements, precipitated by police-citizen encounters involving BIPOC individuals

also occurred at the time the of the interviews detailed here. The police officers interviewed revealed that certain calls for service, such as calls involving BIPOC individuals caused them concern because of the increased potential they seemed to have for citizen monitoring. Although there had been instances of police abuse of power or misuse of force captured through citizen monitoring, in the officers' view, this also had the potential to misrepresent or distort the actions of officers who were exercising their lawful authorities. Several of the officers revealed that, due to the increase in citizen monitoring, they weighed the risks and benefits associated with attending certain calls. In certain circumstances, they assessed the potential risks that a call for service might pose to themselves, both personally and professionally, and might engage in FIDO.

Most participants who expressed concern over the FIDO phenomenon explained that there were a variety of reasons one might consider intentionally neglecting a particular call for service. Officers in the sample confirmed that his occurred, particularly in less serious cases:

> Yes. [I have avoided] minor incidents, like someone crossing the road when they shouldn't be or it's like, you can see that it's like a pretty minor incident…like I mentioned right at the start, the risk versus reward, if it's some fairly minor incident, I will not, and yeah and combine with the fact that it can be monitored, I will use FIDO, I will drive on, sure, and who wouldn't. I think that's pretty common. But anything medium to serious, I'm going to do what I have to do, right, like I have a job to do…I think it's never been on my mind when it's been a critical incident or a fighting thing. (Officer 6)

> Like infractions – car infractions – yeah. But not like a major fight about to break out and we go this way. I haven't seen that. (Officer 14)

> But, like drug offences? We let that stuff go. For things that are not a big deal, we absolutely would but for the most part if we see something major, we will go. But for minor stuff, like suspicious vehicles and things like that, we will just drive by. (Officer 4)

> I've put myself in situations where I've avoided negative situations, but you can't avoid it at all times because there may be one angle that looks bad, and you just can't help that so you just have to deal with it. (Officer 3)

Although the officers indicated that they were more likely to FIDO in less serious incidents, there were more serious incidents in which this occurred. Officer 23 relayed a conversation they had with a colleague in which the colleague revealed that he would "avoid taking [his] gun out at all costs, knowing that [he] would have to" write a report as a result.

The officers noted that FIDO did not often occur if officers had been dispatched to a call. There were, of course, problems associated with bypassing a situation in a marked patrol cruiser, as Officer 10 noted:

If you're in a marked car and someone calls, "well there was a cop right there and they didn't do anything", well they're going to GPS you right there and you're going to be done up just the same, so no, I would say if it's a situation that you've got on view and it needs to be dealt with, you're going to go deal with it. You're not going to want to, but you're going to deal with it.

Similarly, Officer 4 stated:

One example is if you see a male and female arguing – technically it's domestic but a lot of the times if we see if on view we will call it a disturbance so if it's nothing we can very easily write it off without any report but if all of a sudden you call it a domestic then all of a sudden you have to document why you did nothing.

When weighing the perceived potential benefits and challenges associated with attending a situation compared to engaging in FIDO, some participants expressed that their visibility was an important consideration. FIDO seemed to involve more than a simple evaluation of possible public scrutiny associated with the encounter. It also involved deliberation of the scrutiny that could surface from either attending an encounter or bypassing an encounter.

Several officers noted that practicing FIDO was more common toward the end of their shift. This is reflected in the comments of two officers:

What does make us drive on is if it's the end of our shift and we know how much paperwork is involved. (Officer 4)

FIDO is more often the blinders of shift change for us. We work 6 to 6. We don't really work 6 to 6. I am logged into a car at 5:15 every shift. That means that if a call comes in at 5:15, I am going to take it. I am going to work that extra hour every shift and not get paid for it. It also means that towards the end of my shift at 4:30, I am going to be in the office and I am not going to be doing anything that requires my immediate assistance because I don't want to work overtime as well. FIDO is definitely a thing when it comes to proactive enforcement and I would say minor stuff. (Officer 10)

This particular form of FIDO seemed to exist as a rationalization made by police officers that, if they were able to bypass certain police-citizen encounters, they could instead devote more substantial energy to situations that necessitated their presence. Police officers might engage in FIDO as a form of self-preservation because of the physiological and psychological stressors associated with the profession and the likelihood of these to contribute to burnout, as discussed in Chapter Two.

Because of the numerous organized social movements actively asserting their opposition to police across North America, vocal displeasure in the police among members of the public was not uncommon. This was particularly prevalent in situations where race plays a central role. Several participants spoke about this, and although the topic of policing minority groups is controversial and sensitive, they shared their candid experiences and sentiments. In the interviews, several of the officers spoke of engaging in FIDO when attending an incident where BIPOC individuals were present because of the complex nature of policing minority groups. Officer 4 shared an encounter of that nature as it related to a fellow police officer and friend:

> But you know, I have a friend in another department out of province, he recently had a call where he wanted to go arrest someone who was at an all-Black party. The sergeant didn't want to arrest because they didn't want to go over and start arresting Black people. I don't know the circumstances of that so I can't really talk about it, but I do know it's on people's mind. It's not also an immediate safety issue…that's like it doesn't matter if you're the Prime Minister, we are going to arrest you. But if it's not immediate safety, then we can say sort of why ruffle feathers. I am a big fan of that because personal life is way more important, I think. As much as I love this job, I am going to do my very best not going to do anything stupid to add any extra stress on me.

Although this situation did not occur to Officer 4 directly, this participant indicated that they were able to understand why FIDO occurred. Further, Officer 4 said there were benefits associated with placating members of the public, particularly if they identified as BIPOC individuals.

The decisions made by police officers regarding whether or not to attend a call could occasionally be explained by citizen confidence and trust in the police. Often, those who were the least pleased with the police were also the most vocal in their displeasure. The ramifications of this lack of support were felt and experienced by the police and might be reflected in their performance on the road. The PI's master's research which preceded this study found that participants saw the public's lack of confidence in their work as having the potential to reduce their efforts (Todd, 2015). The nature of public complaints is such that they contribute to a cycle in which negative public attitudes contribute to inaction, inaction contributes to negative public attitudes and so on.

The BIPOC community has traditionally had a fraught relationship with police due to historical, present, and systemic racist practices. As noted above, recent high profile police interactions with members of the BIPOC community contributed to a lack of confidence in the police. This lack of confidence, specifically associated with race related complaints, was felt by police officers, and contributed to their use of FIDO. Officer 8 provided a detailed account outlining

their use of FIDO related to citizen monitoring and BIPOC-police interactions. Officer 8, when asked about the FIDO phenomenon, asserted that their treatment of all people, including racialized groups, was the same across the board before they entered the field of policing. This officer stated that after becoming a police officer their treatment of certain individuals, particularly those in BIPOC communities, changed.

> And it's not [a change] in the way you'd think. It's not that I automatically assume someone who is a minority is doing something wrong. It's that you see what's going on in the news and it makes you afraid to approach people. So, it's the reverse.

This view was reflected in the comments of other officers in the sample. Due to the negative perceptions of police held by certain groups in the community and the manner in which officers interacted with BIPOC individuals, some police officers felt their confidence was significantly diminished when in the presence of racially diverse groups of people.

Officer 8's shared an account of an interaction with BIPOC individuals in a large city's entertainment district:

> I have a very specific example. I go up and down, like when you're on a [weekend night] shift, fights don't break out until later, so the first part of the shift, you walk up and down the street, you ask people to pour out their alcohol, you check their IDs and or you write them tickets for drinking in public. You go up to dozens of people. You say, "Sir, can you please pour out your drink? May I have your ID?"

> I don't write people tickets unless it's an offence that's habitual. Like they have five of these tickets so they're clearly not learning their lessons. This particular night I went out and went up to easily you know, a dozen people, all of which happened to be White. No problems. Some would be like, "Oh no it's actually ginger ale." So, I'd be like, "Oh ok, my bad. No problem, have a good night."

> I happened to go up to one person that was a minority and it was…she said, "It's not alcohol, it's pop". And then she says "Is this a Black Lives Matter thing?" And then it was a huge uproar. She's like, "You're only doing this because I am Black." It was just like people yelling at me and there is nothing you can say in that situation to make people think otherwise.

> For the rest of the night, I probably saw a couple more people, but I was hesitant to approach them because I was afraid as being perceived as being racist. I was afraid of being filmed. Society as a whole is sometimes guilty of being extreme leftists, and we jump on bandwagons and automatically assume that everything has to do with race, even though I approached twelve people that were White, and I approach one that wasn't, and it affected the way I did things for the rest of the night.

The incident described by Officer 8 involved a situation in which a routine liquor and ID check developed into a racially charged incident. In this situation, Officer 8 noted that their behaviour

following the initial encounter changed for the remainder of the shift, and further, had an impact beyond that evening. Another important consideration in this example was that, public perception did not always equate to the reality of police work. In other words, in this example, Officer 8 described the public as not knowing or recognizing that only one in a series of police checks involved a Black individual.

Despite policing's highly visible nature, there are many aspects of policing that go beyond what is immediately apparent to the public. Operational police work requires specialized training that most members of the public are not privy to. Although there are limitations and weaknesses associated with police training and operations in the field, there remains a lack of knowledge among the general public regarding the police role. Many of the officers noted that police agency efforts to educate members of the public was largely absent. They believed that increased awareness and education regarding the various challenges and realities of police work could have contributed to a greater amount of support and understanding of the police role and legal authorities.

Officer 8 described how this encounter "definitely changed the way that I do things and interact" and "it's something I have thought a lot about in the last year." This officer felt that the socio-political environment regarding race and the police meant that this interaction was of particular interest to the crowd and that any video footage would have been fashioned to incriminate the officer. This officer also described the tensions that often existed between the BIPOC community and those in law enforcement and acknowledged that this had to be addressed in order to move forward. Inherent in this effort was the need to "address racial tensions and injustices that have happened", and education and discourse were a critical component to this effort (Officer 8).

There are a variety of reasons why police officers may engage in FIDO; however, based on officer accounts in this study, citizen monitoring could be a significant contributing factor. Especially in an era of heightened tensions between police and the BIPOC community, it seemed some police might, in an effort to calculate benefits and limitations, decide police wrongdoing or perceived wrongdoing could be more harshly punished and more easily detected than inaction. A range of potential solutions could be posed aimed at combating FIDO, including programs and initiatives targeting public knowledge of policing duties, efforts to strengthen relationships

143

between police and BIPOC communities, and increased departmental support in line level officers.

5.3.11. Citizen Monitoring and its Impact on Less Experienced Officers

As noted in Chapter Three, a previous exploratory study of the impact of citizen monitoring of police found younger and less experienced police officers were typically more susceptible to the stressors of citizen monitoring. The officers in both studies noted that lack of experience, which was often coupled with younger age, could contribute to more apparent responses to citizen monitoring. Despite extensive training, the significance of police authorities and their role tended to weigh on younger/less experienced officers. They might face concerns regarding job security, departmental scrutiny, and public perceptions simply because of their limited tenure within their respective agencies. As participants noted, this could be exacerbated in the presence of citizens wielding cameras. In particular, younger police officers grew up in the era of social media, and thus might be more aware of the severe consequences "going viral" could have. Several officers shared their views regarding the impact age and experience on their perception of citizen monitoring:

> Younger officers might worry this could be my job on the line... There is a guy I used to work with, great member, like 25 years with the RCMP. He's honestly not scared to deal with any situation. Whenever, wherever. I think, I mean, that's a common thing that I've heard. Maybe they're not used to it as much, so they just don't realize the reality of how many people are actually filming and stuff like that…because even 10 years ago, it wasn't like that. (Officer 14)

> Sometimes you'll see newer officers who are not as experienced, they may be apprehensive in engaging, they might hesitate in taking action because in the back of their head they might be thinking, "well I might get in trouble for doing that". It's that slippery slope that you worry about the consequences, but there is a duty to act, too. You often see that with a lot of newer recruits. Even at the academy in the simulations, you see them hesitate to get in there. They're not sure of their grounds or if they're justified in doing that. I think yeah that maybe just comes with experience but it's hard to say. (Officer 5)

> You just don't expect it and things can escalate in a split second and it becomes different where people are watching with their cameras. (Officer 8)

> Twenty or thirty years ago a phone with a camera was non-existent and in this day, we live in an age of technology that's growing exponentially and the cameras are only getting better on these phones, the data, and how fast it connects to social media. Now you're connected to everyone. I think it's more my generation that's using those cameras and they know how to use them, and they'll be quick to film any interaction that there is. (Officer 2)

As a junior officer you haven't been exposed to certain situations in different times. (Officer 1)

Most participants recognized the impact age and time on the job had on police officers' experiences with citizen monitoring. Certainly, lack of experience could cause individuals in any profession to be reticent to outside scrutiny. However, police officers hold significant authority over the general public and possess the ability to use force, including lethal force, which necessitates a strong sense of confidence in their role.

The authority that police officers had as part of their job could be a stressor in itself. When coupled with the presence of citizen monitoring, stressors were amplified. Those stressors could include the use of force, legal authority, and public interactions. Although extensive training was required to become a police officer, training did not necessarily equate to mastery and confidence. Some police skills, such as communication or, as it was dubbed in policing circles, "verbal judo", were employed on a daily basis by police officers. Others, such as use of force, were less frequently called upon, and yet, improper use of force or abuse of force had far greater consequences for both the police officer(s) involved and the public than poor communication skills did. Because of this, the presence of citizen monitoring could provide an added layer of complexity to any given police-citizen encounter, particularly those in which force was used or required.

Officer 8 described how significant stressors could be for junior officers, particularly when coupled with citizen monitoring:

> Oh yeah. I mean, when you're first on, you're hesitant about everything. There is so much to learn in this job. You're treated differently when you're in uniform and you're not used to being treated that way. When you're first on [the job], there is so much to learn about your powers and your authorities. What you can do, what you can't do. In addition, there are all these added social stressors. You want to fit in with your squad and fit in with your department. There are a million things to learn and I think use of force is the hardest because it's the thing we used the least. It's something we use in such a small fraction of cases that we don't get practice with it. I practice my quote unquote verbal judo every day. I talk to people every day. I mean the amount of mental health apprehensions we have is like astonishing. You're practicing that every day and you get really good at it. You do not get good at use of force. You don't practice that often because you don't use it that often. The times that I have gone into situations and have had to use force, I was not prepared for those situations. It's that it's unexpected. I didn't expect to use force. I wasn't in that mindset. It's not like in other calls where I know that I am going to have to talk to someone and assess their mental state. You're more prepared for that. I am still hesitant to use force because I am junior.

When stressors were accompanied with citizen monitoring, they sometimes had a significant impact on police confidence, particularly among junior officers. The officers also noted, that as experience with use of force increased, confidence increased also.

One officer described a slightly different experience for junior police officers. Officer 17, an officer with a significant amount of experience in the field, suggested that citizen monitoring could impact junior level officers' behaviours because of their career objectives. This officer argued that police officers entering the field had a specific career focus and drive that was not as apparent among officers who had entered the field in a previous generation. Officer 17 stated:

> [Officers entering policing now] are like, "OK, I want to do five years on the street and then I want to go to the drug section, and then I want to get promoted. They're very intelligent and they have a road map already drawn out.

Because of their specific focus, Officer 17 suggested junior officers were particularly attuned to the impact negative public perceptions resulting from citizen monitoring could have on their career trajectory. According to this officer, junior officers might witness interactions going "sideways" and producing a negative impact. As a result, Officer 17 stated:

> They see it happening to others and they're like, that's not happening to me in my career. And like I mentioned earlier, if they want to apply to a specialty section, it's put on your file, even if somebody's complained about you and it's not concluded, it can still impact your mobility, right. So, they're very tactical about it. They can get written off as selfish millennials, but I don't think it's as cut and dried like that. I think it's much more nuanced than that.

Officer 17 explained that this awareness of the negative consequences of citizen monitoring could cause junior officers to hesitate more than more experienced officers. While this analysis was not shared by all participants, it seemed a valid observation. Although other participants noted the impact experience had in one's ability to manage citizen monitoring, it seemed that Officer 17 took their observations a step further.

5.3.12. Citizen Monitoring and Departmental Support

A common point of discussion among the officers was the role of the level of support that frontline officers received from their respective departments. Among the officers, there was a differentiation between perceived levels of support within the RCMP compared to municipal police agencies. In general, the officers employed by the RCMP felt less supported than those employed by municipal agencies.

A major reason for stronger perceived support within municipal agencies was the existence of a police union. Several of the officers highlighted the important role of police unions:

> We have a union that represents us, counselling service to support you if you needed it…I think really depends on like, um, you know I am not saying unions are good or bad, but the RCMP for example do not have a union so if they get investigated, they're kind of on their own. Whereas if you have a union rep or legal representation, it kind of helps you out, right, so you're not in it by yourself. (Officer 5)

> That's a good thing because we do have a union and the RCMP don't have a union and when they're in situations where there is a camera or they're filmed in a negative light, they don't know how to act. Before I even submit a statement to someone at [professional standards], I have a union rep who says no write your statement and I will review it first. (Officer 12)

> I mean we have a great union. (Officer 23)

These officers viewed the unions as providing support to their members in cases where an incident involving citizen monitoring required an investigation[53].

A factor identified as one that contributed to departmental support or lack thereof related to the severity of an incident. Several of the officers noted that their department was more likely to provide support in cases involving serious incidents. Officer 10 recounted a high-profile, police-involved shooting and provided an analysis of departmental response to various incidents:

> The department had his back because he didn't do anything wrong, and they had his back for it. If the worst happens, they'll have your back. They'll get you a high-priced lawyer and they'll defend you for doing your job. It's the little stuff that you have to worry about where it's easier for them to just be like "Yeah, give him that small charge." It's easier for the department. You're like, "Oh, thanks guys" …It's the stuff that's going to complicate your career but it's not going to get you fired. It's the stuff that's going to prevent you from getting promoted and getting into the section you want to get into. It has a long-term effect.

This example identified some of the responses police agencies might give to incidents with differing degrees of severity. While, as Officer 10 suggested, departments might be more inclined to provide support for members who were involved in high-profile incidents, officers involved in comparably less serious incidents were left to fend for themselves. Officer 7 provided an example in which a serious incident captured by citizen monitoring elicited departmental support, saying,

---

[53] Note that the RCMP now has a union, the National Police Federation and this may become a source of support for RCMP officers, similar to their municipal police counterparts.

"The new chief came out and 100% stood by him…and even the letter the chief wrote to the [oversight body]. That was great." Officer 23 argued that the possible outcomes of a lack of departmental support are substantial. For example, they argued that it could lead to depression and a significant disconnection from an officer's peer group. Further, Officer 23 said: "I think that's where we tend to lose a lot of people – the organizational reality and an individual's perception of how they're being treated." Participants clearly expressed that departmental support was critical in terms of providing officers with the confidence to confront citizen monitoring.

Police have the authority to use lethal force, and, as a result, incidents involving high levels of force are subject to independent investigative oversight, in addition to whatever informal oversight might occur through citizen monitoring. The officers discussed the impact the formal oversight process could have on morale within the department, and further, how it contributed to perceptions of oversight, including informal oversight such as citizen monitoring, overall:

> It doesn't work the way it's supposed to. I am all for civilian oversight, but the way it's organized and the way it works is so ineffective and so awful that it's not doing its job. And then we have to worry about that. It's our lives being affected. (Officer 10)

> We're scared to go into scenes now [because of oversight]. (Officer 14)

> I don't even have to tell you how much trust there is with the ***[54]. That's an even bigger fear. If it's an even bigger situation where someone is injured and the ***[55] comes in, that's not a good situation. (Officer 10)

When commenting on formal oversight, many participants expressed negative views about civilian oversight in particular.

The officers shared that they felt their departments engaged in a cost-benefit analysis in order to determine whether or not to provide support for members who had been subjected to citizen monitoring. Officer 10 offered an explanation for this:

> In instances where video is included, well, if you end up the next person on the news taking down somebody, and it looks really bad, is the department going to look better or worse by depending on you? That's the concern…That's the problem. It's really, really terrifying. It is. It's a constant concern.

Officer 11 shared a similar perspective when discussing concerns surrounding departmental support for members who had acted professionally and appropriately while subjected to citizen

---

[54] Oversight body.
[55] Oversight body.

monitoring. This officer spoke of individuals who had been filmed and had "been treated not maybe as accurately as it could in the media and then our department has initiated an investigation and forwarded it to the [oversight body] and to me, that is just despicable that they would do that."

5.4. Conclusion

This chapter indicated that citizen monitoring, despite being a relatively new phenomenon, had several notable perceived impacts on police officers and their use of force. Widespread cellphone and social media usership contributed to an environment in which citizen monitoring was increasingly prevalent. The interviews analysed in this chapter represented the Canadian cohort of this study. In the interviews discussed here, Canadian police officers described their perceptions of the impacts and challenges citizen monitoring had on their role, including their use of force. The findings discussed in this chapter identified a number of key impacts related to citizen monitoring and officer behaviour and decision making.

This chapter identified four significant findings related to citizen monitoring. First, the interviews in this chapter indicated that awareness of being recorded can create a lack of confidence among officers regarding their public image, leading to potential changes in police officer conduct. This lack of confidence appeared to be more significant among police officers who were either new on the job, young, or both, and had had little time in the field. Second, the interviews indicated that among some police officers, citizen monitoring sometimes contributed to situations in which the force option(s) used were less than was either required or necessary. Third, citizen monitoring had the potential to create situations in which police officers hesitated in situations that necessitated immediate, direct, and decisive action. Lastly, citizen monitoring might, in some circumstances, have contributed to officers entirely by-passing situations that required action of some sort. This is known as the FIDO effect, and based on interviews, sometimes occurred in interactions involving BIPOC individuals out of concern that citizen monitoring could misinterpret the encounter.

Police work is dynamic and requires that officers are able to make split-second decisions under challenging conditions. Police officers must be able to withstand psychological and physical stressors and are required to make life and death decisions under these conditions. The introduction of citizen monitoring in these situations can serve to complicate decision making and

impact officer confidence. The findings presented in this chapter provided an important exploration of citizen monitoring and its impacts on Canadian police officers in a variety of contexts. In order to better understand the phenomenon and its effects, further research is recommended.

Dat is van politie werk erg onderschat. Je moet soms in bepaalden korte tijd moet je juist de kuezen maken. En als dat ook nog gefilmed word en die keus had beter gekund dan is het al gebeurt en is het al geframed en de wereld in geslingerd en dan is het heel lastig om de goeie dingen to doen. De goeie dingen en de intentie om goeie dingen te doen, die is er wel voor iedereen, maar in een split-second moet je het wel laten zien. (Officer 31)

That is a very underestimated part of police work. Sometimes you have to make the right choices quickly, and if that is filmed, certain choices are already made and those choices are framed in a particular way and are shared with the world. That is when it is very hard to do the right things. The good things and the intention to do good things is there for everyone, but you have to show it in a split second. (Officer 31)

Chapter 6. Dutch Findings

This chapter presents the findings from interviews conducted with officers in the Dutch National Police. Twenty-four sworn officers employed by the Korps Nationale Politie (Dutch National Police, also known as the National Police Corps) were interviewed. Participants worked in various parts of the country, some in large urban centres and others in smaller cities. The Netherlands is much smaller in area than Canada is, but it is much more densely populated; therefore, there is no dedicated remote policing. There was significant variation in years of service and positions and ranks held among the officers who were interviewed.

Participants were asked a series of questions, which were presented to them in an Interview Guide (see Appendix C). Interview questions were pre-emptively translated from English to Dutch and participants were given the option of reading the question in Dutch or hearing the question in English and referring to the question in Dutch when necessary. The majority of participants were comfortable with English and only consulted the Dutch questions occasionally. The Interview Guide for both the Dutch and Canadian samples were the same and consisted of carefully developed questions and prompts. As was the case in the Canadian interviews, interviews with the Dutch participants sometimes deviated from the questions prepared, allowing the participants freedom to elaborate when needed. Typically, the interview participants shared other relevant information during the conversation. This was welcomed, particularly in the Netherlands where the Primary Investigator (PI) was less familiar with the policing system.

Following the interview process, interviews were transcribed and coded to determine key themes. Aside from translation from Dutch to English where necessary, this process was identical to that applied to the Canadian interviews. During the coding process, some themes unique to the Dutch interviews emerged, but generally the major areas of focus were fairly consistent. The themes that emerged are discussed in this chapter. Further discussion will take place in Chapter 7.

Chapter 6 presents the findings from the interviews that were conducted with the Dutch officers. The purpose of the interviews was to understand the impact of citizen monitoring on the officers' decision making in encounter situations, in particular with respect to the use of force. Because of the PI's ability to speak and understand Dutch, participants were able to share their experiences freely and without concern of any language barrier. This enabled participants to

provide rich responses that contributed to a better understanding of citizen monitoring generally, and, specifically, in the Netherlands.

6.1. Front Line Police Work

Despite the differences in terms of policing environment, namely, more urban-centric, and context, namely, demographics, frontline policing in the Netherlands was not dissimilar to frontline policing in Canada. Police officers engaged in proactive and reactive police work in a comparable fashion. Understanding the dynamics of frontline police work is important in this study because citizen monitoring tends to occur on the frontlines and to patrol level officers. Participants were asked about their experiences with frontline police work and a number of notable themes emerged in their responses. In this section, the intricacies of frontline police work are explored. In addition, this section of Chapter 6 discusses the impact of citizen monitoring on frontline police work.

6.1.1. "Scherp Zijn[56]"

The nature of police work is dynamic and police officers often respond to a variety of calls in the course of a day's work. Although many participants noted that the very nature of an ever-changing work environment was what drew them to the job, it also contributed to significant stress. Working on the frontlines required frequent and sustained interactions with the public, often during challenging encounters. Participants provided examples of this, saying:

> One moment you can go to a call, uh, and just talk to people, a man and his wife who are having an argument and then you are the negotiator and next call can be about guys fighting each other using knives and sticks, so you've got to switch between being the negotiator and I don't know. (Officer 32)

> The front lines are not predictable. One moment you're dealing with a traffic accident and the next moment it's a burglary or something else so it's very dynamic. (Officer 29)

> The first call is a stabbing. The second call is a high-speed chase that ended in a crash. That happened today. It happened. The guy who crashed the car ran from the police as well. The next call might be an elderly lady who fell down the stairs and needs help or kids playing soccer in a garage where they're not allowed to go. You still have to control the emotions from the other things and if somebody gives you 'big mouth', you'll probably be likely to feel the energy from the last calls as well because everything is happening within a few hours. That's the problem with the front line. (Officer 27)

---

[56] "You must be sharp."

When the work…het werk zoals ik nu heb (like I have now), on the frontline, you go to an incident, you don't know what you will find there. (Officer 35)

You don't know what you're going to start your shift with and you actually don't know what you're doing to do that day. You don't know what calls you're going to get and you don't know what interactions you're going to get. You even know what time you're going to get called and what interactions you're going to get. (Officer 25)

Participants spoke of the challenges they faced when going from one difficult incident to the next, never quite knowing what to expect. Officer 33 illustrated this when they explained that working on the frontlines required constant preparation for the unknown. For instance, "if you're a front-line officer, you get a call of a missing cat and them someone crazy turns up and you need to arrest someone" (Officer 33). The participant was speaking to the fact that a seemingly innocuous call might result in an arrest or something more serious.

Some participants shared that the dynamic and uncertain nature of police work meant that the job required intense and continuous focus and concentration. Officer 29 spoke of the attention required in police work, saying, "You have to react fast and change in mindset." The wide variety of skills required and the potentially complicated nature of any given interaction, necessitated a steady level of alertness for the safety of both the officers and the public. Officer 33 stated that police officers "moeten scherp zijn", meaning, they "must be sharp." This participant followed up the statement by saying, "I always think, OK, what's going to happen? What are the risks? The most important is your own safety and then my colleagues and then [the people] around you." Officer 27 also addressed this. "You don't know what to expect. Was there any violence? Was there anyone hurt? Are there children involved?" Participants stressed the importance of constant focus and alertness for police officers working on the frontlines to mitigate adverse risks. Officer 32 emphasized that law enforcement officials had to maintain a challenging balance– that is, they had to ensure they were able to build rapport with community members, but they also had to be aware of risks and be prepared to act. Regarding this, Officer 32 said:

Officer 32: When you're outside you got to be focussed all the time. Of course, I try to be relaxed, I try to be um, easy-going, but you still have to be focussed because when I talk to someone who is really nice, you always got to look around you and scan the area— maybe it's just a distraction, that guy is talking to you really nice while someone else is breaking in somewhere so you got to be focussed all the time. Yeah, yeah, that's the hard part of the job, to be able to constantly be focussed, yeah, I don't know how you really say it in English, but schakellen tussen rustig zijn dan weer heel erg in het geweld zitten en dan weer rustig[57].

---

[57] "switching between being calm and being very much in the violence again and then being calm again."

PI: Oh, so like the balance between or like negotiating between calm and having...

Officer 32: Yeah, yeah! So, for example one moment you can go to a call, uh, and just talk to people, a man and his wife who are having an argument and then you are the negotiator and next call can be about guys fighting each other using knives and sticks, so you got to switch between being the negotiator and I don't know…

This balancing act was challenging for police officers and required significant concentration. It was, necessarily, an essential part of their role in society and was part of what they had been trained to expect; nevertheless, it was, sometimes, difficult for police officers to manage.

The variable nature of policing was illustrated by participants when they called themselves a "Jack of all trades". The demands and challenges that were ubiquitous for the frontline police officers dealing with varied and everchanging calls were exacerbated by the presence of citizen monitoring. Officer 40 noted both the prevalence of citizen monitoring and also the difficulty it presented: "if you walk to the car [during traffic control], open the window and pop, a camera!" The presence of a camera, particularly if it interfered with a police officer's duties, presented an added complication to an already intrinsically dynamic situation. Reference to this was also made during a discussion about the presence of citizen monitoring in nightclub environments. Often fights broke out, and, as Officer 40 shared, during those fights, citizen monitoring almost always occurred: "There is fighting. We are as police officers separating fights or we have to fight with them and every people's fighting and next day, Facebook, Twitter, everywhere." During dynamic encounters such as those which involved a fight, police attention was further diverted and thereby challenged when citizen monitoring was also a factor.

6.1.2. A Different Kind of "first responder"

Police officers are part of the larger group known as first responders. Also in this group are Emergency Medical Services personnel (EMS) or paramedics, and firefighters. Of these, police officers are, typically, viewed with the most scepticism. This was noted by several participants. They found this to be a particularly disappointing aspect of frontline policing. Officer 42 said,

Because nobody blames the fireman that there was a fire in your home and when something bad happens to you there is little bit pointed to the police because why didn't we prevent it, why did we fail in the safe conditions in the total society.

This perceived lack of support from members of the public was noted as being a challenging aspect of frontline police work, particularly when comparing the role to others classified as first

responders. Several participants referenced the phrase "De Politie is je beste vriend." ("The police officer is your best friend.") One participant shared that this saying was significant when they first began their career as a police officer but said that over time the saying had lost its relevance to the point of being untrue. Officer 29 stated, "we don't always have to be your friend…sometimes you have to use force or be strict." This is an important aspect of policing – after all, the police role exists in order to uphold the law and to maintain order. Force can be a necessary part of this role.

The nature of frontline police work mandates that officers respond to a wide variety of calls throughout a typical shift or a block of shifts. Officer 42 said, "we see everything". As first responders, police officers are often the first on the scene of an incident or crime; however, they are also required to engage in proactive police work. Proactive police work is defined as "police, acting on their own initiative, [to] develop information about crime and strategies for its suppression" (Crank, 1998; p. 244-245). Officer 38 addressed proactive police work: "The thing about police work is that you have to sniff it out with your nose. When something happens, you stand in the front." As this participant stated, their policing efforts involved proactive work even though much of the work was intrinsically reactive. Reactive police work involves responding to immediate calls for service and follow up investigations. Both reactive and proactive police work can involve dynamic and unexpected situations. Officer 32 spoke to this when they discussed the need to be prepared to switch from calm to heightened levels of tension in an instant.

Although many participants shared that the complex nature of police work was what drew them to the job, they also noted that it was not without its challenges. The police officers interviewed shared their perceptions that they faced more criticism than other first responder dealing with similar volatility in the workplace. Officer 30 spoke of this challenge when they detailed their time working as a youth officer:

> Sometimes I have to deal with beaten children or neglected children but they're still the most precious thing people have and when I tell them they're not doing [parenting] well, they feel an immediate attack. I got a lot of complaints during that time because people get very emotion [sic]. They can't think right. They see you as an enemy. (Officer 30)

As this participant noted, efforts to assist civilians and to ensure actions taken put the interest of children first, could be perceived as personal attacks. While some first responders were seen as being 'heroes', police officers felt they were sometimes seen as 'villains'. Some participants

shared that they felt the expectations the public had of them was unrealistic: "We can't replace mountains and we can't do [sic] miracles." (Officer 43).

6.1.3. Visibility: "Living under a 'vergrootglas[58]'"

Police officers are the most visible members of the criminal justice system. Their distinguishable uniforms and marked vehicles ensure that members of the public can easily identify them. Visibility is an important component of the police role in society; however, it also presents certain challenges. An exploration regarding the visible nature of the police role was central to this research. While visibility will be addressed in more detail later in this chapter, a foundational discussion of the topic is presented here.

When asked about frontline policing, most participants raised the topic of visibility early in their response. Participants understood that, for the most part, visibility in their role was unavoidable, and even compulsory. Police visibility is intended to create a sense of ease among the civilian population. If civilians can clearly identify police officers, they know who to turn to when they require assistance. Further, according to the tenets of deterrence theory, the visibility of police officers as they are engaged in patrol work has certain deterrent properties. The perceived cost of participating in criminal behaviour outweighs the perceived benefits when visible police officers in the area present the potential of detection and apprehension.

Despite the necessity of police visibility, participants shared that the visible nature of their role presented them with unique challenges and considerations while working. Officer 39 said, "A uniform attracts attention so immediately people are focused on you, and you have to be very aware of that." Many participants spoke of the attention they received because of their uniforms and shared that it felt as though members of the public "put [them] in a glass box" (Officer 42). This participant added that police officers often felt as though their work placed them under a "vergrootglas"[1]. The visible nature of their work meant that they were open to scrutiny and criticism from the public.

Police have become subject to an added layer of visibility with the introduction and advancement of smart phone technology. These technological developments have enabled members of the public to easily record and disseminate footage of police officers engaged in their

---

[58] "magnifying glass"

work. Participants shared that since the emergence of smartphone technology, they felt a heightened sense of visibility. Officer 42 remarked that visibility was a key characteristic of policing and had been since its inception; however, "now it's more. They're watching us more and more each year." Officer 40 shared that smartphone technology had made police visibility increasingly prominent and had changed the environment in which police officers worked: "If we run them doing traffic control, you walk to the car, open the window, and *pop,* a camera!" Participants shared that they frequently saw video footage of them or of their colleagues appear on Facebook or Twitter after they have been involved in separating fights or incidents which required the use of physical force.

The new form of visibility that emerged with smart phone technology presented challenges officers spoke to. Officer 39 said, "If there's an incident of course or if something happens, people tend to use their cell phone which is a challenge." Because the public generally lacks knowledge regarding the intricacies of police work, they may perceive an action as police misconduct or as inappropriate police behaviour, when, in fact, it should not be classified as such given the way the incident evolved and the protocols legally available and necessary for police interventions. Officer 40 spoke of this:

> [My colleague] said it's *way* different than it was in the past and even now the police cannot respond in the say way that they did in the 80s because now someone is always watching you. Even if you're doing something that is lawful, it might not look very good and because of that, you don't want to respond that way.

The challenges associated with inaccurate public perception of the police, particularly those exacerbated by the new visibility, potentially created a difficult work environment for law enforcement officers. Participants understood that, generally, members of the public were legally justified to film police officers. For example, Officer 42 said, "They can make pictures [sic] or take a video of our actions and there is no law about that." Participants shared that the perceived intentions behind the act of filming officers generally seemed malicious and obtrusive. Officer 34 spoke of this:

> If I need to go to a crime scene or help somebody or perform medical aid or whatever and someone gets into my face with a camera? He is in the way. He needs to get out of the way.

Generally, participants seemed to understand and accept that their already public role had an added level of visibility with the advent and ubiquitous nature of smartphone use. As Officer 28 noted, "the whole world can watch what you're doing." For many officers, policing's new visibility

was not seen as an overwhelmingly positive advancement. For instance, Officer 40 said, "It's not fun and it's not good, and maybe it's even bad."

6.1.4. Us Versus Them

Some participants felt that there had been a significant increase in polarization between members of the public and the police in the Netherlands. The police role is, by nature, highly visible. Although the visibility of police is intended to provide some members of the public with a sense of ease, it can also amplify "us versus them" sentiments. During their interview, Officer 42 indicated that in the Netherlands "polarization is one of the major issues". This polarization could have been exacerbated by the changing demographics of Dutch society. For instance, Officer 42 added to their statement by indicating that polarization existed because of income and education disparities, and generational differences.

Other participants shared that the growing "us versus them" sentiment produced aggression and a lack of respect among members of the public (Officer 40). This aggression could be perpetrated by individuals whose behaviour was characterized as anti-social. Officer 40 offered a description, saying, "Maybe in the streets they are sitting at the car with four boys [and] you ask what they are doing here. 'Oh, just chilling.' Yeah, on a Wednesday night." Interactions such as the one described were common and, according to participants, showed a lack of respect, a tendency for aggressive encounters, and an intensifying of the "us versus them" sentiment.

The attention derived from the uniform contributed to public attention, and occasionally this attention led to negative interactions. Officer 39 said:

> A uniform attracts attention so to say so immediately people are focused on your and you have to be very aware of that. It also means that if there's an incident, of course, or if something happens, people tend to…something that happens quite often here, people use their cell phones.

The police uniform and marked patrol vehicles serve a purpose. Their visible nature ensures that civilians can quickly and easily identify the police and while this visibility is meant to instill confidence in both police and civilians, participants indicated that citizen monitoring facilitated a kind of surveillance that was sometimes used to undermine police work.

6.1.5. Split-Second Decision Making

Police officers are required to analyze and assess situations with limited information and little time. They must act on their assessment and hesitation in their action can have a detrimental impact on the outcome of an encounter. Participants shared that while this sort of decision making was an essential component of frontline police work, it also presented a major challenge. There were many aspects of split-second decision making that were difficult for police officers to manage and one of these difficulties was associated with the potentially dynamic nature of any given incident. Officer 42 offered insight, saying:

> Well, the difference is that we have to make a decision in a split second and that decision depends really on the occasion. That occasion every single time is different so there's not just protocol to react on a call. Everything has to be done in a split second. If we go in to shoot, or if we go to arrest somebody, if we go to defend ourselves, if we go to defend some other people. yeah, it's a split second.

Officer 31 shared similar sentiments but added that split-second decision making was further complicated by the presence of citizen monitoring:

> Dat is van politie werk erg onderschat. Je moet soms in bepaalden korte tijd moet je juist de kuezen maken. En als dat ook nog gefilmed word en die keus had beter gekund dan is het al gebeurt en is het al geframed en de wereld in geslingerd en dan is het heel lastig is de goeie dingen to doen. De goeie dingen en de intentie om goeie dingen te doen, die is er wel voor iedereen, maar in een split-second moet je het wel laten zien.[59] (Officer 31)

Because of the dynamic nature of policing, split-second decision making occurred frequently and had to be executed with confidence for the purpose of safety and the proper function of police work. As participants like Officer 31 shared, this was increasingly challenging when in the presence of members of the public engaged in citizen monitoring.

Many of the police officers interviewed shared that the reason they went into policing was because of the work's dynamic nature. Officer 38 explained that they went into police work because "you have to sniff things out with your nose." Officer 42 said, "We want to get involved with something. A boring shift is not nice. Something has to happen, some action." Similarly,

---

[59] "That is a very underestimated part of police work. Sometimes you have to make the right choices quickly, and if that is filmed, certain choices are already made and those choices are framed in a particular way and are shared with the world. That is when it is very hard to do the right things. The good things and the intention to do good things is there for everyone, but you have to show it in a split second." (Officer 31)

Officer 35 said, "when you're on the frontline, you go to an incident, and you don't know what you will find there." Essentially, this participant and others were drawn to work that occurred "in the heat of the moment" (Officer 36). The need to make a decision in a split second and during "the heat of the moment" presented unique challenges.

Officer 41 shared that the public often had beliefs about how a situation could have and should have been handled, despite a lack of knowledge around policing related issues. These opinions expressed by the public were difficult to manage, particularly on the front lines:

> We often have to make decisions in a split second…for example, that girl that was murdered. The public tells us we should have and could have…they say we should have done something. We are confronted by people's dissatisfaction. We hear about it. In the office, they are not as affected by this. But we walk the street. We have to hear this. At a desk you're not bothered by that. (Officer 41)

In addition to managing public opinions, police officers must manage the repercussions from the decisions made. Participants shared that because decisions must be made in the moment, sometimes information was not available to inform the best possible course of action. Regardless of information being accessible, a decision had to be made to de-escalate the situation in a manner that was safest for the attending police officer(s), the subject(s), and any bystanders. Officer 36 spoke to this challenge, saying,

> Because you're a frontline officer, you always get there first. So, you get there in the heat of the moment. And when you're a detective, you get there afterwards and then the heat is gone. It's getting quite easy, so you have the time to look for solutions. But in the heat of the moment, you have a decision to make – it isn't always the right decision – but you make a decision, and you follow it up. (Officer 36)

Officer 33 stated that decision making in a split second was challenging because it required acting as if it were second nature. This implied that the action was done with little thought. Officer 33 explained that this, naturally, had drawbacks, "On one side, [the decision] is part of your nature, but on the other side, you don't want it to be part of your nature because then it becomes routine and maybe you get distracted by its routine." In other words, Officer 33 suggested that it was possible for police to become complacent when making split-second decisions. This point underscored the tenuous and delicate nature of split-second decision making. Interview results established that split-second decision making was a key, yet complicated, component of frontline policing.

6.1.6. Public Perception of the Police

The interview schedule developed for this project addressed the topic of public perception of the police. Public perception and approval ratings are often used as a key performance indicator. Typically, participants indicated they felt those engaged in citizen monitoring had a negative perception of the police and their intention in recording police activities was malicious. If their footage taken or edited to support their particular bias was then uploaded for general viewing, it sometimes served to negatively influence the perception of those who viewed it.

Those participants who saw a shift in public perception of
police over the course of their career

Some participants noticed a marked shift in public perception that had taken place over the course of their career. Specifically, participants noted that at the start of their career, the public had greater respect for the police. They found that over time, respect diminished and that police now were met with greater apathy than in the past, and on occasion, even with disrespect. For example, Officer 43 explained that as a child, they felt the public looked up to the police, but over the course of their career, they had watched that respect shift. Officer 38 said "slowly, slowly we've lost the respect [of the public]". That shift contributed to members of the public who "don't like the police" (Officer 42). Officer 33 referenced a recent Dutch study that concluded that the majority of the public in their jurisdiction were anti-police. Officer 41 said that public perception of the police had changed significantly over the course of their career: "In the past, people accepted the police." When their career began, Officer 41 said, the public respected the police and their authority. Today, however, "that respect is gone, and through social media, everything is seen on the camera." (Officer 41). The lack of respect to which many participants referred was, in their opinion, caused, at least in part, by the emergence of smart phone technology and the ease with which the public could survey, record and share police activities.

Some participants noted that the shift coincided with the emergence of social media. Social media, according to participants, acted as a tool to perpetuate misinformation about the police and to develop anti-police sentiments. Participants shared that social media and the impact it had on operational police work constituted a major change they had observed in policing:

"Everything has changed with the development of social media." (Officer 33)

"I notice a big difference because when there's an incident, people don't react here. They react by grabbing their phones and just [take] a picture or [take] a film." (Officer 28)

"[Some groups of people] are anti-police. You have to deal with that kind of group…They're really against police and that's growing especially the filming and the aggressions against police. That's growing." (Officer 40)

Prior to the emergence of social media, anti-police sentiments might have existed in isolated sub-groups of society. Today, social media enables the public to engage in anti-police discourse and to disseminate anti-police messaging. Despite this, it is important to note that social media can contribute to the proliferation of important and helpful information, and further, that it may be that some negative commentary of the police online could very well be based on fact. Officer 29 argued that the prevalence of social media was something that the police needed to adapt to and grow with.

Most participants who shared that they had noticed a change over time with regard to public perception of the police felt that this change had progressed from positive to negative over the course of their career. Some shared that they had witnessed a change from positive public perceptions to negative, in particular, after a high-profile incident. After a high-profile police incident, certain neighbourhoods found it difficult to maintain trust in the police. Officers 45, 46, and 31 spoke of the challenges they faced in their particular jurisdiction in terms of building rapport and maintaining trust. They shared that their jurisdiction had experienced high profile incidents that had caused the public to question the police and the very public nature of these incidents and subsequent questions impacted their level of trust in law enforcement officials. Officer 45 expressed that such situations made it feel as though the police "take two steps forward and then two steps backward." These circumstances meant that officers felt as though they were "starting over" with members in their community, and this was challenging (Officer 45).

Negative sentiments regarding police were reportedly linked to allegations of past corruption within police forces across the Netherlands. Officer 46 explained that prior to the development of the Dutch National Police, there were serious allegations of corruption, mismanagement, and the squandering of funds. Although the Netherlands now has one unified national police force, memories of corruption remain among some members of the public. This, officers stated, contributed to their distrust in the police. Officer 45, 46, and 31 shared that when members of the public confronted them about this, they did not deny the allegations. Officer 46 shared that, instead, they responded by saying things like, "Maybe that's true." Officer 46

acknowledged that such allegations impacted street level work. Members of the public sometimes commented on their former "boss"[60] or argued that integrity, or a lack thereof, implicated the entire police force. Officer 45, 46, and 31 argued that their strategy to combat this was the use of humour. Officer 46 said, "You can make a little bit of fun of it", implying that the injection of humour helped establish and build rapport with members of the public.

Those participants who felt public perception of the police was primarily positive

Most participants shared that they felt public perception of the police was primarily negative or had changed from positive to negative over the course of their career; however, there were some who felt that the public perception of police was primarily positive. Participants who responded in this manner varied in terms of their years on the job and the geographic regions in which they worked as police officers. One participant said, "I don't think it's really changed" (Officer 35) referring to police work over the course of their career. Another pointed out that the general public responded positively to their presence; however, they had noticed a change in the level of respect (Officer 27). They said, "You have to defend your legitimacy more than you used to." Although this participant noticed a change in public perception, overall, they found that the public had a positive perception of the police. Similarly, Officer 30 stated, "I think it's normal that [the public] change." but added "I don't think there is a lot of questioning your authority."

Of the participants who felt public perceptions of the police were primarily positive, responses varied significantly. While some felt that there was no change to public perception, others felt that a change was natural and to be expected, but that this was not entirely negative. Officer 30 said, "I think the large number of people, 60-70% are just people with a good and bad side, and you have a small part that's really good and a small part that's really bad." It could be that the "bad side" this participant referred to was more obvious to some due to their willingness to record police with their smart phones. Officer 40 said, "I think it is still 60-40[61] because there is a lot of good stuff, with older people who you can help, but I think the negative sentiments are increasing. It's soon going to be 50-50." Officers 42 and 35 felt the perception was positive ("Normally [civilians] do like us."). The variation in responses could be due to a variety of factors including geographic location, confidence in their role, and perceptions and expectations of, and rapport with, the public. Officer 32 noted that the manner in which police responded to members

---

[60] Former "chief" that retired but faced allegations of corruption.
[61] 60% positive, 40% negative

of the public tended to have an impact on public perception of the police: "I see a lot of colleagues walking around here being all *authority*, all *police.*" Officer 47 shared how geographic location can impact perception:

> Depends in which area you are. Certain people really don't like us and there is a good reason for it. Older people like us, kids like us, but some other folks are just against everything, and they don't like that they are told what they can and cannot do.

On the whole, most responses given by the participants indicated that they had witnessed a change from positive to negative citizen perceptions of police over the course of their career.

Those who felt public perception fluctuated depending on numerous variables

Some participants expressed that public perception of police seemed to fluctuate depending on variables such as age, geographic location, socioeconomic status, and media influences. In addition to this, some participants shared that, in ethnic enclaves and areas largely populated by immigrants, political tensions in residents' home countries seemed to have had an impact on the manner in which these individuals engaged with police personnel in the Netherlands. Officer 28 shared that the district in which they worked they work could be particularly impacted as a result of political tension taking place in other parts of the world: "Everyday it's different because of what's happening in the world in this part of the city. You can feel it in the streets." Officer 45 shared a similar account, saying:

> Everything what [sic] happens in the Middle East has its impact here because we've got a lot of nationalities here and they all watch Al Geziera so everything that happens in the Middle East has its impact here. You're outside and people see you.

The tensions that Officers 28 and 45 discussed impacted the interactions some members of the public had with the police, and in turn, possibly affected the way in which police were perceived.

6.2. Use of Force and Use of Force Training

The police profession requires that officers uphold the law and maintain order within society. To this end, police officers are afforded certain powers and authorities, one of these being the use of force. Police officers are trained to use various levels of force, including lethal force and this remains a challenging aspect of the police profession. Although use of force is an inherent and necessary aspect of police work, incidents involving force can be subject to outside scrutiny, particularly if captured by citizen monitoring. It is critical that use of force is guided by appropriate

training, rigorous policies, and measures to ensure accountability. Citizen monitoring may influence use of force, and therefore, it was necessary to discuss use of force and use of force training with the participants of this study.

6.2.1. Use of Force as a Necessary Aspect of Front-Line Police Work

Use of force is a necessary aspect of police work. Police officers must not only feel confident in their application of force and the laws and regulations justifying its use, but they must also be able to make the decision to use force in a 'split second'. The presence of citizen monitoring can add a layer of complexity to the decisions surrounding use of force and its application. The officers interviewed discussed use of force and noted that it was a critical, albeit often challenging, aspect of the police profession. For example, Officer 32 said: "I believe colleagues only use force when they absolutely have to or there is no other way to reach your goals." In some situations, the judicious and decisive use of force is necessary in order to ensure officer safety, protect the public, and maintain order.

Officers spoke of the need to respond to situations in a proportional manner and indicated that this might require the use of force. The ability to use force, when justified and used appropriately, served to resolve potentially dangerous situations, and prevent additional harm. Officer 42 addressed this:

> Officer 42: I'm not holding back on it. When I need to go to action, yeah, I go to action. When I have to hit someone three times, I will hit them 3 times.
>
> Primary Investigator: So, [citizen monitoring] doesn't impact the way you use force?
>
> Officer 42: It was. What I said. It was, but we're getting used to it. I'm getting used to it.

Similarly, Officer 38 spoke of the need to use force decisively in order to prevent additional escalation. They said:

> The times that I've used force, it's just do it, and finished. One strike and it's over…If you're faced with hitting someone, you have to take a step to do it. You cross a threshold, but once you've done it, it's fine.

Use of force is an inherent aspect of police work, and, as participants indicated, when used appropriately, it served as a critical tool in protecting the safety of both the officers and the public. Officer 40 stressed this, saying: "Use of force is a difficult subject, but the accent is always on

safety." When use of force was necessary, the safety of all had to be the officers' primary consideration.

6.2.2. Police Training

Participants discussed police training and identified some of the strengths and weaknesses they experienced. The officers interviewed spoke of the use of force training they received and identified some ways in which the training programs aimed to prepare officers to encounter and manage citizen monitoring. Officer 34 and 40 described the scenarios they underwent while in their training program:

> We get [a scenario] such as something that happens at a scene which has nothing to do with what happens there (i.e., citizen monitoring), so just to irritate us or just to make us aware of what happens. We also have [a tape to review our scenario] for our own, so can take a look at what happened after the incident and learn from our own behaviour." (Officer 34)

> Scenarios and they film you. They ask annoying questions, and you have to make it go away in a legal way. But a solution [to citizen monitoring]? I don't know. In most of these areas they're just filming and filming. (Officer 40)

These participants noted that police training did encompass some focus on citizen monitoring and the challenge it presented in managing dynamic, conflict situations. Despite this, responses like Officer 40's indicated that the scenarios might not be sufficient in preparing officers for encounters with members of the public engaged in citizen monitoring.

Several participants spoke of the deficits of police training. They noted that the skills required in police work needed more time to be developed than they were given during training. Officer 28 said: "When you think of how many times it takes people to master something, it's like thousands of times repeating something, but we have so [few] training moments." Some officers were concerned that their perceived lack of training would be seen as a personal shortcoming, rather than a systemic issue. Officer 43 said: "if the police officer says, I [haven't had enough] training in the last ten years, you will be blamed for it, not the police organization." Although some officers felt the training they received was inadequate, several participants postulated that training would change for the better over time. Officer 36 said, "I do believe that within the next ten years, you'll get trained on how to react to things like citizen monitoring during your education to become a police officer."

6.3. Citizen Monitoring

The aim of this study was to understand the impact citizen monitoring had on the attitudes and experiences of frontline police officers. While Chapter 5 discussed findings related to the Canadian sample of participants, this chapter explores themes related to citizen monitoring as presented by the Dutch sample of participants. This portion of the chapter identifies and expands upon the central themes that emerged from interviews with the Dutch participants. Through a presentation of the interview data, this section describes the perceived impacts citizen monitoring had on frontline policing and, in particular, on the police officer's experience, perceived and otherwise, of use of justified force.

6.3.1. Defining Citizen Monitoring

To briefly reiterate what was discussed earlier in the study, citizen monitoring is a phenomenon that has advanced significantly with the emergence of smart phone technology. Prior to the inception of this technology, although in some instances, technology might have been employed, generally, members of the public monitored police actions and interactions through direct observations. A notorious example of this form of citizen monitoring took place on March 3, 1991, when Rodney King, a Black Los Angeles resident, was beaten by members of the Los Angeles Police Department (LAPD). Footage of this beating was captured by George Holliday, a civilian bystander. This footage offers an early, high profile, and impactful example of the citizen monitoring that is now widespread.

Citizen monitoring has progressed since George Holliday captured Rodney King's attack by the LAPD, and today footage is generally recorded by smartphones and subsequently uploaded to the internet, and in particular, social media platforms like Instagram, TikTok, Twitter, and YouTube. Due to the advancements of smart phone and internet technology, members of the public are able to record and disseminate footage of police quickly and easily. Footage captured by members of the public engaged in citizen monitoring is often intended to identify and combat instances of police abuse of power and misconduct. Indeed, it sometimes does. However, it also has the potential to capture banal and legitimate police encounters and to misinterpret them as instances of police misconduct.

Often, a member of the public activates their camera when they witness something that compels them to do so. In other words, the filming begins in the middle of an incident rather than

at the beginning of what may or may not become an incident. Based on interview data, it seemed that a member of the public was most likely to activate their camera when they witnessed something that they perceived as egregious or as an instance of police misconduct. The civilian population can lack an understanding of the intricacies of police operations, and as such, it is possible that examples of police lawfully exercising their duties can be misinterpreted as misconduct. The fact that citizen monitoring was usually activated once a police encounter had already begun could mean that the critical instigating factors, context, and background of an incident were missing.

Study participants were asked a variety of questions regarding citizen monitoring and, in order to ascertain baseline understanding and perceptions of the phenomenon, they were first asked to define citizen monitoring. Generally, participants' definitions were similar, but some notable differences emerged.

6.3.2. General Definitions

Participants provided insight into citizen monitoring through their definitions of the term. Their definitions ranged in complexity and sophistication; however, all were informed by their personal experiences on the frontlines. Citizen monitoring involves members of the public and, according to participants, civilians of all ages engaged in the activity: "Whether it's an 80-year-old woman or a 5-year-old child, they all have phones! They all have cell phones!" Smartphones are a key component of modern citizen monitoring. They are used to capture footage of the police and they also possess a generative capability, enabling people to share an image or video on the internet with large groups of people instantly.

Participants shared that a notable feature of citizen monitoring was that it was generally permissible and lawful, despite the challenges that citizen monitoring could pose for police. Officer 42 shared: "They can record with their cellphones. They can make pictures of take video of our actions and there is no law about that. They can do it." Officer 33 said, "Everyone knows that when you're in the public or when you're on the street, it's possible for anyone to film you and there is nothing you can do." Officer 31 shared a similar perspective, "Of course, you can film." Officer 37 shared that those engaged in citizen monitoring are often demanding and are brazen in their filming efforts:

> Yeah, and they take you as a person, not as a police officer because they also want to know your name, your number, and that's used as weapon. They say, "I'm filming you, tell

me your name. You should give me your name. I'm a citizen, I want to know your name and you have to give it to me." It's true. I have to make myself known when someone asks it. It's true. I'm not doing it. If someone is doing this, well, you put your phone back and I will give you my name. But that's what they're doing: "look, look, she's not cooperating".

Participants acknowledged that while citizen monitoring was generally permissible and lawful, there were occasions when citizen monitoring was conducted in a disruptive and unlawful manner.

Officer 31 shared a feature of citizen monitoring, saying, "Je gaat filmen je gaat heel dicht bij iiemand staan en die camera in iemands snuffferd houden." ("You're going to film, you're going to get really close to someone and hold that camera in someone's nose.") Several participants provided examples in which members of the public had actively broken the law in order to engage in citizen monitoring. Officer 26 said, "People are breaking the law just to film something exciting. Policing is a hot topic in Holland right now so they're doing everything for it [sic] to film us and say something about it." Further, they shared accounts of instances wherein members of the public had intentionally avoided assisting someone in need in order to engage in citizen monitoring. Officer 26 provided an example of this:

> When we arrive at a scene with a car crash or people fighting, they are always, instead of helping, they are always trying to film it, taking pictures, and yeah, it really annoys me, that, yeah, you should be helping people instead of trying to film it. And of course, when we arrive lots of people are starting to filming us and in our job and sometimes it's really annoying cause when they're right in your face and. Yeah. I guess it's just part of now, this time. Everyone walks around with cell phones.

Although generally conducted in a lawful manner, citizen monitoring was sometimes unlawful, and done without regard for the safety and wellbeing of those involved in the encounter, including the police. This presented various challenges for the police personnel.

Officer 37 provided an example of a specific situation in which members of the public filmed a tragic police incident:

> There was somebody jumped off the bridge but didn't fall in the water but on the concrete. There were people who saw that happening. They were around 15 and 16 years old. They were at my side and looking at this. They were talking to me, and I was arranging immediately psychological help for them. It was too much. I couldn't do my job; I had to be with them. The woman was dead. I couldn't do nothing for her. The ambulance was there, there were coroners. It was obviously a suicide, so we didn't have to have a big investigation. So I went to the two young people…Then I saw someone on the bridge filming what we are doing, and the woman was still there. It was not so busy. It was a quiet street, so it was also busy on the bridge, not under. So, we had the workspace, but there, for me, there was a danger, and it made me really mad. Because I had two people next to

me who might be traumatized for the rest of their lives. And someone is making, like laughing, pictures of someone who's dead?

This incident was troubling for Officer 37 and showcased the lengths to which some individuals would go to capture police activities.

When defining citizen monitoring, participants noted that visibility was one of the central components. They also shared that visibility was central to the policing profession. Officer 26 spoke of this, "At the academy, they're always telling you that you're living in a glass house, and everyone is watching you. You're a police officer 24/7." Citizen monitoring added to the baseline level of visibility that exists naturally in the police profession. Additionally, participants shared that there was always the possibility that an image or video could "go viral" online thereby increasing the already heightened level of visibility that was part of the job. In defining citizen monitoring, Officer 28 said that "The situation citizens love to film: when you have a bad day and you don't respond like normal and it ends in maybe a fight or an arrest. Also not goes very well [sic]. It's material that will go viral." Officer 26 and others also noted that footage captured from instances of citizen monitoring was often subsequently uploaded to websites like YouTube and Dumpert: "That's what you see on YouTube and Dumpert."

6.3.3. Social Media Sites

Social media is a critical element of citizen monitoring. Participants indicated that, typically, this was the way footage of the police was shared online, and through various social media platforms instances of citizen monitoring had the potential to "go viral". Participants shared that members of the public seemed to film them during the course of their work for two main reasons. Participants noted that, first, members of the public sometimes engaged in citizen monitoring because they were interested in police work, and participants felt that the second more frequent reason for of citizen monitoring was that individuals who filmed or photographed them had the specific intention of disseminating the footage online.

Citizen monitoring footage was typically uploaded to social media platforms and to personal blogs. The most frequently discussed social media platforms among Dutch participants were Dumpert and YouTube. Dumpert is a well-known Dutch video and image sharing website where users can upload content and receive "kudos" for their posts. Dumpert compiles the top videos and images of the day for users to view. The use of this platform seemed unique to the Dutch context, certainly when compared to Canadian instances of citizen monitoring. YouTube,

conversely, was used by the Dutch and by Canadians who engaged in citizen monitoring. The video sharing and social media platform had, at the time of study, more than one billion monthly users who collectively viewed over one billion hours of video footage per day. YouTube and Dumpert both had examples of citizen monitoring footage circulating on their respective sites.

Some participants, particularly those who were relatively younger, explained that they appreciated the appeal of these social media and video sharing platforms as they enjoyed using them themselves. Officer 42 said, "Dumpert – it's funny. I'm young, too. It makes me laugh. They put those videos (citizen monitoring footage) up because they know that people will like them. They get money from it." Further, they spoke of the prevalence of citizen monitoring ("Everyone's filming nowadays." (Officer 30). The motivations to share such footage were significant. Participants acknowledged that uploading videos contributed to the growth of the person's social media channel or page; it cultivated influence and clout, and it was potentially financially lucrative. Officer 28 spoke of these social media websites and the potential motivations individuals had to upload footage obtained through citizen monitoring:

> Then it's fun for them to film it and post it. There are some typical Dutch news sites. They bring it into the world they share it, and they have a lot of followers and afterward there are a lot of comments and people will, yeah, they think about that sort of arrest, and they have a typical view about it.

Participants seemed to understand the allure of their work, and further, they recognized the motivations behind the uploading of citizen monitoring footage to social media and video sharing platforms. Despite this, some participants expressed apprehensions in terms of reconciling the assumed reasons for sharing footage obtained through citizen monitoring, and the fact that it occurred and was potentially challenging for police officers to manage.

6.3.4. Conflicting Opinions about Citizen Monitoring

When asked about their opinions of citizen monitoring, participants shared varying views of the phenomenon. While some expressed that they felt citizen monitoring had potentially positive impacts, most voiced a level of concern about the phenomenon. The majority of participants, however, acknowledged that citizen monitoring was unlikely to decrease in its frequency as technologies continued to advance and develop. Those who expressed concern about citizen monitoring included Officers 41 and 36:

"I don't like it because the goal of the film is not positive. It's to make trouble or to disturb the police." (Officer 41)

"It's a problem, citizen monitoring." (Officer 36)

Some participants expressed that they felt neither opposed to, nor in support of, citizen monitoring. Instead, they felt aware and cautious of its presence. For example, Officer 48 said, "I don't think it's good or bad. It's part of "now". It's part of the way people live…It's part of your job, being monitored by everyone." Overall, participants were more likely to share negative sentiments regarding citizen monitoring.

6.3.5. Misinterpreting an Event

One of the primary reasons participants expressed wariness regarding citizen monitoring was due to the potential that existed for footage to be misinterpreted. The majority of participants shared their view that footage of citizen monitoring rarely, if ever, showcased an entire interaction from start to finish. Instead, filming typically began when an observer had witnessed something that compelled them to activate their camera. According to participants, this moment was usually at the height of an incident and did not necessarily take into consideration the portion of the incident that had occurred before a camera was activated, namely, the instigating events.

Participants expressed concern regarding the fragmented nature of citizen monitoring. For instance, Officer 41 said, "I find those films on Facebook etcetera and those films are everywhere, reasonable or not, and also, they're usually fragments, and people believe what they see. It's not even the whole film." This statement exemplified the concerns of most participants who spoke of the many things that could take place in an incident before filming was activated and which often served to clarify police and subject behaviour and could demonstrate that the video footage of what appeared to be an egregious police encounter was, in fact, entirely banal. Officer 36 shared concerns regarding the lack of context in footage obtained through citizen monitoring, saying: "And some things go viral. [It shows you] saying the wrong thing, but without context." This sentiment was echoed by many participants. Some participants even shared that while they were not entirely opposed to citizen monitoring, what concerned them was that the lack of contextualizing details permitted erroneous conclusions to be drawn.

Participants expressed that the "real problem" associated with citizen monitoring was the misinterpretation that could occur when viewers were not provided with "all the information" (Officer 36). Officer 26:

> The big issue with citizen monitoring is that most of the time they start, and they only see from some part of the incident. They didn't see it from the beginning. And then when you form an opinion in something you don't understand, and I think it's bad because you don't understand what's happening.

Compounding the problem was the propensity for videos that captured footage of questionable activity to "go viral". This encouraged those engaged in citizen monitoring to focus on the climax of police events, perhaps willfully ignoring precipitating activities and thereby leading to a heightened interest in the video on social media platforms. Officer 36 shared that this resulted in viewers who started filming when an incident escalated. This contributed to a lack of contextual information and resulted in a "[reaction] to that part of the recording but not to the whole incident." This was further complicated by the fact that the general public had little knowledge of legal protocols and procedures guiding the police profession.

Participants were also quick to acknowledge that there were instances in which police officers "make mistakes" or failed to conduct themselves in a professional manner and in accordance with their training. However, they suggested that unprofessional behaviour occurred less often than professional behaviour did, and conclusions that behaviour exemplified the former was more often a lack of understanding on behalf of the public. Officer 26:

> The citizens have their own meaning about the things we do, and they don't fully understand what our job is and so when we do something they don't understand, they complain about it.

Participants often acknowledged that they understood why members of the public lacked knowledge regarding the police profession. They did not have the same specialised skills that police personnel had and, as such, could not be expected to understand the intricacies of police interactions. Beyond that, participants recognized that often they were unable to provide to the public information that might have shed light on a given viral video because of ongoing investigations.

6.3.6. The Benefit of Citizen Monitoring

Generally, participants expressed negative sentiments regarding citizen monitoring. Some, however, shared positive views about the phenomenon. Positive feelings were often expressed, only after sharing negative feelings about citizen monitoring. None of the participants shared exclusively positive feelings about the phenomenon. Participants acknowledged the potentially positive evidentiary implications that could result from footage obtained through citizen monitoring, including education and awareness. One participant expressed that social media should be seen as a "gift instead of a trap" (Officer 42). Officer 42 explained this view by sharing a story in which social media assisted in locating a stolen article of clothing:

> Last week we caught someone who stole a jacket from another student, but he didn't want to say where he left the jacket, or he forgot. So, we put it on our Facebook page, and the police from ***[62] had a post about the same jacket, asking anyone who finds it to bring it to the police station because it was stolen. So, we use it for our investigation." (Officer 42)

Officer 25 added that citizen monitoring's potential benefits depend largely on "how it's used". This participant said:

> You know if it's used just in a social way or even to help us get a solution or get stuff, I think it's a good thing! It's great thing! If it's used to put people in a bad context and that kind of thing, it's always a bad thing. (Officer 25)

Officer 44 spoke of the duality of citizen monitoring: "There are positives and negatives." Citizen monitoring is a tool used by the public to monitor the police. It is largely enabled by technology and social media. Participants expressed that both technology and social media have the potential to positively impact the police. While citizen monitoring placed police "in a glass box on social media" (Officer 42), participants suggested that police should focus on using technology to their advantage.

6.3.7. Frequency

Participants were asked to describe how frequently they were subjected to citizen monitoring. Given the density of The Netherlands police officers, even those working in smaller cities, were exposed to members of the public on a regular basis. Based on participants' accounts, members of the public increasingly engaged in citizen monitoring. With the advancement of technology and the growing prevalence of smart phone ownership, citizen monitoring had become

---

[62] The policing jurisdiction.

a regular occurrence. Consequently, all participants expressed that citizen monitoring was something they commonly encountered.

Participants working in urban areas appeared to experience citizen monitoring more frequently than their counterparts in suburban and rural regions. For instance, Officer 43 worked in what they described as a "closed neighbourhood", meaning their neighbourhood was densely populated and had high levels of visibility. They stated that citizen monitoring occurred regularly as a result of their work environment: "[Citizen monitoring occurs in] almost every incident here because it's a very closed neighbourhood. When you're speaking to one guy or you give someone or two guys a report, a ticket, within one minute there will be 20-30 guys shouting at you, filming you." Officer 32 shared a similar experience: "You know, when you talk to someone here out on the streets, it can take ten, twenty seconds. There are always five, six, seven guys around us, standing around you. It's normal here." Officer 40 also described the citizen monitoring as being a normal occurrence, saying, "Every weekend in the entertainment district. Every weekend you get filmed. Even when it's a simple question they ask you. A simple question like, you know, where are the toilets?" Officer 44 said, "it happens in almost every incident here." Officer 45 described that in their district, filming occurred with almost all police involved incidents: "The filming if it happens an incident here, car accident, everybody comes and films." Certainly, the physical and demographic characteristics of a district or neighbourhood seemed to impact the frequency of citizen monitoring.

Some participants shared that citizen monitoring occurred frequently regardless of the neighbourhood. Officer 42 said it occurred daily and added that "The chances of being recorded every day are quite good." Officer 41 shared that filming occurred "daily" but noted that film footage did not always make it to the public domain. Officer 38 shared that they had been filmed "hundreds of times". In addition to being filmed by civilian cameras, some participants also shared that they were frequently filmed by CCTV cameras. When asked how frequently they experienced citizen monitoring, Officer 28, stated "Daily, but we're not only filmed by public citizens. Here in the main city, we also have a lot of public cameras (CCTV)."

Citizen monitoring can occur as a result of malicious motivations; however, some participants shared that they were frequently filmed by interested members of the public. The intention of these people engaged in citizen monitoring was not to use footage and upload it to potentially discredit the police officers, but rather to capture activities they found interesting on a

personal level. Officer 34 discussed this, saying, "I get filmed a lot from a distance by those who like to see what happens but not as to 'get me' or insult me or something." Officer 31 shared a similar perspective: "Er wordt wel veel gefilmd. Maar kijk, er wordt ook wel eens gefilmd als ik iets vertel in de wijk. Dat is dan op een vriendelijke manier.[63]" Of course, police are often subject to filming when they present press releases or were involved in community events or activities. Despite this, participants expressed that they were less often filmed in this capacity than by members of the public seeking to capture them digitally in an act of what they interpreted as misconduct, whether it was that or not.

Due to the visible nature of their jobs, police officers have been subject to monitoring by the public throughout history. Police visibility is amplified by technological advancements, which, according to participants, caused an increase in the frequency of citizen monitoring. When asked about the frequency of citizen monitoring, Officer 39 spoke of this, saying:

> There is more just simply from technological advancements because now everyone has a phone. And there was this incident a couple years ago. It was a car accident in which a car flipped over into some kind of very small river and then there were people actually filming it.

In this quote, Officer 39 referenced a car accident. Although the car accident was serious – the vehicle flipped over and landed in a body of water – passersby stopped to film the incident, rather than to offer assistance to the occupants of the vehicle. Officer 25 shared a similar account:

> Everybody's filming nowadays. All the time, even when you're standing at a traffic accident. I think it's an issue nowadays. It's a change in our society. It's a change in how we look at things, how we feel about things.

Variations of similar stories were recounted by participants who shared that they felt distressed at the perceived need for members of the public to film incidents, encounters, and accidents without a corresponding desire to assist the police officers or civilians involved.

Most participants expressed that they were often filmed while on shift; however, two participants shared that they did not experience filming as frequently. Although all participants were frontline police officers, some were more frequently exposed to and working with members of the public. Officer 30 shared that they experienced filming "once or twice a week", and Officer

---

[63] *You are filmed frequently. But look, you're also filmed a lot if I communicate something in the community. That is in a friendlier manner then."*

35 said, "het gebeurt niet zo vaak[64]". Despite these conflicting responses, overall, participant responses indicated that citizen monitoring occurred frequently, and indeed might continue to increase as technology continued to advance.

6.3.8. Being Filmed

This study aimed to understand how police officers perceived citizen monitoring and, in particular, whether their behaviour changed when they were subject to citizen monitoring. Participants were asked how they felt when they were filmed by members of the public. In general, four main themes emerged. These themes were similar to the themes that emerged in the Canadian portion of the interviews. They were: (1) actions could be misinterpreted and manipulated; (2) vulnerable, scared, or apprehensive; (3) it's *verveland* (annoying); (4) I welcomed it unless it interfered with my work.

Actions could be misinterpreted and manipulated

A significant theme that emerged in discussions of citizen monitoring was that of concern over the potential for footage to be misinterpreted and manipulated. Participants spoke of the challenges associated with understanding video footage that portrayed only a portion of an incident and likely did not capture the precipitating behaviour that contributed to escalation. This intentional or unintentional framing impacted the way an encounter was understood by members of the public. An instance of perceived misconduct might appear that way specifically because there were layers of complexity missing. Participants shared their concerns regarding the potential misinterpretation of video footage. Officer 38, for example, said, "It can work against you, and it can be positive for you. But if it goes on YouTube, the history is not shown and then the idea people get is that the police are not good: they fight and hit and kick, but if they take it back to CCTV, they see the other side." Officer 36 added that a challenge associated with citizen monitoring was its inability to capture an entire incident: "It would be better if they were monitoring the whole incident. That would be nice." The inability of citizen monitoring to capture both sides of an incident or to capture an incident in its entirety seemed to be concerning for many participants.

Participants also shared that a significant limitation and concern related to citizen monitoring was the fact that members of the public could goad and aggravate police officers, and

---

[64] "It doesn't happen that often."

178

as such, essentially manipulate the outcome of, and response to, citizen monitoring. Officer 35 discussed this, saying, "Zij gaan eigenlijk zitten te wachten tot je een fout maakt…En dit is dan een betrokken die dat dan zelf op de internet heeft gezet.[65]" Interviews indicated participants' concern that the public was filming police officers' actions with the almost exclusive intention of catching them in a misstep. Officer 27 explained this in detail, saying:

> People try to irritate officers by filming them. Telling them, "I'm finding me, I'm going to show everybody how wrong this is. How unjust it is. Yada, yada. Cry, cry, cry." You're doing something right and…they're a loser. They're like a little kid, trying every trick in the book to make you make a mistake. But you're doing it right. So, you know when people film you, start irritating or trying to irritate you. Try to provoke you, you know you're doing the right job. The fault of a lot of police officers, especially young ones, is that they fall into the trap these people are setting for them. Putting a hand in front of the camera, shining a light, putting them away.

Officer 27 explained that, in some instances, those engaged in citizen monitoring did so to provoke and irritate police officers. Officer 25 shared a similar experience in which the subject of an encounter misrepresented the events that took place in citizen monitoring footage:

> This bugger put this whole film on Dumpert. I was on Dumpert with my angry face and he was shouting "Ow!". And I was like, "oh my God!" And then he was explaining that the police in [city name] were very aggressive – that he was smashed in the face with no reason at all. And I was like, "oh my God, I am really fucked." I did some research on that stuff and was like, "oh no". At that moment my chief called me and our mayor called me at my house, and they were like, "it's ok, this happened – don't worry. It doesn't matter and we know how it's like and we're going to protect you.

Their presence and their verbal attacks appeared to be intended as a distraction and an impediment to police officers. Officer 27 described how this could cause police officers, particularly junior level officers, to doubt their actions and could cause them to falter out of anxiety and a lack of confidence.

Vulnerable, scared, or apprehensive

Some participants shared that citizen monitoring caused them to feel vulnerable, scared, and/or apprehensive. Various aspects of citizen monitoring led to these sentiments. Officer 41, for example, discussed an incident in which footage of them was disseminated online. This footage contributed to a ripple effect – the participant's colleagues, family, and friends viewed the footage. Beyond that, the participant's son and his friends saw the footage. This impacted the participant's son and caused the participant considerable grief. Officer 41 said:

---

[65] "They actually sit and wait for you to make a mistake…And this is an involved person who then puts it on the Internet himself."

People see that [footage]. I have to live with that. Plus, my son is confronted by that. Nine years old. He came home from school. Crying. I chose my job – the ups and the downs, but I don't want my family to have to deal with that.

When describing that incident, Officer 41 shared how very vulnerable the incident and citizen monitoring in general made them feel. Because citizen monitoring could impact police officers and also their family members, participants like Officer 41 shared that, particularly subsequent to a given incident, they felt particularly apprehensive when faced with members of the public filming them.

Most participants did not share stories like Officer 41's. Instead, they shared that in general, citizen monitoring caused them to feel nervous and apprehensive because of the potential for people to misinterpret the footage and the ramifications that would take place as a result. They spoke of the impact that citizen monitoring could have on their mental state. Participant 39, for example, shared that citizen monitoring could cause one's thoughts to spiral: "I try to stay calm, but of course sometimes my mind is working overtime…it's one of the things that goes through my mind and sometimes you have these people who want, how you call, *uitlokken*[66]?" Because those engaged in citizen monitoring often attempted to provoke police officers, participants expressed that this meant they sometimes found it challenging to control their thoughts.

Vervelend

A common response from participants when asked about citizen monitoring was that they found it *vervelend*[67]. Generally, participants were irritated with the prevalence of both individuals engaged in citizen monitoring, and footage circulating on the internet, particularly when the instances lacked context. Participants expressed that despite the fact that they were conducting their work in a professional manner, they continued to be "provoked" through citizen monitoring. Officer 41 said:

I find it very irritating, purely because I have nothing to hide, but I find those films on Facebook etcetera and those films are everywhere. Reasonable or not. Also, it's usually fragments, and people believe what they see…The goal of the film is not positive. It's to make trouble or to disturb the police.

---

[66] "To provoke"
[67] "Annoying"

Officer 41 expressed a variety of reasons that contributed to feelings of frustration and annoyance due to citizen monitoring. Many participants reiterated these concerns, suggesting that even in the process of conducting legitimate police work, they were continually provoked by onlookers engaged in citizen monitoring.

Some participants shared that despite their feelings of frustrations associated with the prevalence of citizen monitoring, they nevertheless felt comfortable confronting members of the public when their actions were interfering with legitimate police work. Citizen monitoring sometimes occurred from a respectful distance, and while it might have been "annoying" and might have impacted a police officer, it was not considered an obstruction to police work. In other instances, citizen monitoring was both "annoying" and obstructive. Officer 40 spoke of this: "It's a problem when they're getting obstructive, and they don't go away when I ask them to go away. You're busy with one guy and the other guy's filming and now you have two guys." When engaged in an encounter, police officers had to divide their attention between the subject(s) and bystanders. If a bystander engaged in citizen monitoring verged upon becoming or became obstructive, the police officer or officers' attention was further impacted.

Officer 41 expressed that often the motivation, or perceived motivation, behind an instance of citizen monitoring contributed to the level of frustration felt by police officers: "I don't like it because of the motivation behind it. I am 100% certain that people subconsciously want to provoke when filming. For me, that's a "wrong world"." Like Officer 41, others also spoke of the seemingly malicious motivations behind citizen monitoring and expressed that they felt this was "annoying". Additionally, according to participants, problematic motivations sometimes caused police officers to feel a heightened level of awareness and a need to manage their image.

Participants expressed that, when faced with citizen monitoring, they could respond in various ways. Some participants shared that their response to citizen monitoring was simply a heightened awareness; others expressed that when citizen monitoring was particularly "annoying" or obstructive, they tended to directly confront those engaged in the citizen monitoring. Officer 36 shared their approach: "Sometimes when they're very annoying, I tell them: "You're gathering evidence for us. Thank you very much, and I'll take your phone. Can't say when you'll get it back." They stop immediately." Certainly not all participants employed this approach; however, Officer 36 expressed that this tactic served to quash problematic and "annoying" instances of citizen monitoring. Officer 35 noted that sometimes citizen monitoring was "annoying" but that it did not

warrant intervention. Officer 35 deemed it annoying: "Vervelend. Als er een bepaalde afstand is, he? En de privacy van de betrokkenen wordt niet benadeelt, dan is het gewoon zo, ja dan kom ik in beeld[68]." Officer 35's approach involved an assessment of the filming, an acknowledgement that it was not interfering with the interaction, and a continuation of the task at hand. Certainly, interview results indicated that some participants found it particularly challenging to carry on with their work while in the process of being filmed; however, others, like Officer 35, were able to approach it with a pragmatic stance.

I welcomed it unless it interfered with my work

In general, citizen monitoring was seen as a rapidly developing additional challenge within policing. Some participants accepted citizen monitoring as a welcome technological advancement. Citizen monitoring, in their opinion, could act as a useful tool. Participants with this view felt that their actions could withstand the scrutiny of citizen monitoring. Officer 42 said, "I think most of the time it's a good thing. Because I believe the police have authority and will do good and when something is going bad, just a minority of actions we do are bad. So, when it's recorded, it's a pity." This participant explained that citizen monitoring should not have an impact on individuals who engaged in proper police work, which according to their statement, accounted for the majority of police officers. Several participants, including Officer 43 and Officer 30 added that police officers worked in the public domain and as such should be prepared for outside scrutiny:

> I'm very comfortable. I don't mind. I work in the public domain, so we all know that the things we do are always under review. (Officer 43)

> You're always watched. When you're wearing your uniform and you walk into the public, you know everyone is watching you. You have to be, well, after so many years, you're just relaxed. You know, "everyone is watching me". You're used to it. (Officer 30)

Many expressed consensus that an important element of the police profession is visibility. Due to their uniform and marked patrol vehicles, police officers have a level of visibility that most other professions do not. Some participants had more neutral sentiments regarding being filmed. They felt as though, due to their visibility, citizen monitoring was inevitable. Among these participants, there seemed to be some level of indifference to citizen monitoring. Officer 38, for example, said:

---

[68] "Sometimes when they're very annoying, I tell them. You're gathering evidence for us. Thank you very much, and I'll take your phone. Can't say when you'll get it back. They immediately stop."

It doesn't really make a difference. I am 58 years old. In the neighbourhood, youth see me maybe as a granddad or father figure and I take advantage of that. For the rest, I don't have any difficulty with it if they film me or whatever. It's part of the job. I always go to work whistling and I go home whistling.

Officer 38 acknowledged that citizen monitoring was a reality of modern policing and that their relationships with members of the community were positive and that this offset any protential concerns regarding observation.

Officer 30 added that there were some instances in which citizen monitoring might be useful in investigations:

No, I don't find it annoying or disturbing. I think, well, neutral. Everyone can film me. Sometimes it's also useful. For example, we had a shooting at an accident for a man with a knife who was threatening some colleagues and they had to shoot him in the leg. He didn't die, but every police officer who is using his weapon has to report it and he will be questioned like he is a suspect. And then when you have the film from the public around it, they can see well, here, this is what happened so it will support your own explanation and I think that's fine. It can help you.

Footage gained through citizen monitoring, even when it was not a full account of a given police-civilian encounter, did offer some information regarding the incident and could be used for evidentiary purposes. Although this participant had a neutral view of citizen monitoring, the benefits noted were compelling.

Some participants shared that, over time, they had become increasingly comfortable with citizen monitoring. For those who had worked as police officers for long periods of time, smart phones that enabled citizen monitoring had emerged and developed over the course of their careers. Some expressed that this was difficult to become accustomed to. For newer officers, citizen monitoring with smart phones had always been part of the job. Although that meant that citizen monitoring was not something they had had to adjust to, the implications of citizen monitoring was, nevertheless, something to which they had to become accustomed. Officer 42, for example, shared that their experience in coming to terms with citizen monitoring did not happen immediately: "Well, I'm comfortable with it, but a couple years ago it was a bit strange. Vervelend[69]. But now it's calmed down." Officer 42 explained that the process of coming to terms with citizen monitoring could take some time but was possible.

---

[69] "Annoying"

6.3.9. Confidence

Studies suggest that monitoring can impact behaviour. The threat of monitoring is known to have deterrent capabilities in many instances, and certainly supports the existence of CCTV cameras to prevent shoplifting, loitering, and other delinquent behaviours. There could be many potential motivators for individuals engaged in citizen monitoring. Civilians might have been inclined to film police officers in order to capture their version of events, to potentially witness and document abuses of police authority, or simply to record activities of interest. Sometimes citizen monitoring could prevent police officers from engaging in deviant behaviour; however, there were other potential side effects as well. For instance, participants reported that citizen monitoring had an impact on their confidence. When engaged in police work, it is necessary for officers exercise their authorities with confidence. An understanding of the law, their authorities, and situational responses are necessary to carry out their work with the greatest ease. Should something like citizen monitoring be present, it might impact the confidence of police officers involved in an incident.

Participants spoke about their experiences with citizen monitoring and detailed the ways in which it impacted their confidence. They described that the filming itself could affect confidence; however, they also noted that ancillary aspects of citizen monitoring, such as berating, yelling, and harassing behaviour could further impact confidence. Officer 26 discussed the thoughts that could go through one's head when confronted with citizen monitoring:

> At first. For s few seconds it's what did I do? It's a reaction. The third person that happens is always like, did I do something wrong? Because it's human, you're insecure. But then you get backed by the point like no, I'm confident that I'm doing what I'm supposed to do. So, at first yes, and I'm always aware that if there's a camera, that my colleagues also know there is a camera, but I'm not reacting differently anymore. At first, I did, but now not anymore.

The process Officer 26 described involved an initial internal struggle with insecurity, followed by an acknowledgement that they were carrying out their job in accordance with their training and, as such, did not need to feel concern over citizen monitoring. Even though this thought process likely took mere seconds for Officer 26, it was still time focused on confidence, or lack thereof, rather than on the incident itself.

Other participants shared that when confronted with citizen monitoring, concern over the potential implications of the footage was something they considered. The focus of their concern

was on the conceivable long-term consequences of citizen monitoring, and consideration of this impacted their confidence. For example, Officer 36 shared that the presence of citizen monitoring made him more "op m'n hoede[70]". Officer 36 added that a tangible awareness existed that footage could go viral, whether it portrayed lawful police work or not, and this had an impact on confidence:

> If I do something, they'll get part of the incident, that I'm very aware of, and it always goes viral negative if it goes viral. That's what I'm aware of. So, when I have to use violence [force], normally you say you're going to use violence [force] once, maybe twice. In a situation like that you'll say it three, maybe four times.

Officer 29 contributed a similar perspective, saying, "When someone is filming, the public opinion, so that lingering concern is in the back of your head." Other participants added that when they saw individuals engaged in citizen monitoring or saw footage of citizen monitoring, it impacted their confidence.

Participants were asked whether they felt concern for their job when they saw members of the public engaged in citizen monitoring or saw footage from citizen monitoring on the news or social media platforms. When asked about this, Officer 33 said, "It gives me concern for my job. I hope it doesn't happen to me." Officer 42 shared a similar sentiment, saying, "there's not 100% confidence". This participant added that the lack of confidence resulted from concern at the number of individuals who were likely to view an example of citizen monitoring, including the public and government officials. Another participant expressed that several of their colleagues appeared to lack the confidence needed in their job: "I know some of them so... Yeah, that's not, how do you say, verstellend[71]. Confident." (Officer 33). Officer 45 explained that they felt a sense of concern when members of the public were engaged in filming because of the potential for a situation to escalate. This participant stressed that when a situation involving citizen monitoring unfolded, they did their best to ensure that escalation did not occur because of the potential way in which it could be perceived. Officer 45 said:

> I always think is I hope it doesn't escalate. Because I want this guy, I want to arrest him or whatever, I want to talk to him or arrest him. I want to get him as soon as possible to the station because here things can escalate very fast. (Officer 45)

---

[70] "Cautious"
[71] "Confident"

Because of the potential implications of citizen monitoring, participants like Officer 45 shared that they attempted to de-escalate situations to manage the circumstances and to mitigate the effects of citizen monitoring.

Some participants shared the importance of image management during instances that involved citizen monitoring. They shared that this process could impact confidence, and that it could be difficult to negotiate competing demands. For instance, Officer 40 shared:

> I think confidence is a big issue when something happens like you say you need aggression or obstruction, and you get filmed as well. The police must be in the middle on both sides and then they have to confront the police with those issues and ask what you think and if you answer it wrong then it's on social media: "look what this police officer is saying".

As Officer 40 noted, there were various opposing forces that required management in a given police-citizen encounter and those situations were challenging for officers who lacked confidence, particularly, as noted by participants, newer officers with less experience. Officer 40 expressed that police encounters required consideration of both sides, of the situation's optics, and of the word choices used. Should any of those appear nefarious on film, long-term consequences might be felt. Officer 40 said, "If you come in a situation that maybe has some impact on you, it takes some time to get over it and now you have to go on and sometimes you can't." Officer 40 stated that sometimes confidence was impacted long beyond the incident in which citizen monitoring had occurred.

Departmental support was an important predictor of confidence and will be explored in detail in a later section of this chapter, but it is important to mention here that some participants expressed that they felt more confident while subject to citizen monitoring if they felt they had the support of their department. Participants expressed that they acted lawfully and in accordance with their training when carrying out their work. Of course, there are documented examples of police officers who abused their powers and, in some instances, had engaged in excessive use of force. Some of those examples were captured through citizen monitoring. Participants who spoke of the importance of departmental support expressed that they expected departmental support when engaged in lawful police work, even in instances where footage obtained through citizen monitoring did not show the entire context or was framed in such a way that it could be misinterpreted easily. Officer 42 spoke of the importance of departmental support: "The confidence is that I hope my organization has my back and helps me." Other participants

expressed similar views and referenced the need for support from their superiors in their confidence in the ability of officers to manage challenging situations involving citizen monitoring.

6.3.10. Citizen Monitoring and its Impact on Use of Force

Changes in police tactics

During their interview, participants were asked how, if at all, citizen monitoring caused them to change their tactics, particularly use of force tactics. Responses varied. Some participants shared that their tactics did change, while others expressed that their policing practices were the same whether or not they were subject to citizen monitoring. It is important to consider the possibility of changed behaviour, and its relevance to police operations and training.

No change

While all participants acknowledged an awareness of citizen monitoring, some shared that they did not feel as though it impacted the way they conducted their work. Some of those participants also shared that citizen monitoring had previously impacted their work, but felt that over time, they had become more comfortable with being monitored by members of the public. For example, Officer 36 said, "[Citizen monitoring] used to have a lot of rather big impact, then I learned to deal with it." Many participants shared that they had either observed or personally experienced that the effects of citizen monitoring were more significant for junior level and/or less experienced officers. Early in their career, police officers might have perceived citizen monitoring in a more threatening manner and, over time, this perception diminished. Some participants noted that the more they were exposed to citizen monitoring, the easier the phenomenon was to manage.

When other participants were asked about changes in their behaviour due to citizen monitoring, they responded that their behaviour did not change and never had. Those participants made up a minority of the respondents; however, their perspectives were significant. Officer 47 shared that, "Nee, [my policing style] hasn't changed, no. Ik heb geen problemen.[72]" Officer 32 offered a similar perspective: "No, other than like I said that it's annoying, I don't think it's taking away my confidence or the way I act in a situation." These participants noted that, while citizen monitoring might have presented an added level of frustration and irritation, it did not cause them to change their behaviour.

---

[72] "No, that hasn't changed, no. I don't have any problems."

While some participants had personally experienced or witnessed colleagues experience instances of citizen monitoring that went viral, others had no connection to any viral videos of police incidents. They expressed that this might have had an influence on their ability to manage citizen monitoring without changing in their behaviour. For example, Officer 30 said, "I've never been a subject on Facebook of something that went completely wrong, so I don't know how it feels like." One could conclude that a reasonable predictor for an officer's behavioural changes when on duty was personal experience or witnessing the results of such an experience in other officers with an instance of citizen monitoring that had gone viral. Participants who were the subjects of such a situation or who had witnessed it occur to someone else seemed more likely to feel apprehensive about citizen monitoring and were more likely to express that they changed their behaviour when faced with citizen monitoring.

Policing is a highly visible profession. Participants noted that this visibility and the frequency of citizen monitoring was something that police officers and new recruits were reminded of and trained to manage. One participant who shared that they did not feel that their behaviour changed when they were being monitored expressed that monitoring came in many forms and was an integral part of life as a police officer. Officer 42:

> I don't change if there is a camera or not. You always have to be aware of your surroundings. The most dangerous thing is when you've lost your awareness [and have developed] blindness. Because when you focus on one person, well maybe he has family or relatives who have his back.

This participant expressed that citizen monitoring was one form of surveillance police officers were subject to. Because of their visible nature, police should be aware of the likelihood that they would be monitored and scrutinized by members of the public, whether with a camera or not. Further, the perceived threat posed by citizen monitoring was, according to this participant, similar to that of other central tenants and potential threats that accompanied police visibility.

Extra caution

Many participants shared that when confronted with citizen monitoring, they exercised additional caution. For fear of being perceived in a negative light and out of concern that footage could be manipulated and widely distributed, participants noted that they tended to ensure they conducted their work with precision and in some instances, changed their behaviour when they

were being observed. Those who expressed that they exercised additional caution when subjected to citizen monitoring pointed to the importance of being "sharp" (or "scherp" in Dutch) and also spoke of changing their actions.

Citizen monitoring that captures police officers engaged in their work often fails to capture an incident from start to finish, and generally does not capture the entire incident and therefore lacks context. Some participants acknowledged this, sharing that, given this, it was incredibly important to manage their image and to ensure that they conducted their work in a professional manner. Officer 34:

> Well, I just make sure that I know what I am doing. It keeps me sharp and knowing that everything I do will be under close view and that my superiors and citizens will always know what I'm doing. So, it just makes sure I know what I'm doing.

As this participant noted, police work was constantly under review by members of the public as well as by the officer's superiors. By ensuring that their actions were "sharp" and by recognizing that scrutiny was likely, police officers felt more confident when confronted with citizen monitoring. This opinion spoke to the issue of support from leadership. The issue here was more that monitoring could be taken out of context than that citizen monitoring existed at all. If officers were confident that their superiors would support them, they seemed to feel more confident.

Several participants spoke of a high-profile incident in a particular region in the Netherlands that had left many police officers particularly wary of public scrutiny and of citizen monitoring. They shared that after this incident had occurred, police officers displayed apprehension in their use of force. This is discussed in greater depth in an upcoming section of this chapter; however, it is important to note here that this incident caused some police officers to think through their actions more carefully given how they felt they might be perceived by members of the public. Officer 45 said:

> I think police officers here are aware of what happened and that makes them cautious, but if we see something, we're not afraid to handle it and to arrest because people expect that from us. So, if we get afraid of it, we [had] better stop. But we are aware of it. Also, if [new] students come here, we tell them the history of what happened here, so they know the history of [it] ***[73]

---

[73] Particular policing district

Here, Officer 45 explained that despite what took place in their district, it was important to respond to situations with precision given the potential for the public to dissect police actions.

In addition to the impact historical events could have on police experiences with citizen monitoring, individual situations could also affect officers' desire to be "sharp" when being monitored. Officer 37 shared a specific example during their interview:

> Officer 37: …But we had here like really 50 young people standing in front of the gun. This is the suspect. The colleagues were here and behind the suspect were 50 people and I was behind. I was in a wall behind. The man from those people were behind those people to go away because if my colleague shoot it could hit them. But these guys they were— they just start filming, so they're really not paying attention. They're really just want to capture the picture and they hope that we shoot and that we eventually kill someone so they can put it on YouTube, and you name it and harass us again.

> Primary Investigator: So those types of situations, what does that do to your attention then?

> Officer 37: Uh, it makes work difficult. Because now you don't have to watch just the suspect, but you also have to watch the people behind the suspect, and you're being watched.

In this exchange, Officer 31 described a situation in which members of the public flanked the subject. They did so in order to capture footage of the police engaged in their work, rather than to necessarily assist the subject or the police. This made it challenging for the police to engage in their work in the manner required and made it so that they had to be particularly "sharp".

Officer 31 spoke to the importance of "sharpness", sharing that this was a necessity, particularly in certain neighbourhoods. Officer 31:

> Dus wij met z'n allen moeten scherper blijven. Het is wel algemeen geldig dat iedereen begrijpt zeker in deze wijk dat je daar voorzichtig mee moet zijn. Omdat we wel een incident hebben gehad waar we dus de deksel op de neus kregen, dat is een Nederlandse uitspraak.[74]

Officer 31 explained that because an incident had occurred in their region, extra caution had to be exercised as a result. The historical circumstances in a district can impact the way in which

---

[74] "So, we all have to stay sharper. It is generally valid that everyone understands, especially in this neighborhood that you have to be careful with that. Because we did have an incident where we got the lid on the nose, that is a Dutch expression—"

police officers are viewed by members of the public, and in turn, have an effect on the way in which police officers respond to calls for service.

Change action

While some participants stressed that they did not change their actions when subjected to citizen monitoring, others indicated that their behaviour did change. For some of these participants, the changes were minor, but for others the changes to their behaviour were more significant. These changes are important to understand for two reasons. First, some of the behaviour changes did not comply with the behaviours expected as a result of their training. Second, the behaviour changes that occurred have implications on future training, and operational standards and procedures.

Officer 27 identified many of the reasons participants might change their behaviour when subjected to citizen monitoring. In this quote, the participant explained that policing was a visible role and that due to its visibility, it was critical for police officers to explain their actions when they knew or believed they were being recorded. Officer 27:

> You have to be more careful. You don't want to get into an incident where you have to use force. Uh, too much. Because you're under the magnifying glass so people are already above the glass and if you um—of course if there's somebody with a gun and he's shooting at you and you shoot back, that won't be a problem, but if you have an incident where you say to somebody, OK, he's drunk, but you don't want to arrest him so you're telling him go away, go away, go away. Normally you would probably get your baton out and give him a hit on his forearm or something. Because you don't want him in jail, you just need him to go. You probably won't do it.

This quote exemplified what many participants spoke of. They referenced the need to explain their actions with added care and precision, and further, they avoided the use of certain use of force tactics that might have had worse optics, such as the use of the baton, than other tactics might have had. In doing this, police officers managed their image and engaged in a performative practice to ensure their actions were perceived in a positive light.

Certain changes to police behaviour, such as articulating police actions, could be seen as potentially positive. According to participants, verbalizing actions enabled the subject and members of the public to understand the rationale for what was going on, and, to a certain extent, articulation was expected among police officers. Despite this, it is important to consider the fact that changes to behaviour could contradict policing training, and as such, could potentially place

police officers in precarious positions. For instance, in using a level of force that differed from the type of force prescribed in training, police officers might inadvertently put themselves in a situation that was more difficult to deescalate. If this happened, police officers might ultimately be required to use a higher level of force to manage and regain control of the situation. This could potentially have serious consequences for both the police officer, or officers, involved and for the subject.

Talking more

A common response among participants related to their dialogue with both subjects and with members of the public. Police officers are trained to articulate; however, according to participants, there was a notable difference between typical articulation and the articulation many resorted to when subjected to citizen monitoring. Officer 34 said:

> At the academy we learn to talk to the suspect a lot because he needs to understand why we're doing it so he stops resisting but I think the younger generation or the officers coming off the academy will talk a lot more than the officers who are here for 15 years already.

Officer 29 shared a similar perspective, "I think there's more attention at training: talk to your suspect; explain what you want from him." Participants shared that they felt it was important to carefully articulate their actions so that they were not misinterpreted by members of the public. For example, Officer 39 said, "I try to explain more calmly [when on film]." Generally, participants shared that the articulation they engaged in when subject to citizen monitoring exceeded "normal police articulation". In these instances, participants noted that they took extra measures in order to ensure that not only the subject and fellow officers, but also those watching and/or filming understood what they were doing. Officer 27 said that instances that involved citizen monitoring were challenging because they required careful image management:

> It's difficult. You have to be, you have to talk with the people, because every time you use force it won't take a solution and the risk. So, you have to be a little bit in between. Sometimes you have to make a gesture and say this is the line. Mostly you have to talk. Negotiate a little bit. Be in between.

Force is a necessary element of policing. Provided police officers exercise force in accordance with their training and use a level that appropriately responds to the subject's behaviour, force is permissible. Despite this, the optics of use of force tactics can be less than ideal. Because of the way use of force can be perceived by members of the public, participants expressed that use of force tactics sometimes changed slightly when officers were subject to citizen monitoring. Out of fear of citizen monitoring's potential repercussions, namely, that actions

might be edited or taken out of context and then uploaded for general viewing, participants noticed that they might wait longer than was necessary to exercise force. For example, Officer 40 shared, "If you're willing to use force, I think most of the time, then I use force. But if you're being filmed, you give him an extra warning and maybe another one. If he wasn't filming, [I would give] one warning and "bam"." In this quote, Officer 40 described the extra effort they went to when being filmed so that the person or people filming them were sure to capture the officer providing ample warning or offering extra time before using force. Similarly, Officer 36 shared, "Normally we tell people we're going to use force, if it's possible. If you know they're filming you might say it twice, three, four times and then you're going to use force. So, more verbal commands."

Officer 40 described the impact that extra dialogue and pause could have in a situation, saying:

> You give more warnings, and you describe the force you will use if necessary. It will be more, or less, less aggressive than it can be. For example, according to the rules we can use pepper spray very quickly. "You're under arrest." If they say no: "pssht[75]". In reality, you don't do that. Warning. Another warning and then you go physically and then when physically you give him the chance to fight back and if he can fight back, you don't know what he can do. Maybe he's a trained kick boxer. I know from myself, I can fight, but not really. (Officer 40)

Here, Officer 40 described the potential cost of failing to use immediately the force prescribed in a given situation. Officer 40 noted that additional communication could prevent an officer from going "hands-on" immediately. The result could be a situation in which a police officer put themselves at undue risk because of their attempt to appear in a positive light on camera.

While articulation was seen as important, Officer 40 was not alone in his concern that its overuse could put officers in unsafe situations. Officer 32 noted that articulation was a common tool used by police: "Colleagues are trying to explain more what they're doing to a suspect. You know, "If you don't comply, I have to use force". This participant went on to state that this level of verbalization increased dramatically when officers were filmed: "Then some colleagues feel like they have to explain everything they do." Although this strategy might allow members of the public to better understand the rationale behind police actions, Officer 32 suggested that this could have detrimental impacts on the police officers involved. "You lose focus of the things that you really have to do. Instead, you focus on the other things around it." In these instances, over-explaining

---

[75] Vocalizes to represent the sound pepper spray makes.

could result in officers who over-extended the reach of their attention and focus. Officer 32 confirmed that undue attention on the peripheries of the incident specifics could, potentially, exacerbate a situation and inadvertently put officers at risk.

Officer 45 and 46 described a specific example in which additional verbalization in the presence of filming could have had a detrimental impact on the way the incident unfolded. In the encounter, Officer 45 and 46 stopped a vehicle in which there were a driver and three passengers. The participants noted that this type of situation required a high level of focus and attention, specifically because of the number of people in the vehicle. This type of encounter had a heightened level of tension when filming was an added variable. The participants stated that the addition of filming "makes the situation very difficult" and added that in such situations, "if something went wrong, it would go really foul." Using this example, Officer 45 and 46 explained that the actions that resulted due to filming could lead to circumstances that could be unsafe.

In addition to increased verbalization in the face of citizen monitoring, one participant shared that they were also more likely to articulate their actions in written form more thoroughly when citizen monitoring was present. Officer 36 noted that written articulation after the incident was always important in policing; however, it was especially critical when recounting an incident that had involved citizen monitoring. Officer 36 explained that before the advancement of smart phone technology, written articulation had been brief: "Normally, we used to say, before the mobile phones and things like that, we got into a fight, we gave some punches, we get some punches, and that's it." Since smart phone use became ubiquitous, written articulation required officers to consider and recount additional details of an interaction: "You're thinking about what you did, why you did it and what happened." Officer 36 also described changes to written articulation that included the discussion of emotions. For example:

> And recently we do also say, we also, and that's very strange for a police officer, we tell what we feel. Do you feel angry? Do you feel scared? Mostly they're calling you names, and you say, "That's offending to me." But why? So, you have to tell what you feel. They use a lot. Yeah, we call it the K[76] word, I think in Canada it's the C[77] word. Well, that affects me. My father died of it, so. That affects me more than it didn't happen. That's why it's offensive to me. If you tell that to the judge or the DA, they will use that in their *straf mark.*[78] (Officer 36)

---

[76] Kanker (Cancer)
[77] Cancer
[78] Sentencing

They explained that written articulation regarding experiences, including those experiences that involved citizen monitoring, could help others understand the impact that these events had on police officers. Articulation in the form of notes that were "more thorough" offered an important way in which some police Officer 45 responded to citizen monitoring (Officer 36).

<div align="center">Change in Behaviour</div>

Some officers interviewed described changes in their behaviour that occurred as a result of citizen monitoring. Officer 39, for example, said: "Yeah, of course my behaviour changes in a way." Officer 35 responded similarly: "In het incident dat ik heb laaten zien dan wordt ik kalmer en dan zeg ik minder." For several officers, these were changes they had actively engaged in when citizen monitoring had been present; however, others did not realise their behaviour had changed until they were asked and had had the opportunity to reflect on this. Participants like Officer 34 noted that when they saw an individual or individuals engaged in citizen monitoring, they actively ensured their behaviour appeared professional:

> If I see a camera, I change my behaviour in a way that I won't be slacking or won't sit on a wall with a cigarette or something like that. I don't smoke, but just for example. No phone in my hands or something like that.

Officer 27 echoed this sentiment:

> I won't shout, "Stretch out, mother fucking bitch!" I'll say, "spread your arms, sir."

Officer 33 shared that their physical body positioning changed when in the presence of citizen monitoring. Officer 33 did this because they believed it dissuaded individuals from engaging in citizen monitoring:

> There are lots of examples when you're facing the person, you're going to show up on the internet. So, my strategy is to turn away. Leave them. That's the best, I think. Yes, yes, yes [I change my behaviour]. I'm turning my back.

When Officer 37 was asked whether or not their behaviour changed when they knew or believed they were being recorded, they responded "Yes, I think so." While many officers indicated that their behaviour did change when subjected to citizen monitoring, others said that this did not happen to them. Among them, Officers 29 and 32 both indicated that their behaviour did not change in these circumstances.

6.3.11. Citizen Monitoring Contributing to Hesitation in the Use of Justified

Force

Hesitation is the act of "holding back in doubt or indecision" (Merriam-Webster). Sometimes, a moment of hesitation is brief – possibly almost indistinguishable from no hesitation at all. In the policing context, hesitation, however slight, has the potential to significantly impact officer safety and can affect the way in which a situation unfolds. Police officers are trained to evaluate situations and to deal with them decisively. Their job requires split-second decision making, and, on occasion, the decisions police officers make mean the difference between life and death for a subject. Given the level of authority police officers have, and the ability they have to use lethal force, it is necessary that their decision making is not impaired.

In the 2013 master's research that preceded this study, the PI reported that a common response to citizen monitoring was hesitation. Participants shared that, in the face of citizen monitoring, they sometimes hesitated in their application of necessary force, or in their response in general. This study asked participants similar questions and the resultant findings were comparable. Participants spoke of hesitation and noted that the presence of an individual or multiple individuals filming them could cause them to hesitate. While not all participants felt they hesitated, the number that did express a tendency to hesitate was significant enough to warrant reporting on.

The following details a description of hesitation, based on participant responses, the reasons for hesitation, and examples of hesitation.

Hesitation as police officers described it

Whether or not officers expressed that they had themselves hesitated when experiencing citizen monitoring, most were able to describe hesitation and had witnessed hesitation in other officers who were being filmed. Officer 28:

> In a violent situation…you're thinking am I doing the right thing because when you can act, you have to act. We have a term – how do you call it in English – you have to be hard where you have to be and when it has to happen, it has to happen. Fast and good and proportional. When you're hesitating and thinking, am I doing the right thing? Yeah, then it's a risk. You're the victim. I understand when people are hesitating maybe when they're filming, but when you're trained? I think that's the problem. We don't train enough. We need to feel confident and act better in violent situations and arrests.

In this description, Officer 28 explained that hesitation potentially contributed to an unsafe environment for police officers. They stressed that the hesitating officer transformed from

commanding control of a situation to being "the victim". In addition to placing the attending police officer(s) in the role of "victim", hesitation contributed to a situation in which the police officer(s) involved, the subject(s), and bystander(s) faced an increased risk. For example, a situation in which the proper de-escalation strategy had not been used immediately because of hesitation, might end up escalating unnecessarily, thus requiring the police officer(s) involved to use a higher level of force than might initially have been required to manage the situation. Certainly, it is critical to understand and manage hesitation to ensure police encounters are anticipated and potential responses of officers are considered and mitigated against by appropriate training in accordance with training, and, as in Officer 28's example, the findings addressed in this section indicate there may be a need for increased training.

Participants explained that citizen monitoring could contribute to hesitation because of the pressure it placed on police officers to perform professionally and in a situationally and optically appropriate manner. When citizen monitoring occurred, participants expressed feeling as though they were "under a magnifying glass" and said that the ramifications of a misstep, including an accidental misstep or the perceptions of a misstep could result in severe consequences. Officer 27 described hesitation, saying that the presence of citizen monitoring contributed to the absence of action:

> You have to be more careful. You don't want to get into an incident where you have to use force…Because you're under the magnifying glass so people are already above the glass and if you—of course if there's somebody with a gun and he's shooting at you and you shoot back, that won't be a problem, but if you have an incident where you say to somebody, "OK, he's drunk", but you don't want to arrest him so you're telling him, "Go away, go away, go away". Normally you would probably get your baton out and give him a hit on his forearm or something. Because you don't want him in jail, you just need him to go. You probably won't do it [when people are filming you]. (Officer 27)

Officer 27 described the concern many that participants shared they felt when they were subjected to citizen monitoring. Because they did not wish to be incorrectly perceived by both the individual(s) filming them and those subsequently viewing the footage, they had the inclination to hesitate.

Officer 43 explained that in some situations, particularly those that involved citizen monitoring, their outward presentation did not match their inner emotional state. They said, "All that bravado is nice, but I…I know for myself that that's what you show outwardly, on the outside, but maybe not how you feel on the inside." Some participants described how citizen monitoring

sometimes left them feeling unsettled and uncertain about their actions. Officer 40 said, "you might hesitate when it comes to [a situation involving citizen monitoring]. It's not comfortable. It's not. When they're not filming you, you're more than comfortable, for sure." Based on these participants' accounts, it was clear that citizen monitoring acted as a significant variable that contributed to self-doubt and hesitation. With its presence, "you change your behaviour; you're more careful" (Officer 40). Although hesitation could contribute to dangerous situations, some participants explained that to hesitate is "human". Officer 40 described "life and death" encounters and indicated that the human's logical desire to be perceived positively contributed to hesitation.

Some years before the present study, the use of a controversial police tactic known as the "neck lock" received considerable criticism in the Netherlands. Due to a high-profile incident involving the neck lock and a consequent civilian fatality, some participants indicated that either they or their colleagues had hesitated in the application of force. Subsequent to the incident, according to participants, the use of the neck lock, even though it was an approved police tactic, had decreased. Participants spoke of the optics of certain use of force tactics and expressed that because of the way certain tactics were perceived, police officers hesitated to use them for fear of damaging their public appearance. For example, Officer 43 explained that a moment of hesitation could occur when striving to select a use of force option that was both effective and efficient.

It is not uncommon for police officers to discuss the importance a split second can play in their line of work. An instant can mean the difference between life and death; therefore, quick and decisive decision making is critical in policing. Despite this, participants openly shared circumstances in which they hesitated, sometimes for a split second and sometimes for longer. The following is an account from a participant who discussed hesitation in detail. This account served to provide an understanding of how citizen monitoring could contribute to hesitation.

Officer 39 described an encounter that took place shortly after terrorist attacks in Paris and Brussels:

> I remember this incident when there was this bombing in Brussels and Paris. I think it was two years ago? I think it was in 2015? 16? We have this train station. The train station which is actually quite an important hub for international travel. You know people going to Brussels, Paris, also Amsterdam, The Hague. I was there actually alone there when this woman came toward me and said like, and it was just like a couple of days following the incident in Brussels. Yeah, I think it was Brussels. And then she said, and she ran towards me, and said like, "I saw two guys stepping out with guns." And, that's also something,

you know. I, um…whether I froze or not. This is where you have to make a split-second decision. Every time you have to make a split-second decision, in your memory it always feels like a very long time because every millisecond I wait is very bad. I was like, "OK, I'm the only person". I knew I was the only police officer at the station which is very busy. I was the only one visible and also you know, the only one armed. So, for me there was this split-second decision, should I make a call just to this police station or to the entire district. Which of course, making a call to the entire district would just implement so many protocols. You know closing the station down, evacuating the people. Anyway. It was difficult but I decided to call the police station. There were only two other people on duty as well. They immediately came by bike. And we did an immediate search for this person. Two persons. I think in some time we found out that there were actually two colleagues of ours who were in plain clothes. It could have been quite different. It could have been someone with real intentions to cause havoc at the train station. Or you know it cloud have been major, close down the entire station, news and so on, and nothing. Of course, I thought about it in the days after and sometimes still. It could have gone quite differently—

In this example, Officer 39 hesitated momentarily. The participant described individual milliseconds as both feeling much longer than they were and the fact that those could potentially have led to negative consequences. In calls for service such as the one described above, hesitating for even a brief moment could serve to escalate the situation. Although the hesitation Officer 39 described is relatively minor, it was a form of hesitation, nonetheless. When describing this scenario, Officer 39 mentioned the threat of citizen monitoring. While it was not necessarily visible to the participant, it was still seen as a threat and contributed to their hesitation. This suggested that even without the overt presence of cameras and given officers' general impression that cameras could exacerbate situations, the presence of cameras could have intensified the urgency in this instance of hesitation.

Reasons hesitation occurred

A better understanding of hesitation will help to make it possible for training to be formulated to help officers anticipate and be better prepared for these instinctive reactions and potential subsequent responses to citizen monitoring. This section addresses themes that emerged when discussing the reasons for hesitation, including: (1) a lack of legal knowledge or a lack of time on the job; (2) CYA; (3) hesitation for race-related reasons; and (4) hesitation in extreme situations.

Lack of legal knowledge/lack of time on the job

Participants who shared that they had personally experienced or observed hesitation frequently expressed that they felt the hesitation was due to a lack of experience on the job or due to their relatively young age. According to participants, those with less experience tended not to be as confident in the knowledge of their legal authorities, and as a result, tended to hesitate in their application of force. Additionally, younger officers might have felt less confident and their general lack of experience, might cause them to second guess their response to a situation. Officer 39, for example, shared that their "younger colleagues hesitate" especially where citizen monitoring was present. Officer 42 said, "Younger officers are affected by it, yeah, hesitating or they get nervous a bit. They start to react more polite than they used to." Similarly, Officer 28 explained that "there are situations where people hesitate" and added that this could occur for a variety of reasons including lack of experience. Officer 28 added that the type and amount of training officers received was a significant issue and contributed to hesitation among less experienced officers:

> I understand people are hesitating when they're filmed, but you don't if you're trained properly. I think that's the problem. We don't train enough. [Proper training contributes to] feeling confident and acting better in violent situations and during arrests. (Participant 28)

Officer 28 explained that proper training was essential for officers, particularly younger and less experienced officers to feel confident in their work and so that they were not prone to hesitation.

Officer 30 explained that some younger and less experienced officers felt less confident than their counterparts and that this resulted in a certain form of hesitation. In particular, younger, and less experienced officers might, on occasion, have hesitated by deflecting their responsibility. Officer 30 explained that, as an experienced officer, they had had some younger and less experienced officers hesitate in the course of their work and turn to them for guidance rather than act of their own accord. Officer 30 shared that, when in a difficult situation, "younger officers always think, 'Well, when we have a problem, [Officer 30] knows.'." This type of situation required that Officer 30 be extra vigilant and, as a result, as the participant expressed, "you always have to think, "Am I doing the right thing?" You're always questioning yourself, "Am I doing good?" Further, Officer 30 explained that when citizen monitoring was present, "I know they are paying attention to what I'm doing." Officer 36 provided a similar account, indicating that younger officers tended to hesitate, waiting for direction from more experienced officers:

> When something's happening and there're all officers and a senior officer is coming there, and they're a bit hesitating. [When a senior officer arrives] and when he or she says "we're going", we're going. It's very strange. (Officer 36)

Not only did citizen monitoring appear to cause younger and less experienced officers to hesitate and rely on the guidance and action of experienced officers, it also tended to cause experienced officers to question their actions in the face of citizen monitoring.

Some participants noted that the experience younger officers and their older counterparts had with citizen monitoring depended on their experience with technology and with social media. Younger and often less experienced officers had generally grown up with the technological advances that are integral to social media, and they might also have their own social media account(s). Some participants suggested that because older and generally more experienced police officers might not have been as familiar with social media, they might not understand its ramifications as well as those officers who had grown up with it and were perhaps social media users themselves did. For example, Officer 33 said, "Sometimes older officers are used to the routine and uh, are not familiar with that kind of social media." Based on their observations and personal experiences, participants speculated that older and more experienced officers were not as affected possibly because they were not fully aware of the impact social media could have.

Officer 30 noted that younger officers in particular "don't like it when they're getting filmed." This participant suggested that there were two reasons younger officers did not like being filmed. First, "they don't have the confidence and they just don't want anyone to point out what they're doing wrong." And second, because younger officers understood the potential consequences of "going viral" – "when it's caught on film and goes viral on WhatsApp or Facebook or anything, they don't like it." (Officer 30). Officer 30 said that generally those engaged in citizen monitoring did so because they knew it caused police officers to feel stressed. In other words, they were doing it in order to "get a rise out of" the police officers they were filming. Officer 30 said that, conversely, when police officers simply accepted the filming and no longer let it impact them, the individuals filming lost interest in engaging in citizen monitoring.

Officer 27 explained that confidence was a key characteristic that younger officers lacked. As they responded to a diverse range of calls, they gained experience, and with that experience, they gained confidence. Further, the added variable of citizen monitoring could cause younger officers to feel particularly insecure in their knowledge of police procedures and of the law. Officer 27 said,

> If you are confident in yourself – that it's the right procedure to do – then you can film all the way. I don't care because I know I am right. But if you doubt yourself, then somebody

filming becomes annoying because they see you on film and don't know what you're doing. That would give me stress.

Officer 25 also discussed this:

For the younger officers, it's normal that they are like, "Oh my God, I am on film", it doesn't feel right and that kind of stuff. It's a normal thing.

Typically, for all people, confidence rises with experience. According to Officer 27 and others, this was the case for police officers. Regardless of their time on the job and regardless of their level of confidence, police officers were all subject to citizen monitoring. It is important to consider the impact this phenomenon had on younger officers given that they seemed to be disproportionately impacted. As Officer 48 said, "it shouldn't be that the colleagues kind of freeze because they think 'now I'm in a situation that involves citizen monitoring.' It can't be!"

CYA

In policing circles, there is a phrase known as "CYA". CYA stands for 'cover your ass' and refers to an action or inaction taken by police to protect themselves from potential scrutiny from either internal (i.e., management) or external sources (i.e., public opinion). While the term CYA was not used by Dutch participants, some of their interview responses implied that this was a term that could be extended to police officers' decisions and actions in the Netherlands. Some participants spoke of avoiding certain situations in an effort to protect their professional reputation. Officer 31, for example, discussed observations they had made of their colleagues avoiding certain situations as a protective measure, saying, "Het gebeurt, het gebeurt.[79]" This participant added that it appeared particularly pronounced for officers who had been the subject of scrutiny in the past. Officer 31 explained that some police officers tended to avoid certain situations if they had proved to be problematic in the past: "Ook door dat agent, zeg maar, het strafrechtelijk dingen hebben meegemaakt, zie je dat ze daar heel erg over nadenken.[80]" This description suggested that, given their experiences, some police officers acted in a certain way in order to protect themselves.

It is important to note that those participants who spoke of CYA related tactics expressed that CYA tended to occur in less serious incidents. For example, Officer 27 spoke of serious

---

[79] "It happens. It happens."
[80] "You can also see that they think a lot about it because of the officer who, say, went through things with criminal implications."

202

incidents that required police use of force. They said that in these incidents, it was almost impossible for a police officer to hesitate or avoid the situation. Instead, regardless of the optics of such situations, police officers involved had to act. Less serious incidents, however, more often had a CYA component. Officer 27 said, "But the minor cases where you can maybe avoid it and you can choose to back out of it, you probably won't use your means that are given to you even if they are legal to use." Officer 27 explained that officers could and did opt to avoid or hesitate in some less serious situations to preserve their image and reputation. Despite having the legal justification to engage in a situation, and even to use force in some circumstances, they opted to CYA, meaning they avoided or hesitate. Some participants spoke of serious incidents in which they had hesitated. These are discussed in an upcoming section.

Hesitation for race-related reasons

Another theme that emerged with participants in their discussions of reasons for hesitation had to do with perceptions of and experiences with racialized groups. Some participants shared that the public discourse about race and policing that was ongoing at that time had impacted their confidence and ability to effectively engage with visible minorities. In the years before and during this study, there were a series of highly publicized police incidents involving visible minorities in North America. Those contributed to public calls to defund the police and, in some instances, to abolish police forces altogether. The police officers involved in those incidents, and police officers in general faced considerable backlash as a result. Those incidents had, not infrequently, resulted in riots and public demonstrations.

Although the high-profile racial incidents seem particularly prevalent in North America, and specifically, in the United States, the Netherlands experienced such incidents as well. Regarding the impact the public incidences of policing of visible minorities had on policing in the Netherlands, Officer 40 said:

> Police chiefs are warning us about it and say be careful how you speak to people. Don't make any mistake with talking in a different way to "coloured people". Because it's easy to make…so you might hesitate when it comes to it. Without even knowing you change your behaviour.

Shortly before the interviews with the Dutch National Police commenced, a high-profile police-involved fatality occurred in The Hague. In 2015, Mitch Henriquez was killed by Dutch police at a music festival. The police officers who restrained him used a now controversial tactic known as the 'neck lock'. This restraint ultimately caused his death. Footage captured by bystanders (i.e.,

citizen monitoring) indicated that the narrative communicated by police regarding Henriquez's death was misleading. This contributed to four days of rioting in The Hague. Henriquez was an Aruban man, and his death has been compared to those of high-profile American police-involved fatalities including Freddie Gray and George Floyd.

In the interviews, participants shared that the Henriquez case and the concerns around policing and racial minorities in general could be part of what contributed to hesitation. Citizen monitoring has the ability to capture instances of police misconduct; however, it can also capture legitimate police work and misinterpret the events. Additionally, because of its generative capabilities, footage captured through citizen monitoring can be shared around the world instantaneously. Some participants expressed that this was cause for concern. They worried about interacting with racial minorities out of fear that their actions would be misinterpreted as racism or discrimination.

In the interviews, participants stressed that the actions they took were not driven by racist motivations. For example, Officer 27 said:

> You're getting a fine because you're holding your phone in your hand. You're getting a fine because you drive through a red light. You're getting a fine because you're pissing against somebody's front door. You can't get a fine because you're Black. That doesn't exist.

This kind of perspective did not take into account the potential for systemic racism which is known to exist in many institutions; rather, it presented the opinion that, in general, the Dutch National Police did not overtly target racial minority groups.

Even though participants might not have been inclined to target racial groups, they expressed that they had often received allegations of racism when interacting with minority groups. One participant explained this, saying:

> When we ask something simple to a Moroccan, the first thing they say most of the time is why? Because I am Moroccan? And then the tone is set. They set the tone. If they reply elsewhere, they set the tone. Racism is a big issue now because also we all see footage from the US. We all see them and they'll [internalize them]. (Officer 40)

Other participants shared similar experiences, saying that minority groups responded in a particular way when they interacted with police. For many, interactions such as the one described above, particularly interactions that were taking place in the aftermath of the Henriquez case, had a heightened potential to negatively impact the officer. Officer 29 said, "I don't avoid situations

with racial minorities – Moroccan people or those people. I don't hesitate to act. But it's in the back of your head, so yeah." When asked if they observed hesitation among their colleagues, Officer 29 said, "Yeah, yeah. I understand that some people, some colleagues have problems with that." Other participants explained that those types of encounters had had a significant impact on them when they were less experienced officers (e.g., "It used to affect me, yeah. When I was a younger officer."

When asked about the neck lock in particular, some participants expressed their hesitancy in administering this use of force tactic subsequent to the Henriquez incident. For example, Officer 43 explained the impact of the case:

> Primary Investigator: After that [the Mitch Henriquez incident], was there a ripple effect among the police officers?
>
> Officer 43: Yeah, there was.
>
> Primary Investigator: Are people afraid to use the neck lock because of that?
>
> Officer 43: Yeah, yeah. Really. Yeah, people are really afraid of it.
>
> Primary Investigator: OK.
>
> Officer 43: Because they saw the consequence from this action.

Based on Officer 43's assessment and on other participants' comments, it appeared that the frequency of use of the neck lock as a tactic had changed since the Henriquez incident. Some participants shared that this particular use of force tactic was too risky to employ, and further, that the optics of this tactic could be problematic.

Because of the narrative around use of force tactics, and visible minorities, and around policing in general at the time of this study, there was, among many officers, an increased level of concern regarding interactions that included visible minorities. Some participants felt that there were elements of risk associated with police interactions that involved visible minorities and that the repercussions could be similar to what had happened in the incident involving the neck lock. Although it might not have occurred as frequently in the Netherlands as it might have in Canada or the United States, incidents in which visible minorities called out refrains like "Black Lives Matter" when approached by police nevertheless were a reality. Officer 27 spoke of incidents that involved visible minorities and expressed that those interactions could contribute to hesitation because of the risk associated with them. When discussing being involved in a situation where

the lawful application of force was required, Officer 27 said, "You probably think, 'hmm, ok, let's keep warning him because…it's not a grey area, but it's not worth the risk.'" The participant added, "Shying away from people won't help but watching your step does. You have to be more careful. You don't want to get into an incident where you have to use force because you're under the magnifying glass." Although participants were clear in their conviction that inaction could have potentially serious, if not fatal consequences, they explained that some situations might have, potentially, negative and long-lasting implications and, therefore, officers sometimes hesitated before acting when faced with this type of incident.

While some participants shared that they hesitated in situations involving visible minorities, other participants expressed that this did not happen to them. They shared that when interacting with visible minorities, they were not as fearful of citizen monitoring as they were sceptical of mainstream news media. Officer 45, for example, noted that framing in news coverage was problematic. Further, they explained that the police has considerable agency when confronting this issue. They shared:

> I think that filming is not the problem. The behaviour is the problem. I think that social media can have a good influence and a bad influence like we spoke of. I think the wijkagent[81] is really crucial in our organization…. The real issue discussed here is with modern media. How can you best prevent the framing issue? (Officer 45)

Officer 45's point was an important one. The Dutch National Police's wijkagent role could be effectively used to bridge the divide between members of the public, including visible minorities, and the police. Because of their visible role within the community and the distrust among some community members regarding the police, wijkagents could serve to offer information about the police role and their authorities. Additionally, they could offer a complement or counterpoint to the narrative put forth by mainstream media sources.

6.3.12. Citizen Monitoring Contributing to Avoidance

In addition to hesitation, some participants expressed that citizen monitoring caused them to hesitate before engaging, or to avoid an incident altogether. Participants were explicitly asked about this and although many responded that they had not avoided an encounter out of fear they

---

[81] Community police officer

were being filmed, others noted that they had. For example, Officer 43 offered information regarding an incident they had considered avoiding because of citizen monitoring:

> Primary Investigator: Have you ever considered avoiding an incident or the use of force because of citizen monitoring?
>
> Officer 43: Yeah, of course it has. Yeah. I have done it.

Similarly, Officer 35 shared:

> Ja. Van, het heeft natuurlijk de vraag, het gevoel, van wat denkt de ander, wat denkt het publiek, wat denkt mijn baas... He? Dat is wel, um...Want je wil het dan goed doen. He? Die behoefte heb je natuurlijk wel[82].

This was an important distinction: Officer 43 and Officer 35 both shared that they considered avoiding a situation, but they note that they had not hesitated themselves.

Officer 26 described an incident in which they opted not to use force as a result of citizen monitoring. The participant described the situation:

> It was at the beach, and it was very, very crowded, and someone was verbally aggressive, not physically. He was just really not compliant. Normally we use force to remove him from the area. But it was really, really crowded there. And then colleague from mine in a higher rank, he decided, "OK, let's just form a line so stand in line and just by using your personal space, move him away, without touching him and just—bring him someone else". I think that was a pretty good technique. We have the colleagues enough to do it. We have four people, and that worked very well. And when we were doing it I saw at least five phones. So yeah, I think that was a good call. And I think when we [had been] using force it [would definitely have been] on the internet and it was definitely [blown] out of proportion.

This participant indicated that because of the crowed nature of their environment, they and their fellow officers opted to use a strategy that avoided the use of force for the purpose of maintaining positive optics.

While some shared that these feelings lingered in the back of their mind (Officer 29: "It's in the back of your mind."), many expressed that they hesitated on occasion; however, they did not avoid situations because of citizen monitoring. Participants, including 34, Officer 35, Officer 32, and Officer 28 responded with "No" when asked whether they had considered avoiding a

---

[82] "Yeah. Of course, it makes you question and gives you the feeling of what do other people think, what does the public think? What does my boss think, hey? Because then you want to do it right, hey? Of course, you have that need." (Officer 35)

situation because of the presence of an individual engaged in citizen monitoring. These participants each shared in their own way that it was their duty as police officers to respond to calls for service, to uphold the law, and to protect civilians and their fellow offers. Several participants shared their perspectives regarding this:

> No, I don't believe [I would avoid a situation because of citizen monitoring]. The public expects us to do something. We *have* to do something, even. And if something has to happen that includes a level of force, we don't think about cameras until maybe afterward. We just have to do something. We cannot help it. Fighting and walking away until it's over? That can't happen. We have to do something. (Officer 42)

> I think that's because if we have to use force, we already came to a point that we have to use force and people expect that from us. We are the police. We hesitate, if we don't use force or whatever, if we don't act—it can be force, it can be talk—if we don't act, then I better quit my job. If I'm just afraid of the camera, because then I'm hiding something. So no, I don't change my attitude or my behavior, no. (Officer 45)

> Not using force is not an option. My family knows [about my job], my friends also know. So, they might stumble upon a video with me in it, they'll probably text me: "I saw you on the internet" and if they have a question, because "hmm, that looks a little bit nasty", they'll talk to me, they ask me: "well I saw you on the video, what happened?" So, it won't be for me in my private situation, it won't be a problem. I have nothing to hide. Publicly, sometimes you're a lamb to the slaughter because you don't have the right to stand up to the media and say this is not what happened. This movie is just a part of what happened, or the movie is being cut up and manipulated. Played other than how happened so events didn't take place in this order. And nobody is stepping up for you. The police only say we're looking into the matter and we're going to investigate. Yeah, OK. (Officer 27)

The above quotes and the responses from various participants illustrated their belief that if they avoided a situation because of citizen monitoring, police officers were not living up to the professional expectations set out for them.

Some participants indicated that while they had not personally avoided or considered avoiding a situation because of citizen monitoring, they had witnessed their fellow officers do so. For example, Officer 32 shared that some of their colleagues used certain avoidance strategies when faced with citizen monitoring: "I found colleagues trying to stay away from the camera, turning their backs on the camera." Although this could be considered an avoidance strategy, the individuals mentioned their coworkers were simply avoiding citizen monitoring rather than avoiding the incident itself. Officer 32 added, "I've never found someone not using force." In general, participant responses suggested that while some might have considered avoiding a situation in which citizen monitoring was overt or recognized as a risk, the majority of participants felt strongly that they did not and would not be deterred from action.

6.3.13. Citizen Monitoring and its Impact on Less Experienced Officers

Based on participant responses, citizen monitoring appeared to disproportionately impact younger and less experienced police officers. As with most, if not all, professions, experience contributes to feelings of confidence. Participants expressed that new recruits, despite the fact that their training was recent, tended not to be as confident in the parameters of their legal authority and generally lacked the confidence that more experienced officers had in their role. Citizen monitoring added a dimension to the lack of confidence experienced by some officers. In the following exchange, Officer 30 offered an explanation as to why this was the case:

> Officer 30: A lot of officers don't like it when they're getting filmed, especially the younger ones. That's something I've noticed.
>
> Primary Investigator: Can you tell me why the younger ones say they don't like it?
>
> Officer 30: I think because they don't have the confidence. They just don't want anyone to point out what they're doing wrong. When it's caught on film and it goes viral on WhatsApp or Facebook or something, you don't like it as an officer.

Similarly, Officer 29 said:

> It's a new phenomenon. [It's impacted by] experience with cameras and experience with your job. So, when you have experience in your job and something new happens, I think you're better [able] to handle it than when you're just out of police training. One step out of the police station and there's a camera in your face. That can be a problem then.

According to participants, experience was a key consideration when anticipating how an officer might respond to citizen monitoring.

In addition to experiencing a lack of confidence when faced with citizen monitoring, junior officers were observed by some participants employing certain tactics to avoid being captured on film. These tactics did not necessarily align with their training and seemed to be protective strategies employed by younger officers to prevent themselves from the potential ramifications of citizen monitoring. Officer 40 offered an example: "Less experienced officers are answering filming especially when the people are disruptive, answering filming with a question. Not only verbal, but also fists. Pushing them away. Slapping the phone out of their hands." Officer 32 shared a situation that illustrated less experienced officers' approach to citizen monitoring:

> — Yeah well, when I worked at ****[83] I was Team-Leader, you know? I was lieutenant. Two of my guys were harassed by an illegal taxi driver that was constantly filming

---

[83] Name of location

everyone and they were not used to it so he was always asking annoying questions, being a bit insulting, but not that insulting that they could arrest him. And yeah, and those guys really didn't know how to act. They kind of blushed and. So yeah, that was really sad to see. You felt for those guys.

Experience led to better approaches to managing citizen monitoring, according to participants. As Officer 38 said, "The more [experience] you have, then you can deal with those things better."

The qualitative evidence seemed to suggest that younger and less experienced officers were also more likely to hesitate when faced with citizen monitoring. Officers 36, 38, 33 and others spoke of the perceived increased likelihood that younger and less experienced officers hesitated when in situations where citizen monitoring was present (i.e., "yeah, the younger officers hesitate – the older officers don't hesitate that much."). Officer 29 explained that this happened because citizen monitoring was a "new phenomenon" and, because of the proven potential impact of citizen monitoring, it tended to cause hesitation among less experienced officers.

Findings from the interviews conducted for this research suggested that younger and less experienced officers were disproportionately affected by citizen monitoring. The majority of participants who spoke on this topic agreed that those officers were more likely than experienced officers to feel the impacts of citizen monitoring. However, some participants shared that the more experienced officers often had a different relationship with technology and noted that this could affect their experiences with citizen monitoring. Though it was not always the case, more experienced officers were usually older, and, according to some participants, their age meant that they might not feel as comfortable with or, as knowledgeable about, technology as younger officers. Because of this some of the older officers were not as aware of, or concerned about, the generative capabilities citizen monitoring wields. Their concern, as a result, might have been minimal compared to those who were more aware of the internet's capabilities.

6.3.14. Impact of Citizen Monitoring

Citizen monitoring's specific impact on hesitation, confidence, avoidance, and use of force were explored, and the PI also discussed with participants the question of general impact of citizen monitoring on officers. Some participants reiterated the impact they felt citizen monitoring had on their behaviour and on their operational decisions. Others shared specific examples that offered insight into the overall impact citizen monitoring had on them. Although most participants had not

personally experienced being captured on a video that went viral, some had, and they explained the impact.

Officer 41 spoke of an incident that was captured by citizen monitoring and went viral. He shared that this not only impacted him, but it also affected his family. Officer 41 said:

> There was an incident. My colleagues were busy with an arrest, and the suspect was very difficult. They called another car, but I was around the corner. I arrived last. My colleagues were trying to [apprehend] the guy but it wasn't working. I took the guy by the arm and the moment I had his arm he spat right into my face. My reaction to this is that I do *this.* Not pretty. To explain, the film, at the top, it says, "Cop kicker, ***[84]." Well, I get chills from that too. I think it's terrible. It's bad, but it happened. I was filmed and the film was spread. The incident was filmed. I wrote everything down. I explained everything. The perpetrator said he tried to take out pen and stab us in the neck. He said that. But nowhere can you really see what actually happened. It happened on a Friday, and on Sunday, someone phoned me to say I was on the internet and then my kids were confronted with it. Finally, my supervisors took over and they reacted to it all as professionals. It became an investigation, and it still is. Very strange.

> [Use of force] doesn't look good, and then it's also on social media. Who is making the film, what goes into that, and that's also not always good? Like, in my case, okay? I'm filmed but I was absolved of all wrongdoing. Everything was fine. But that film…it's still there even though everything was fine. People see that. I have to live with that. My son was confronted by that. He came home from school, crying. These are the things…I don't want my family to deal with that. (Officer 41)

At this point in the interview, Officer 41 was audibly and visibly emotional. The impact this incident had was obvious. The participant was particularly distressed by the experience their son had as a result of the incident. They stressed the long-term effect that citizen monitoring has had on them and on their family.

6.3.15. Specific Dutch Strategies

There are differences between Canadian and Dutch policing, and these differences were explored in Chapter 4. Here, it is important to note some specific Dutch policing strategies that participants saw as positive influences on their relationship with citizen monitoring. They indicated that these strategies allowed them to build relationships with members of the public. The three

---

[84] Name of city

key features addressed by participants were: Wijkagents[85] ,[86] WhatsApp Block Watch, and police social media. Participants spoke to the strength of these strategies in mitigating the impact of citizen monitoring. The PI's interview schedule did not include questions regarding these specific strategies and their impact, so these responses were entirely participant-initiated.

Wijkagent (Community Officer)

The Wijkagent's role was to "engage in surveillance and talk to people on the street", rather than to focus primarily on "112[87] calls" (Officer 43). The focus tended to be on proactive police work, rather than reactive responses to calls for service. Participants explained that the Wijkagent had the ability to provide resources and to connect civilians with services they might need, in addition to responding to emergency calls for service when needed. Officer 45 explained:

> I think the Wijkagenten are really unique in the Netherlands, because now you have a police officer that everybody knows and that knows the area. Everybody knows him from name so now the police have a face. They do a lot to establish a relationship with the public and to build that rapport, which is really important, I think. Because we even play soccer with [community members]. We try to get a connection with these guys. At least they have a positive interaction and not just a negative interaction. We have a similar thing. Youth that are headed into gangs. They have a day where they bring them in and play football with the police officers and it's very meaningful for these kids. Sport voor broeder, hoe zeg je dat?[88] Sport for brothers? or brotherhood?

The Wijkagent was uniquely placed to establish and build rapport with members of the public. Their role was to educate civilians regarding their job as law enforcement officials, to break barriers that might have existed because of cultural expectations and opinions of the police in general, and to offer a friendly and approachable image of the police.

Although the Wijkagent did not directly tackle the topic of citizen monitoring, their ability to engage with the public in a meaningful way might offset the negative effects citizen monitoring could have on the police image in general. According to participants, the way in which the Wijkagent role was set up allowed them to cultivate respect and rapport simultaneously. Officer 35 said, "As a Wijkagent, you're alone. Ja. Dus, als ik naar een beruchte crimineel ga bijvoorbeeld, en ik ben alleen, dan krijg je eerder respect dan als je met tien man komt.[89]" Officer 43 described

---

[85] Community officers
[86] It is also important to note that some participants held roles as Wijkagent, so their perception of the position and its impact may have been impacted by their proximity to the position.
[87] Emergency calls; the equivalent of 911 calls in Canada
[88] "Sport for brotherhood? How do you say that?"
[89] "Yeah, so if I go to a notorious criminal for example, and I'm alone, you get more respect than if you come with ten men."

the role as a "liaison to the community". Some participants speculated that because of the interactions civilians had with Wijkagents, they were potentially better able to distinguish between misleading or manipulated citizen monitoring content and something that was genuinely intended.

WhatsApp Block Watch

A second key feature of Dutch policing with respect to citizen monitoring to which participants spoke was the WhatsApp Block Watch program. According to participants, this initiative was unique to the Netherlands and was developed with the principles of predictive policing in mind, along with a desire to serve the community at large. Officer 32 shared details of the WhatsApp Block Watch program, saying:

> If we respond to a situation which involves a burglary, we put it in the app we're going to and then people come out of their houses looking if they see the [suspect]. So, the public has access to this as well. You can see it like—I'll draw it (*participant draws picture of a neighbourhood).* You've got 3, 4 persons who completes the whole neighborhood and in that group there's also the police group. [The group is updated] at the moment it's happening. This is run by civilians. It's a civilian thing and we just participate. We just monitor it.

Through this program, the police and the public joined forces to work together in an effort to combat crime. Information sharing and intelligence gathering became a community effort even as they were a police responsibility. Just as Wijkagenten were not directly linked to citizen monitoring, the WhatsApp Block Watch program did not set out to impact citizen monitoring; however, given that it was an effort aimed at bridging the gap between community and police, it might have residual positive impacts on the effects of citizen monitoring.

Police social media

Participants referenced police social media as an effective tool in publicizing police efforts and providing civilians access to the police narrative. Participants shared that there were a variety of social media platforms employed by the Dutch police: "Dumpert, YouTube, Instagram, but also, Facebook, WhatsApp." (Officer 42). They noted that the police used these modes of online communication to educate the public, to bring awareness to their role, and sometimes, to engage in 'damage control'. Officer 42 said:

> We have a few people in ***[90] working with us who check the social media all the time, so if they see videos that damage the police, they…are like a public relations person from the police side. Police perspective.

Officer 33 added, "I heard that 4 million tweets are tweeted every day by Dutch police officers."

Responses indicated that police social media accounts were prevalent.

Although the use of social media by the police did not prevent citizen monitoring, it might have had the effect of decreasing potentially negative impacts associated with the phenomenon. Officer 45 spoke of the ways in which police social media was employed:

> We will always ask for permission if we can use something. But you know, we cannot show everything. If someone is dying, we will not ask to put it on [police social media accounts] just to enhance our image as friendly, because that's not – we want to show good police, but not at the cost of others. So that's really an important thing. But what we do is, we play soccer with [civilians]. ***[91] does the Twitter account in which he shows what he's doing in the name of the police. It legitimizes our work.

Participants indicated that there were multiple motivations behind citizen monitoring; however, based on police accounts and perceptions it seemed that the motivations were predominantly malicious in intent. Police social media gave police the agency over their narrative. While they were not able to discuss all details of a criminal investigation publicly, social media provided them with the opportunity to share what they could, and, in this way, potentially dispel incorrect assumptions regarding their responses to certain situations. To some extent, police social media accounts offered an important complement to footage captured through citizen monitoring and offered another perspective on an incident.

6.3.16. Citizen Monitoring and Departmental Support

Footage captured through citizen monitoring had the potential to "go viral" or to be disseminated widely via the internet. When this occurred, the police officer(s) involved were often subject to considerable public scrutiny, and depending upon the circumstances, they could face disciplinary measures from within their department. The topic of departmental support was broached by many participants. Participants were clear in their belief that abuses of power or of use of force should not be tolerated within the police service; however, they also stressed the fact

---

[90] Name of police jurisdiction
[91] Fellow officer's name

that footage obtained through citizen monitoring did not present "the whole story". The fallout that could result from incomplete or altered footage or simply the fact that footage showed one point of view only, made it all the more important that officers felt they had the support of their department. This, participants claimed, would help increase officers' confidence in dealing with incidents that were digitally monitored by citizens.

When asked about the support, or lack thereof, participants received from their department, responses varied. Although most participants felt confident in their departmental support, some did not have confidence, and some had conflicting opinions. Officer 43 was among the participants who were confident in their organization's ability to support officers. This participant said, "[The department] will tell them [they'll] hire an attorney for you to keep you safe in procedures and [they] try to speak with them during the whole process. That's good." Officer 29 also acknowledged they felt confident in their department's ability to support them should they be caught on camera, and referenced an incident with a colleague as evidence for their view:

> There's one time, a colleague was acting at some riot in ***[92] and a woman accused him of hitting him with a baton. So, there was an investigation and later in the investigation there was filming. But the weird part of it was that on the filming it wasn't necessarily visible that he hit her, but the public made it as if he—it wasn't—the filming was a bit vague—but [the public] interpreted what they wanted to. So he was under investigation, but was also supported for, he wasn't pulled out of the street, or anything. So just do your job, investigation are two separate things.

In general, participants more often responded that they felt supported by their department. Most participants felt strongly that if they were to be captured by citizen monitoring while engaged in the lawful application of force, they would be supported by their department.

Some participants felt as though their direct management would support them; however, they felt less supported by their senior management team. Officer 33 discussed this:

> Officer 33: My direct boss is OK, but — the big organization, no I don't think so. There are a lot of examples that colleagues were dropped like a brick, that I think, OK, I hope that doesn't happen to me. When it does happen, you have a real problem. They won't support you.
>
> Primary Investigator: When you see a camera or when you see footage on the news, does that give you any concern about your job?

---

[92] Name of city

Officer 33: Yes, it does. What I told you, I hope it doesn't happen to me. I know some few people who have gone through this. Yeah, they're not, how do you say, verstellend. *Confident*.

Participants who shared this sentiment, generally felt as though their direct managers would offer support and would be able to separate political objectives from the good of their officers. Officer 42 addressed this, saying, "the public opinion and the government and politicians are also watching", indicating that senior management could potentially be swayed by external motivators, whereas direct management had a more tangible interest in maintaining a good connection and level of mutual trust with their officers.

Officer 42 said, "I hope my organization has my back, but there's not 100% confidence that it will happen." The participant added that although it "may be naïve", generally they did believe their organization "has my back". Similarly, Officer 35 noted that the department was supportive, but only when it was in their best interest. Officer 35 said, "Nee. Ze wachten. They wait hoe de zaak afhandelt bij justitie. Als hij bestrafd wordt ja of nee."[93] Officer 35 added, jokingly, that they had their own solution to the lack of confidence they felt in their senior management: "Dat als er iets gebeurt dat, dat dan mijn eigen dynamiet kan krijgen en de politie in het verkeerd daglicht wordt gezet."[94] Despite the general sentiment that departments were supportive of their officers who had experienced negative effects of citizen monitoring, some participants felt as though this area was lacking.

6.4. Conclusion

In this chapter, the findings presented suggested that citizen monitoring had an impact, and in some cases, a profound impact, on Dutch police officers and their use of force. The officers interviewed expressed that the pervasive nature of citizen monitoring was a reality of contemporary policing. Although some participants felt there might be benefits to citizen monitoring, overall, the interview results indicated that citizen monitoring impacted officer behaviour and decision-making in several notable ways.

---

[93] "No, they wait. They are waiting to see how the case is handled by the judiciary. If he is punished yes or no."

[94] "That if something happens, I can get my own dynamite and put the police in the wrong light."

The findings in this chapter were similar to the findings presented in Chapter Five, in that the main findings suggested that officers' confidence could be impacted by the presence of citizen monitoring. This was particularly apparent in areas that had been impacted by a public and controversial use of force incident. The findings also indicated that citizen monitoring might contribute to hesitation in situations that necessitated swift and decisive action. Additionally, the findings presented in this chapter suggested that officers felt favourably about the departmental support they received in situations involving citizen monitoring. Further, the findings indicated that some strategies unique to the Dutch policing landscape served to benefit the relationship the police had with the general public, which, perhaps mitigated some of the potentially negative impacts of citizen monitoring.

While citizen monitoring was overwhelmingly seen in a negative light, some officers noted that its potential benefits should not be overlooked. Officer 43 said:

> Well maybe I'm different from all the other opinions but I think we can see it as a gift instead of seeing it as a trap. It's common, everything uses it, and we are using it as well [for educational purposes] and press...Last week we caught something who stole a jacket from another student, but he didn't want to say where he left the jacket, or he forgot. So, we put on our Facebook page: "if someone found it, please bring it to the station because it was stolen". So, we also use it for our investigation.

Although it became clear that citizen monitoring presented unique challenges in modern policing, it was also noted that it was a real part of today's society and that it could contribute to the production of dialogue and perhaps to collaboration. The findings presented in this study pointed to the importance of continual, updated, and effective training in order to appropriately respond to the challenges citizen monitoring could present.

It's not the filming that's the problem, but the behaviour behind the filming. They use the camera as a tool, a weapon.

<div align="right">Officer 31</div>

Chapter 7. Conclusion

Citizen monitoring is a relatively new phenomenon, and, as such, there is a need for academic research on the topic. This study investigated the perceptions of Canadian and Dutch police officer as to the impact and perceived impact citizen monitoring had on police officers in both the Canadian and Dutch context. While it must be acknowledged that the two samples in this study operate within distinct contextual frameworks, it is important to note that their shared experiences revealed a striking homogeneity. There exist inherent differences in the Dutch and Canadian legal systems, cultural nuances, and societal norms; however, the parallel themes that emerged from the interviews conducted for this research highlight the widespread challenge citizen monitoring poses for law enforcement officials. The convergence of these experiences points to the importance of this study's findings on a broader scale and emphasizes the impact citizen monitoring has on confidence, decision making, and use of force across contexts. Based on this, there is a clear need for further cross-cultural examination of the phenomenon.

The findings revealed that citizen monitoring affected police officers in a variety of ways, including confidence, decision making, and the way in which they used force. This chapter provides a discussion of the implications resulting from the findings addressed in Chapters 4, 5, and 6. Additionally, it presents conclusions that can be drawn from these findings, including: 1) training that considers citizen monitoring; 2) educating the public; and 3) ensuring officers are supported in their dealings with citizen monitoring. The chapter concludes with a discussion of study limitations and directions for future research.

7.1. Implications

The possible implications of research around citizen monitoring are significant. The ubiquitous nature and the potentially far-reaching consequences of this type of monitoring make these findings, which were based on the perspectives of police officers, critical to the work of police going forward. This research bridges a crucial gap in the academic understanding of citizen monitoring and has tangible practical implications on the police profession. The findings addressed here offer valuable insight into a phenomenon that necessitates exploration and understanding as it has significant impacts on police officers and their work.

The present study shares the perspectives of 48 police officers in an effort to better understand and provide a wide-angled view of the impact of citizen monitoring on police ability to perform their job. The findings showed that perspectives among participants regarding citizen monitoring were similar. They showed that despite unique contextual factors and operational experiences, common themes related to perspectives of citizen monitoring existed. These themes suggested that police officers were universally affected by citizen monitoring. While some participants stated that they did not believe their own behaviour changed when they were subjected to citizen monitoring, all participants were of the opinion that citizen monitoring impacted police officers generally. Because of this, it is critical to consider the findings this study present. Police agencies must recognize the impact citizen monitoring has on its members in order to properly prepare and support them.

7.1.1. Training that Considers Citizen Monitoring

Citizen monitoring is a consideration, although perhaps not a central element, in use of force training. Both Canadian and Dutch participants said that reference was made to the notion of "being watched" and that this idea was being communicated to officers in training long before citizen monitoring was enabled through smartphone technology. At present, however, citizen monitoring is not considered to the extent it perhaps should be in use of force training. Its impact on officers, and in particular on novice frontline officers, should be given increased consideration. The results of the study indicate that novice officers from both the Canadian and Dutch sample seemed disproportionately impacted by citizen monitoring, and as such, this study hopes to inspire change within the current training procedures so that novice officers can be better prepared to cope with the ever-mounting public scrutiny to which they are subjected.

In both Canada and the Netherlands, new recruits receive use of force training. Use of force training programs are "based on Force Options Theory which is the foundation upon which all use of force, arrest, control, and officer safety training is built." (Todd, 2015; p. 111). Based on the concept of control, Force Options Theory asserts that police officers deal with violent subjects and violent situations regularly. Police officers must control violent behaviour, manage, and mitigate violent situations, and enforce the law. Based on participant responses related to use of force training, it was clear that many aspects of the current training model were both rigorous and thorough. However, it was also apparent that there was a deficit with regards to managing citizen monitoring. This deficit included training in how to handle monitoring, preparation for the impacts of secondary visibility, and the politics of citizen monitoring. Police officers interviewed indicated

that they manage a multitude of stressors in their work, and their new visibility presented an added stressor the impact of which could potentially be decreased through comprehensive training and pre-emptive intervention.

Although this study finds a deficit in citizen monitoring training for officers, the scenario-based use of force training current at the time of the study did involve examples of citizen monitoring. Scenarios included actors or fellow recruits imitating bystanders engaged in citizen monitoring. This was a positive development and helped better prepare recruits to manage situations that involved citizen monitoring; however, based on participant responses, it is likely that these efforts were insufficient. Training should be expanded given the added stressors the ubiquitous nature new visibility presented. The findings in both the Dutch and Canadian samples suggested that citizen monitoring impacted confidence levels among novice officers in particular and certain accounts in the Canadian sample specifically indicated that weak legal knowledge compounded the negative impact of citizen monitoring. Consideration should be given to stressors, such as citizen monitoring, that could impede knowledge required on the job. Training procedures aimed to address the impact of citizen monitoring should be established through consultation with those officers most affected (i.e., novice officers) so that use of force trainers have a good understanding of the stressors that exist in operational police work and can use these first-hand accounts to better prepare recruits for real-life scenarios. The better prepared officers are, the more able they will be to remain calm when pressured by citizens while performing their duties.

Consideration should be given to training beyond recruits alone. Technology has contributed to significant changes in many aspects of day-to-day life and these changes impact the policing landscape. Because of this, it is necessary for all law enforcement officials to receive regular and up-to-date training that reflects the changes technology initiates. The findings presented in this study indicated that officers often experienced a reduction in their confidence levels when faced with citizen monitoring and this decreased confidence was compounded by a perceived lack of support from management. Both of these potential consequences of citizen monitoring related to image control. Officers expressed concern that both their professional and their personal image would be impacted by footage obtained through citizen monitoring, and participants felt that management might be reluctant to support their officers because of the potential impact this support might have on the image of the force. The concept of "image", both personal and professional, is important not only to the force as a whole, but is also a key

221

component in the officer's ability on the job. Image and perceived image affect confidence and are important for the perception of authority. This cyclical relationship must be considered by those in managerial positions. Further, management must recognize its role in ensuring and preserving officer confidence, and, by extension, image management. Training is a realistic avenue by which to accomplish this.

7.1.2. Educating the Public

A key theme that emerged through the interviews for this study related to the public's perception of policing and of police officers in general. Typically, the public develops an understanding of police operations through mainstream media. According to participants, the public developed assumptions regarding police work not only through media coverage, but also, and, among some demographics in some areas, perhaps more so, through citizen monitoring. These assumptions were often flawed due to a presentation that disregarded, either willfully or out of ignorance, the intricacies, and challenges of police work. Participants explained that when members of the public saw footage obtained through citizen monitoring depicting police officers using force, it was not unusual for them to conclude that the application of force was excessive despite them not having the knowledge and evidence to support this. Participants suggested that the public was wont to make overarching assumptions regarding police practices and professionalism in general based on a single example of police inappropriate use of force as depicted in video footage gained through citizen monitoring and disseminated via the internet.

Information regarding the principles that guide police use of force are available to the public. The use of force framework and information regarding section 25 of the *Criminal* Code, which provides the justification for police use of force, are available on the internet for public consumption. Although this is available to the public, the nuances and professional implications might not always be easily discerned. Information can assist members of the public in understanding the legal elements of use of force; however, there are often complicating factors at play in use of force incidents and these are unlikely to be evident in the footage gained through citizen monitoring. As discussed, this kind of video footage did not typically cover an incident from start to finish therefore those viewing the footage likely would not have all the information required to make an informed assessment of the incident and its outcome. The footage might depict what appeared to be excessive use of force, but a lack of knowledge regarding the action(s) that led to this use of force meant that the footage would likely be incorrectly interpreted.

Footage obtained through citizen monitoring can easily be misinterpreted by the public. For this reason, it is incumbent upon police departments to establish systems aimed at educating the public about their role with the goal of instilling public confidence in the police. The advent of police social media accounts might serve to reduce the gap between the public and the police; however, based on the findings of this study, it seems more must be done. Participants in this study noted that police departments' "hands are tied" when it came to sharing information regarding an investigation that involved the public. While this is true, there are other ways in which police agencies could work to educate the public. In the PI's master's research, potential solutions were presented, including allowing members of the press to participate in use of force training scenarios. It is unlikely that any one specific approach to educating the public would serve as a panacea to close the gap between public perception and police action. Instead, a more reasonable expectation is that a variety of efforts to this end will gradually encourage people to expand their understanding of the police role.

Senior members of police agencies have a responsibility to support their officers and must ensure they are adequately prepared for their role on the front lines. The findings presented in this research pointed to the prevalence of citizen monitoring and the potential misinterpretation of footage obtained as a consequence of the phenomenon. Frontline police officers are the face of the legal system. Their behaviour, interactions, and responses can be observed firsthand and further scrutinized second-hand. This visibility can contribute to accountability, but it can also mean that the public has the power to create an unintentionally or intentionally misrepresented narrative around police behaviour. In order to manage this, some participants spoke of the use of social media as a counter tool. Social media is used as a tool to disseminate citizen monitoring footage, but it can also be used by the police as an effective way to educate and build rapport with the public. It is not uncommon for police agencies to have well-developed social media platforms, and this is certainly one avenue to increase public awareness of the police role. However, social media is a rapidly developing landscape, and it is critical that police agencies are up to date and able to take full advantage of the various platforms available. It has also become increasingly common for individual police officers to have public and organizationally approved social media accounts which they use to share details of their role and showcase the ways in which they engage with the public. This may be an additional strategy that police agencies can employ in order to educate the public regarding the intricacies of police work.

Dutch participants spoke of the role Wijkagents played in educating the public. Participants explained that this model enabled police to engage with vulnerable populations including youth and the elderly, educate members of the public, and to survey the neighbourhood in which they were stationed. The community policing model exists across Canada as well; however, it is possible that something can be learned from the Dutch Wijkagent model in terms of its potential to educate the public. Community policing integrates three essential parts: (1) partnership with the community, (2) problem-solving approaches, and (3) a supportive organizational structure (IACP, 2018). According to the Canadian Association of Chiefs of Police, key elements of community policing include trust, accountability, and support of the community (CACP, 2022). Through engaging in consultation with the community and proactive policing, those engaged in community policing can build rapport with individuals who live and or work in their jurisdiction. Dutch participants expressed the power their community policing model had in managing misinformation due to citizen monitoring, and based on this, it is possible that an added emphasis should be placed on such efforts in Canada.

7.1.3. Support

A key finding presented in this research related to the perceived managerial support or lack thereof that officers felt they had. Based on participant responses, there appeared to be a cyclical relationship between perceptions of managerial support and confidence on the part of officers when confronted with citizen monitoring. Participants expressed that when they felt supported by their management teams, they felt more confident, particularly with respect to the lawful application of force, when dealing with citizen monitoring. Based on this, a key recommendation relates to an assessment of the support frontline officers receive, and an evaluation of its efficacy.

Support is a challenging concept. It implies that the individual or individuals providing the support must "hold up" those requiring the support regardless of the circumstances. The police hold a considerable amount of authority over the general public and, as such, the concept of support requires some elaboration. There are confirmed instances of police abuse of powers, including excessive use of force, in both Canada and the Netherlands. Although the prevalence of such instances is significantly outweighed by lawful police behaviour, it is important to acknowledge that there is evidence of such cases and that it is likely that they will continue to arise. Because of this, it is critical to differentiate between 'blind support' and 'fact-driven support'. Blind support implies support that exists regardless of the circumstances. Police officers who felt

they were supported regardless of whether or not they exhibited lawful or unlawful behaviour experienced blind support. Contrarily, those officers who felt they would be supported if their lawful actions were considered and when the totality of circumstances were understood and recognized experienced fact-driven support.

Participants clearly indicated that support from senior level officers and management was critical for officers to confront citizen monitoring with confidence. Although this is important, it is equally important that the support they receive is fact driven. Officers should feel confident in their ability to take lawful action when in a situation that involves citizen monitoring, and they should feel certain in management's ability to support them regardless of the optics. Participants frequently noted that incidents involving the lawful application of force did not "look pretty", and therefore, footage of such a situation obtained through citizen monitoring had the potential to be misinterpreted as abuse of force. In these situations, frontline officers should feel some assurances that their management team will provide support if public backlash resulted from misinterpreted citizen monitoring footage.

Citizen monitoring is touted as a tool used by the public to ensure police accountability. It is important to consider public perception in discussions of support from management. Recent high-profile police incidents have impacted public confidence in the police and have spurred large-scale protests and calls to "de-fund the police". Those who supported this movement presented arguments regarding the perceived need to re-allocate funds to other social services, systemic racism, and police abuse of force. Given this kind of backlash, it is critical for management to engage in fact-driven support so as not to invite controversy, but rather to promote integrity among their officers.

The line between blind support and fact-driven support is not necessarily clear. Consideration must be given to issues around officer integrity and honesty, perception, and the intricacies of the law. Although, from a legal perspective, the difference between justified and unjustified force is clear, the path to determine which of the two has occurred can be somewhat nebulous. One mechanism that some police agencies rely on in the hopes of a more complete picture is the body-worn camera (BWC). The BWC is a wearable device that captures interactions between police and members of the public. Body-worn cameras are used in an effort to increase transparency, public trust, and accountability. Although it is impossible to capture the entirety of an incident from all vantage points, BWCs may serve as a means for the production of an

unbiased and objective way to present information from the perspective of the officer involved in the incident. This footage may enable management to engage in fact-based support in a more meaningful way than they might be inclined to do if they have access only to the footage obtained through citizen monitoring.

7.2. Limitations

This study was a novel and in-depth exploration into police officers' experiences with and perceptions of citizen monitoring. The possible implications of this research are substantial; however, the study is limited by 1) sample size, 2) representativeness, 3) generalizability, 4) the perception-based nature of the interviews, and 5) its lack of in-field observations of officers' behaviour in citizen encounters, use of force situations, and the presence/absence of monitoring.

The study included 24 Canadian police officers and 24 Dutch police officers. The nature of interview-based qualitative research is such that there are typically fewer participants or study subjects than there might be in quantitative research studies. Because interview based qualitative research generally involves the in-depth examination of the experiences of a small number of individuals, the results can be particularly valuable because they are detailed, personal, and specific, but they do not necessarily reflect the experiences and perceptions of the majority of the population from which a sample is derived.

As of 2019, there were 68, 718 police officers in Canada (Statistics Canada, 2019). The sample size of 24 represents 0.00034% of the total number of Canadian police officers. Similarly, the Dutch sample of 24 reflects approximately 0.0004% of the total Dutch force of +/- 60, 000 police officers (Clingendael Report, 2016). However, it is interesting that, despite this, the findings that emerged through discussions with both the Canadian and Dutch samples reflect similar opinions regarding citizen monitoring. Contextual factors discussed in Chapter Four offer an examination of how experiences with and perceptions of citizen monitoring differ based on the occupational context of participants' work.

The second key limitation of the study relates to the representativeness of the sample. In an effort to develop a balanced understanding of citizen monitoring across Canada and the Netherlands, officers from multiple geographic regions participated. The Canadian sample represented police officers who had worked, or were working, in Canada's west coast, prairie

provinces, central provinces, Atlantic provinces, and/or northern territories. Canada's central provinces are Ontario and Quebec. The official language in Quebec is French, differing from the remaining Canadian provinces and territories where the dominant official language is English. None of the participants from the Canadian sample had ever worked in Quebec. This is a notable limitation as the perspective of officers from Quebec would certainly add to the overall understanding of citizen monitoring among Canadian police officers. Nevertheless, each of Canada's regions were represented by participants within the sample.

Canada's unique policing structure was considered when determining representativeness for the purpose of the study. The Royal Canadian Mounted Police (RCMP) is under contract to provide policing services to seven Canadian provinces and three territories. Consideration was given to the size and scope of this mandate and an effort was made to ensure representation from RCMP members among interview participants. At the time of the data collection, the PI was based in Vancouver, which is in Canada's west coast region. Because the primary mode of sampling was opportunity sampling, some of the Canadian participants were located in a proximal region with the implication that, comparatively, more participants were based in Canada's west coast region than other regions in the country. Additionally, the study sample was comprised of participants from three of Canada's four levels of policing: municipal, provincial, and federal; however, the study did not interview any participants from the fourth level, which is First Nation policing. Several participants had worked in communities largely comprised of Indigenous peoples, but it is likely that their perspectives would differ from Indigenous people working in Indigenous communities for a First Nation police department.

The Dutch sample for this study included participants from the Dutch National Police force which consists of ten regional units, a central unit, and a police services unit. Although participants from various regional units were interviewed, the majority were from the Netherland's central regional units. A concerted effort was made to obtain a heterogeneous sample of participants from various regional units; however, due to time constraints and the type of sampling employed, most participants were from the central region, including east and west Netherlands. Participants ranged in their years of service and experience on the job; nonetheless, like the Canadian sample, the Dutch sample cannot be considered entirely representative, in part because members from all regional units across the country were not interviewed. It must be noted that compared to Canada the Netherlands is a small country with relatively consistent policing needs. In this the two countries are substantially different.

Lastly, this study did not have an in-field component, and as such, the PI did not observe police officer behaviour during citizen encounters, use of force situations, and the presence or absence of monitoring. In-field observations can offer a rich addition to interview based research in that they provide a fist-hand witnessed account, and therefore a potentially more comprehensive understanding of the nuanced dynamics and contextual factors that influence officer behaviours during encounters that involve citizen monitoring. Future exploration of this topic should consider the incorporation of in-field observations to provide additional depth to the findings presented herein. In-field observations would contribute to a deeper understanding of the complex interplay between citizens, law enforcement, and monitoring efforts.

7.3. Acknowledging Bias

Bias can occur during all phases of academic research, including planning, data collection, analysis and the publication phases (Pannucci and Wilkins, 2011). As a researcher, it is important to thoroughly consider one's personal biases and to take action to avoid bias in research. Qualitative research is "frequently criticized for lacking scientific rigour with poor justification of the methods adopted, lack of transparency in the analytical procedures and the findings being merely a collection of personal opinions subject to researcher bias" (Noble and Smith, 2015; p. 1). In order to minimize the impact of bias and to produce research that is both credible and valuable, the researcher must recognize that multiple realities exist, particularly when producing perception-based research, and must outline any of their own experiences and views that may have contributed to methodological bias (Noble and Smith, 2015). In this section, I consider my personal biases and the action I have taken to ensure credibility and value in my research.

As a young adult, I aspired to go into law enforcement, but, instead, gravitated toward the study of policing and embarked on graduate studies. It is incumbent on me to acknowledge my previous interest in policing as a career choice because it has in some ways impacted the way in which I see the profession and those employed in it. My academic work has influenced my point of view, and my perspective of policing has changed, with my opinions becoming less subjective and more balanced: however, my respect remains for those who embody and uphold policing's ideals of serving and protecting. In recent years, I have experienced the juxtaposition of my research and the public outcry regarding police abuse of power as well as the allegations that the law enforcement structure is embedded in systemic racism. I am reminded that my role as a

researcher is to present my findings, and that, although it is important to be aware of emotions current controversies might bring up for me, the purpose of my findings is to reflect the perspectives of police officers working on the frontlines. Through these findings, we are better able to understand the impact of citizen monitoring on frontline policing. This information can be used to make changes that will benefit not only the policing abilities of frontline officers, but also the best interests of the public.

My master's research (2013-2015) focussed on an examination of citizen monitoring and the findings were considered an important contribution to the study of citizen monitoring despite the relatively small participant sample. Themes that emerged from that research include incident avoidance, change in behaviour, FIDO, and citizen monitoring's impact on confidence, and these became the foundation for my doctoral research. Because qualitative researchers must acknowledge their personal biases, it was incumbent upon me to embrace the notion that the doctoral research findings might differ from the hypothesis I was positing as a result of my master's research findings. My responsibility as a qualitative researcher is to give a voice to the participants and to report on the findings, regardless of the ways in which these do or do not align with the findings presented in my master's research.

Personal bias is unavoidable, but its impact can, and must, be mitigated. In an effort to ensure my own biases would not impact this research, I not only confronted and examined my biases, but I also took steps to ensure the research presented in this study was both credible and valuable. I did this by clearly and accurately presenting participants' perspectives, and by recognizing that, as a qualitative researcher, I have been able to give agency to my participants by sharing verbatim portions of their interview transcripts and by honouring their voice. I clearly identified the methodological decisions made in this research and described why opportunity sampling was employed over the randomized sampling methods researchers often deem optimal. Further, the discussion of contextual factors in Chapter 4, provided a rich description of the contexts in which citizen monitoring occurred and this enhances the credibility of this research. I have taken pains to do everything possible to identify and confront my biases to ensure that this work is accurate in its reflections of participant observations and opinions and credible in its conclusions and recommendation.

7.4. Directions for Future Research

While the research presented here increases extant literature on the topic of citizen monitoring, further exploration on the phenomenon is required. There are a number of ways in which citizen monitoring could be further explored. First, this research addressed the experiences and perceptions of those at the receiving end of citizen monitoring but did not investigate the motivations and expectations of those participating in citizen monitoring. In an effort to produce a baseline understanding of how citizen monitoring is viewed by the public, a sample of the general civilian population could be surveyed regarding their attitudes toward citizen monitoring. Second, focus groups could be conducted with frontline police officers. Through the use of focus groups, the Primary Investigator might gain a deeper understanding of the experiences of police officers as a collective. The communication that takes place between research participants during focus groups would be of benefit in terms of understanding citizen monitoring on a more comprehensive level. Participants would have the opportunity to explore and clarify their views in a way that might be less readily accessible in an individual interview setting. Third, the present study focuses primarily on frontline officers. In order to better understand citizen monitoring, it would be beneficial to explore if and how the experiences of officers with differing assignments of duties vary in terms of the way citizen monitoring impacts them. Fourth, while this study examines the experiences of officers in two countries, Canada and the Netherlands, exploring officers' experiences with citizen monitoring in the United States might result in a deeper understanding of citizen monitoring not only in that country but also in Canada. The findings presented in this study were based on interview data. While interviews can provide rich and fulsome data, any future research developing from the present study should consider employing an all-inclusive approach.

7.5. Concluding Remarks

This research expanded upon an important discussion regarding citizen monitoring and its impact on police officers within both the Dutch and Canadian contexts. The perception-based focus gives voice to police officers who frequently experienced citizen monitoring while working on the frontlines. The findings outlined in this study demonstrated that citizen monitoring may impact police work. The heightened sense of awareness that results from citizen monitoring can contribute to fear of potential scrutiny of the police by the public, thus causing behaviour change among police officers, including hesitation and avoidance. The potential consequences of citizen

monitoring must be carefully considered in order to ensure they do not prevent police officers from effectively engaging in order maintenance and ensuring public safety.

There are possible benefits of citizen monitoring. It presents as a powerful tool for accountability, fostering transparency, and promoting responsible behaviour among police officers. In some instances, it may be possible for citizen monitoring to positively contribute to professionalism among police officers and to the reduction of instances of misconduct. However, in order to strike a balance between accountability, transparency, and effective policing, an emphasis should be placed on ensuring training programs provide police officers with the skills and knowledge necessary to skillfully navigate the complexities of citizen monitoring.

In an age where social media use and cell phone ownership are widespread, the police can no longer afford to ignore or resist the presence of citizen monitoring. It is incumbent upon police agencies to recognize the pervasive nature of citizen monitoring in contemporary society and accept the changing landscape. Modern technology enables the civilian population to capture and disseminate footage of the police with unprecedented ease and reach. This paradigm shift requires that police agencies move to adapt their practices accordingly. Rigorous training and comprehensive discussions around policy are needed in order to address the impact of citizen monitoring on police officer behaviour and perceptions. Citizen monitoring shows no signs of abating, and therefore, it is necessary to consider the ways in which a safe and supportive workplace for police officers can be ensured.

References

Adang, O. (2012). Learning to Deal with Potentially Dangerous Situations: A Situation-Oriented Approach. In M. R. Haberfeld, C. A. Clarke, & D. L. Sheehan (Eds.), *Police Organization and Training: Innovations in Research and Practice* (pp. 153–168). New York, NY: Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4614-0745-4_10

Adegbile, D. P. (2017). Policing through an American prism. *The Yale Law Journal*, *126*(7), 2222–2259.

Alang, S., McAlpine, D., Hardeman, R., & McCreedy, E. (2017). Alang et al. Respond. *American Journal of Public Health (1971), 107*(8), e22–e23. https://doi.org/10.2105/AJPH.2017.303872

Alpert, G., Rojek, J., & Hansen, A. (2013). Building Bridges Between Police Researchers and Practitioners, *U.S. Department of Justice – Office of Justice Programs,* 1-297.

Alpert, G. (2004). *Understanding Police Use of Force: Officers, Suspects, and Reciprocity.* Cambridge University Press. Cambridge, England.

Alpert, G. P., and Dunham, R. G. (1997) *The Force Factor: Measuring Police Use of Force Relative to Suspect Resistance* (No 97–878734–52–0). Washington DC: Police Executive Research Forum.

Alpert, Dunham, Alpert, Geoffrey P, & Dunham, Roger G. (2004). *Understanding police use of force: officers, suspects, and reciprocity* / Geoffrey P. Alpert, Roger G. Dunham. Cambridge University Press.

Amnesty International. (2016). *Use of Force: Guidelines for Implementation of the Un-basic Principles on the Use of Force and Firearms by Law Enforcement Officials.* Amnesty International Netherlands. Retrieved from: https://www.amnesty.nl/content/uploads/2017/01/ainl_guidelines_use_of_force_short_version_0.pdf?x79902

Archbold, C. A., & Schulz, D. M. (2012). Research on women in policing: a look at the past, present and future. *Sociology Compass*, *6*(9), 694–706. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1751-9020.2012.00501

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. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10940-014-9236-3

Barclay, E., & Donnermeyer, J. F. (2005). The Policing of Farm Crime. *Police Practice and Research*, *6*(1), 3-17. https://doi.org/10.1080/15614260500046913

Bayley, D. and Bittner, E. (1997). *Learning the Skills of Policing.* In R.G Dunham and G. Alpert (Eds.), Critical Issues in Policing: Contemporary Readings (3rd ed., pp. 114-137). Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland.

Beahen, W. (2008*). Riding to the rescue: the transformation of the RCMP in Alberta and Saskatchewan, 1914–1939. *Pacific Historical Review*, *77*(2), 332–333. https://doi.org/10.1525/phr.2008.77.2.332

Bentham, J. (1995). *The Panopticon Writings.* Miran Bozovic. London.

Braidwood, T. (2010), *Why? The Robert Dziekanski tragedy*, Distribution Centre, Victoria, BC.

Bradley, D., & Nixon, C. (2009). Ending the 'dialogue of the deaf': evidence and policing policies and practices. An Australian case study. *Police Practice & Research*, *10*(5-6), 423–435. https://doi.org/10.1080/15614260903378384

Briggs, S. R., Cheek, J. M., & Buss, A. H. (1980). An analysis of the self-monitoring scale. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 38*(4), 679–686. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.38.4.679

Brown, J. (2014). *From Sir Robert Peel to PLTs: Adapting to Liaison-based Public Order Policing in England and Wales.* In The Future of Policing (pp. 269–281). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203435946-30

Brown, R. A. (2019). Policing in America. *Du Bois Review*, *16*(1), 189–195. https://doi.org/10.1017/S1742058X19000171

Boudon, R. (2002). Sociology that really matters: European academy of sociology, first annual lecture, *European Sociological Review*, *18(*3), 371–378. https://doi.org/10.1093/esr/18.3.371

Bullingham, L., & Vasconcelos, A. C. (2013). The presentation of self in the online world: Goffman and the study of online identities. *Journal of Information Science*, *39*(1), 101–112. https://doi.org/10.1177/0165551512470051

Butler, C. (2009). The Use of Force Model and its Application to Operational Law Enforcement – Where Have We Been and Where Are We Going? Public Safety Canada. Retrieved from: https://www.publicsafety.gc.ca/cnt/rsrcs/lbrr/ctlg/dtls-en.aspx?d=PS&i=23959067

Campbell, J. E., & Carlson, M. (2002). Panopticon.com: online surveillance and the commodification of privacy. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media*, *46*(4), 586–606. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15506878jobem4604_6

Casey-Maslen, S., & Connolly, S. (2017). *A History of Law Enforcement.* In Police Use of Force Under International Law (pp. 10–50). https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108186575.002

Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms, Part 1 of the Constitution Act, 1982, being Schedule B to the Canada Act 1982 (UK), 1982, c 11.

Chermak, S., & Weiss, A. (2005). Maintaining legitimacy using external communication strategies: an analysis of police-media relations. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, *33*(5), 501–512. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcrimjus.2005.06.001

Cop Watch. 2022. *Cop Watch Training Manual: United Against Police Terror – Cop Watch Training Manual.* Retrieved from: https://uaptsd.org/copwatch/copwatch-training-manual/

Criminal Code, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-46 (CANLII).

Grawer, A. & Cullen, J. (2016). What the data tell us about crime and the 'Ferguson Effect'. *Brennan Center for Justice.* Retrieved from: https://www.brennancenter.org/our-work/analysis-opinion/what-data-tell-us-about-crime-and-ferguson-effect

Day, E. (2015, July 19). *#blacklivesmatter: The Birth of a New Civil Rights Movement*. The Guardian. Retrieved from: https://www.theguardian.com/world/2015/jul/19/blacklivesmatter-birth-civil-rights-movement

Denny, E., & Weckesser, A. (2022). How to do qualitative research?: Qualitative research methods. *BJOG : an International Journal of Obstetrics and Gynaecology, 129*(7), 1166–1167. https://doi.org/10.1111/1471-0528.17150

Deuchar, R., Fallik, S. W., & Crichlow, V. J. (2019). Despondent officer narratives and the 'post-Ferguson' effect: exploring law enforcement perspectives and strategies in a southern American state. *Policing & Society*, *29*(9), 1042–1057. https://doi.org/10.1080/10439463.2018.1480020

Devi, T. & Freyer, R. (2020). Policing the Police: The Impact of "Pattern-or-Practice" Investigations on Crime. *National Bureau of Economic Research.* Retrieved from: https://www.nber.org/system/files/working_papers/w27324/w27324.pdf

Donnermeyer, J. F., & Barclay, E. (2005). The policing of farm crime. *Police Practice and Research*, *6*(1), 3-17. https://doi.org/10.1080/15614260500046913

Donnermeyer, J., & DeKeseredy, W. (2014). *Looking Forward and Glancing Back: Research, Policy, and Practice.* In Rural Criminology (pp. 106–139). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203094518-11

Donnermeyer, J., DeKeseredy, W.S., & Dragiewicz, M. (2010). *Policing Rural Canada and the United States*. In Rural Policing and Policing the Rural (pp. 37–46). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315607191-7

Canadian Northern Economic Development Agency. (2020). *About the North.* Government of Canada. Retrieved from: https://www.cannor.gc.ca/eng/1368816431440/1368816444319

Custers, B. (2012). Technology in policing: experiences, obstacles and police needs. *The Computer Law and Security Report*, *28*(1), 62–68. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.clsr.2011.11.009

Custers, B., & Vergouw, B. (2015). Promising policing technologies: experiences, obstacles and police needs regarding law enforcement technologies. *The Computer Law and Security Report*, *31*(4), 518–526. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.clsr.2015.05.005

Ericson, R. V. & Haggerty, K. D. (1997), *Policing the Risk Society*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Emsley, C. (2021). *A Short History of Police and Policing.* (Oxford, 2021; online ed.). Oxford Academic. https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780198844600.001.0001

EuroStat. (2023). *Police, Court, and Prison Personnel Statistics.* Retrieved from: https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/statistics-explained/index.php?title=Police,_court_and_prison_personnel_statistics

Everbach, T., Clark, M., & Nisbett, G. S. (2018). #IfTheyGunnedMeDown. *Electronic News*, *12*(1), 23–41. https://doi.org/10.1177/1931243117697767

Fijnaut, C. J. C. F. (2008). *A History of the Dutch Police.* Uitgeverij Boom.

Foucault, Michel. (1977). *Discipline and punish: the birth of the prison*. New York.

Fyfe, N. R. (1995). Policing the city. *Urban Studies (Edinburgh, Scotland), 32*(4/5), 759–778. https://doi.org/10.1080/00420989550012870

Fussey, P., Davies, B., & Innes, M. (2021). 'Assisted' facial recognition and the reinvention of suspicion and discretion in digital policing. *British Journal of Criminology, 61*(2), 325–344. https://doi.org/10.1093/bjc/azaa068

Gangestad, S. W., & Snyder, M. (2000). Self-monitoring. *Psychological Bulletin*, *126*(4), 530–555. https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.126.4.530

Goodison, S., & Wilson, T. (2017). *Citizen Perceptions of Body Worn Cameras: A Randomized Controlled Trial*. Washington, DC: Police Executive Research Forum. Retrieved from www.perf.memberclicks.net/assets/bodyworncameraperceptions.pdf

Goodyear, V. A., Kerner, C., & Quennerstedt, M. (2019). Young people's uses of wearable healthy lifestyle technologies; surveillance, self-surveillance and resistance. *Sport, Education and Society*, *24*(3), 212–225. https://doi.org/10.1080/13573322.2017.1375907

Goffman, E., & ProQuest. (2008). *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life / Erving Goffman.* Anchor Books/Random House.

Goldsmith, A. J. (2010). Policing's new visibility. *British Journal of Criminology*, *50*(5), 914–934. https://doi.org/10.1093/bjc/azq033

Government of the Netherlands. (2023). *Organisation of the Dutch Police.* Retrieved from: https://www.government.nl/topics/police/organisation-of-the-dutch-police#:~:text=The%20Dutch%20national%20police%20force,and%20the%20Police%20Services%20Centre.

Grieve, R. (2011). Mirror Mirror: The role of self-monitoring and sincerity in emotional manipulation. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *51*(8), 981–985. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2011.08.004

Griffiths, C. T., & SFU Faculty publication. (2020). *Canadian Police Work* / Curt T. Griffiths, Simon Fraser University. (Fifth edition.). Nelson Education.

Griffiths, C. (2019). *Policing and community safety in northern Canadian communities: challenges and opportunities for crime prevention. Crime Prevention and Community Safety*, *21*(4), 246–266. https://doi.org/10.1057/s41300-019-00069-3

Haese, B. (2022). *'Working with Passion and Humanity': Perspectives on Community Policing in the Netherlands.* Retrieved from http://essay.utwente.nl/92829/1/Haese_MA_BMS.pdf

Halseth, G. and Ryser, l. (2006). Trends in service delivery: examples from rural and small-town Canada, 1998 to 2005. *Journal of Rural and Community Development*, *12*, 69–90.

Hoffman, R., Lawrence, C., & Brown, G. (2004). Canada's national use-of-force framework for police officers. *Police Chief. 71*(10): 125-140.

Hoyle, R. H., & Lennox, R. D. (1991). Latent structure of self-monitoring. *Multivariate Behavioral Research, 26,* 511–540.

Ilker, E., Alkassim, R. & Abudakar, S. (2015). Comparison of snowball sampling and sequential sampling techniques. *Biometrics and Biostatistics International Journal. 3*(1), 1-2.

Katz, C. M., Choate, D. E., Ready, J. R., & Nuňo, L. (2014). *Evaluating the Impact of Officer Body Worn Cameras in the Phoenix Police Department*. Phoenix: Center for Violence Prevention and Community Safety, Arizona State University. Retrieved from www.publicservice.asu.edu/sites/default/files/ppd_spi_feb_20_2015_final.pdf

Koper, C. S., Lum, C., & Willis, J. J. (2014). Optimizing the use of technology in policing: results and implications from a multi-site study of the social, organizational, and behavioural aspects of implementing police technologies. *Policing: a Journal of Policy and Practice*, *8*(2), 212–221. https://doi.org/10.1093/police/pau015

Kusha, H. R. (2013). Impediments to police modernisation in Iran, 1878-1979. *Policing & Society*, *23*(2), 164–182. https://doi.org/10.1080/10439463.2012.661430

Lemieux, F., den Heyer, G., & Das, D. K. (2015). *Real influence of Sir Robert Peel on Twenty-First Century Policing in America.* In Economic Development, Crime, and Policing (pp. 88–115). CRC Press. https://doi.org/10.1201/b17725-11

Lennox, R. (1988). The problem with self-monitoring: A two-sided scale and a one-sided theory. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 52*, 58-73. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327752jpa5201_5

Lippert, R. K., & Walby, K. (2013). Police moonlighting revisited: the case of 'pay duty' in three Canadian police services. *Policing: a Journal of Policy and Practice, 7*(4), 370–378. https://doi.org/10.1093/police/pat026

Lithopoulos, S., Jones, N. A., & Ruddell, R. (2014). Crime, cost, and well-being: policing Canadian aboriginal communities. *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies & Management*, *37*(4), 779-793. https://doi.org/10.1108/PIJPSM-01-2014-0013

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

Madhani, A. (2017). *'Ferguson Effect': 72% of US Cops Reluctant to Make Stops.* USA Today. Retrieved from: https://www.usatoday.com/story/news/2017/01/11/ferguson-effect-study-72-us-cops-reluctant-make-stops/96446504/

Manning, Peter. (2005). The study of policing. *Police Quarterly, 8*(1), 23-43. https://doi.org/10.1177/109861110426732

Mawby, R. I. (2010). *Rural policing and Policing the Rural: A Constable Countryside?* (R. Yarwood, Ed.) (1st ed.). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315607191

Maurantonio, N. (2014). Remembering Rodney King. *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly*, *91*(4), 740–755. https://doi.org/10.1177/1077699014550094

McCartney, S. & Parent, R. (2015). *Ethics in Law Enforcement.* Victoria, B.C.: BCcampus. Retrieved from http://opentextbc.ca/ethicsinlawenforcement/.

Meleady, R., Abrams, D., Van de Vyver, J., Hopthrow, T., Mahmood, L., Player, A., Lamont, R., & Leite, A. C. (2017). Surveillance or self-Surveillance? Behavioral cues can increase the rate of drivers' pro-environmental behavior at a long wait stop. *Environment and Behavior, 49*(10), 1156–1172. https://doi.org/10.1177/0013916517691324

Monkkonen, E. H. (1992). History of Urban Police. *Crime and Justice*, *15,* 547–580. https://doi.org/10.1086/449201

Murphy, C. (1998). Policing postmodern Canada. *Canadian Journal of Law and Society*, *13*(2), 1–25. https://doi.org/10.1017/S082932010000572X

Newell, B. C. (2019). Context, visibility, and control: police work and the contested objectivity of bystander video. *New Media & Society, 21*(1), 60–76. https://doi.org/10.1177/1461444818786477

Nix, J., & Pickett, J. T. (2017). Third-person perceptions, hostile media effects, and policing: Developing a theoretical framework for assessing the Ferguson effect. *Journal of Criminal Justice, 51*, 24–33. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcrimjus.2017.05.016

O'Connor, C. D. (2017). The police on twitter: image management, community building, and implications for policing in Canada. *Policing and Society, 27*(8), 899-912. https://doi.org/10.1080/10439463.2015.1120731

Ong, M., & Jenks, D. A. (2004). Hispanic perceptions of community policing. *Journal of Ethnicity in Criminal Justice*, *2*(3), 53–66. https://doi.org/10.1300/J222v02n03_04

OSCE Polis. (2023). *Netherlands: Policing Overview.* OSCE. Retrieved from: https://polis.osce.org/country-profiles/netherlands

Owens, M. L. (2020). The urban world is a world of police. *Journal of Race, Ethnicity and the City*, *1*(1-2), 11–15. https://doi.org/10.1080/26884674.2020.1795488

Palmiotto, M. (2017). *Police Use of Force: Important Issues Facing the Police and the Communities They Serve*/ edited by Michael J. Palmiotto. CRC Press, Taylor & Francis Group.

Palys, T., & Atchison, C. (2014) *Research Decisions: Quantitative and Qualitative Perspectives.* Scarborough, Ontario.

Paoline, E. & W. Terrill. (2007). Police education, experience and the use of force. *Criminal Justice and Behaviour. 34*(2), 179-196.

Paperman, P., & Katz, J. (2003). Surveillance underground: the uniform as an interaction device. *Ethnography*, *4*(3), 397–419. https://doi.org/10.1177/146613810343005

Paternoster, R., Jaynes, C. M., & Wilson, T. (2017). Rational choice theory and interest in the "fortune of others". *The Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, *54*(6), 847–868. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022427817707240

Paulson-Smith, K., Nehlsen, D., Lau, J., Knutson, J., Wesner, J., Klug, M., Beck, G., Reinhard, B., & Weinschenk, A. (2023). The politics of words: a survey experiment on "defund the police" *The Social Science Journal*, 1–13. https://doi.org/10.1080/03623319.2023.2221604

Peyton, K., Sierra-Arévalo, M., & Rand, D. G. (2019). A field experiment on community policing and police Legitimacy. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences - PNAS*, *116*(40), 19894–19898. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1910157116

Pratt, T. C., Cullen, F. T., Blevins, K. R., Daigle, L. E., & Madensen, T. D. (2008). *The Empirical Status of Deterrence Theory: A Meta-Analysis.* In Taking Stock (1st ed., pp. 367–395). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315130620-14

Pryor, C., Boman, J. H., Mowen, T. J., & McCamman, M. (2019). A national study of sustained use of force complaints in law enforcement agencies. *Journal of Criminal Justice, 64*, 101623. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcrimjus.2019.101623

Quackenbush, S. L., & SpringerLink. (2011). *Understanding general deterrence: theory and application.* Palgrave Macmillan.

Rataj, T. (2019). *From Paper to Computers.* Blue Line. Retrieved from: https://www.blueline.ca/from-paper-to-computers-6094/

Rajakaruna, N., Henry, P. J., Cutler, A., & Fairman, G. (2017). Ensuring the validity of police use of force training. *Police Practice & Research, 18*(5), 507–521. https://doi.org/10.1080/15614263.2016.1268959

Renden, P., Nieuwenhuys, A., Savelsbergh, G. J., & Oudejans, R. (2015). Dutch police officers' preparation and performance of their arrest and self-defence skills: a questionnaire study. *Applied Ergonomics, 48*, 8–17. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apergo.2015.01.002

Reynolds, J. J., Estrada-Reynolds, V., & Nunez, N. (2018). Development and validation of the attitudes towards police legitimacy scale. *Law and Human Behavior*, *42*(2), 119–134. https://doi.org/10.1037/lhb0000281

Ross, D. L. (2000). Emerging trends in police failure to train liability. Policing: an International Journal of Police Strategies & Management, *23*(2), 169–193. https://doi.org/10.1108/13639510010333796

Royal Canadian Mounted Police. (2022). *Incident Management/Intervention Model.* RCMP. Retrieved from: https://www.rcmp-grc.gc.ca/en/incident-management-intervention-model-imim

Ruddell, R., Lithopoulos, S., & A. Jones, N. (2014). Crime, costs, and well-being: policing Canadian Aboriginal communities. *Policing: an International Journal of Police Strategies & Management*, *37*(4), 779–793. https://doi.org/10.1108/PIJPSM-01-2014-0013

Ruddell, R., Lithopoulos, S., & Jones, N. A. (2014). Policing: an international journal of police strategies & management, *37*(4), 779-793. https://doi.org/10.1108/PIJPSM-01-2014-0013

Ruddell, R., & Lithopoulos, S. (2016). *Policing rural Canada.* In The Routledge International Handbook of Rural Criminology (1st ed., pp. 399–408). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315755885-44

Sandhu, A., & Haggerty, K. D. (2017). Policing on camera. *Theoretical Criminology*, *21*(1), 78–95. https://doi.org/10.1177/1362480615622531

Sarre, R., & Prenzler, T. (2018). Ten key developments in modern policing: an Australian perspective. *Police Practice & Research*, *19*(1), 3–16. https://doi.org/10.1080/15614263.2016.1242424

Satz, D., & Ferejohn, J. (1994). Rational choice and social theory. *The Journal of Philosophy*, *91*(2), 71–87. https://doi.org/10.2307/2940928

Saulnier, A., Bagg, J., & Thompson, B. (2021). Canadian policing and body-worn cameras. *Canadian Public Policy*, *47*(2), 131–157. https://doi.org/10.3138/cpp.2020-096

Schaap, D. (2021). Police trust-building strategies. A socio-institutional, comparative approach. *Policing & Society*, *31*(3), 304–320. https://doi.org/10.1080/10439463.2020.1726345

Sharp, E. B. (2013). Politics, economics, and urban policing. *Urban Affairs Review, 50*(3), 340–365. https://doi.org/10.1177/1078087413490397

Sheptycki, J. (2017). Contemporary Reflections on the History of Canadian Policing - Reading The Vigilant Eye; Policing Canada from 1867 to 9/11 [Review of Contemporary Reflections on the History of Canadian Policing - Reading The Vigilant Eye; Policing Canada from 1867 to 9/11]. *Police Practice & Research*, *18*(6), 624–629. Routledge. https://doi.org/10.1080/15614263.2017.1363974

Shockey-Eckles, M. L. (2011). Police culture and the perpetuation of the officer shuffle: the paradox of life behind "the blue wall", *Humanity & Society, 35*(3), 290–309. https://doi.org/10.1177/016059761103500305

Sierra-Arévalo, M., Nix, J., & Mourtgos, S. M. (2023). The "war on cops," retaliatory violence, and the murder of George Floyd. *Criminology*, 00, 1-32. https://doi.org/10.1111/1745-9125.12334

Silver, L. (2019). *Smartphone Ownership is Growing Rapidly Around the World, But Not Always Equally.* The Pew Research Centre. Retrieved from: https://www.pewresearch.org/global/2019/02/05/smartphone-ownership-is-growing-rapidly-around-the-world-but-not-always-equally/

Singh, D. (2022). The causes of police corruption and working towards prevention in conflict-stricken states. *Laws*, *11*(5), 69. https://doi.org/10.3390/laws11050069

Skogan, W. G. (2006). Asymmetry in the impact of encounters with police. *Policing & Society*, *16*(2), 99–126. https://doi.org/10.1080/10439460600662098

Sloan, J. J., & Paoline, E. A. (2021). "They need more training!" A national level analysis of police academy basic training priorities. *Police Quarterly, 24*(4), 486–518. https://doi.org/10.1177/10986111211013311

Staller, M. S., Koerner, S., Heil, V., Klemmer, I., Abraham, A., & Poolton, J. (2022). The structure and delivery of police use of force training: a German case study. *European Journal for Security Research*, *7*(1), 87–112. https://doi.org/10.1007/s41125-021-00073-5

Statistics Canada. (2022). *Criminal victimization of First Nations, Métis and Inuit People in Canada, 2018 to 2021.* StatCan. Retrieved from: https://www150.statcan.gc.ca/n1/daily-quotidien/220719/dq220719c-eng.htm

Statistics Canada. (2022). *Table 22-10-0115-01 Smartphone Use and Smartphone Habits by Gender and Age Group, Inactive.* StatCan. Retrieved from: https://www150.statcan.gc.ca/t1/tbl1/en/tv.action?pid=2210011501

Statistics Canada. (2019). *The Rate of Police Strength in Canada Remains Stable From 2019.* StatCan. Retrieved from: https://www150.statcan.gc.ca/n1/daily-quotidien/220331/dq220331f-eng.htm

The Canadian Association of Chiefs of Police. (2000). *A National Use of Force Framework.* CACP. Retrieved from: https://www.cacp.ca/cacp-use-of-force-advisory-committee.html?asst_id=199

Thomas, A. L., Hatten, D. N., & Connealy, N. T. (2022). Does police use of Twitter align with and Enhance Community Policing Objectives? An Analysis of the New York City Police Department's Twitter Activity. *Police Quarterly*, 25(4), 443–469. https://doi.org/10.1177/10986111211043875

Thompson, J. (2005), 'The new visibility', *Theory, Culture and Society, 22*(6), 31–51. https://doi-org.proxy.lib.sfu.ca/10.1177/0263276405059413

Todd, H. (2015). *The Effects of Citizen Monitoring on the Police: An Examination of Citizen Monitoring and Police Use of Justified Force.* Simon Fraser University, 1-143.

United Nations Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights. (2023). *Basic Principles on the Use of Force and Firearms by Law Enforcement Officials.* UN. Retrieved from https://www.ohchr.org/en/instruments-mechanisms/instruments/basic-principles-use-force-and-firearms-law-enforcement

United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (2023). *The General Principles of Use of Force in Law Enforcement.* UN. Retrieved from https://www.unodc.org/e4j/zh/crime-prevention-criminal-justice/module-4/key-issues/3--the-general-principles-of-use-of-force-in-law-enforcement.html

Waters, I. (2007). Policing, modernity and postmodernity. *Policing & Society, 17*(3), 257–278. https://doi.org/10.1080/10439460701497345

Wintle, M. (1996). Policing the liberal state in the Netherlands: The historical context of the current reorganization of the Dutch police. *Policing & Society, 6*(3), 181–197. https://doi.org/.10.1080/10439463.1996.9964750

Williams, K. L. (2003). Peel's principles and their acceptance by American police: ending 175 years of reinvention. *Police Journal*, *76*(2), 97–120. https://doi.org/10.1177/0032258X0307600202

Wilfred Laurier University. (2019). *The History of Policing in Canada.* WLU. Retrieved from: https://online.wlu.ca/news/2019/08/13/history-policing-canadac

Williams, F. P., & McShane, M. D. (2010). *Criminological Theory* / Frank P. Williams III, Marilyn D. McShane. (5th ed.). Pearson/Prentice Hall.

Wolfe, S. E., & Nix, J. (2016). The alleged "Ferguson Effect" and police willingness to engage in community partnership. *Law and Human Behavior, 40*(1), 1–10. https://doi.org/10.1037/lhb0000164

Worden, R. & Catlin, S. (2002). *The Use and Abuse of Force by Police. In K. Lersch (Ed.), Policing and Misconduct:* 85-120. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Yarwood, Richard. (2010). *Policing Rural Canada and the United States. In Rural Policing and Policing the Rural* (pp. 23–33). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315607191-7

Yukon Bureau of Statistics. (2022). *Population Report, Q4 2022*. Government of Yukon. Retrieved from: https://yukon.ca/en/population-report-q4-2022

Zhao, J., Lovrich, N. P., & Thurman, Q. (1999). The status of community policing in American cities. *Policing: an International Journal of Police Strategies & Management*, 22(1), 74–92.

Appendix A.

Informed Oral Consent

My name is Hilary Todd, and I am a Doctoral student at the School of Criminology at Simon Fraser University. I would like to ask you a few questions that will help us better understand the phenomenon of citizen monitoring and the impact it has on police officers' use of justified force. The information collected from this interview will be presented in my Doctoral Dissertation, and potentially in other publications or presentations.

Participation in this project is voluntary, and you may choose to withdraw from it at any time with no fear of any sort of penalty. If at any time you decide to withdraw from this study, all data pertaining to you (audio recordings, transcripts, or notes) will be destroyed.

I guarantee confidentiality to all participants. I will change your name to a pseudonym and will take out indirect identifiers such as names of cities or any other identifying information at your request, from any papers, publications, or presentations of this data.

Prior to any sort of publication, you will be given opportunity to read over and provide feedback about any portions of the research results relating to your interview. All feedback will be taken seriously and will be addressed by the Primary Investigator. The final Doctoral Dissertation will be sent to all participants upon completion.

Do you understand the information I have just outlined?

           Respondent says yes

           Respondent says no

Do you have any questions?

           Respondent says yes

           Respondent says no

Do I have your consent to conduct the interview?

           Respondent says yes

           Respondent says no

Appendix B.

Interview Guide - English

Interview Guide: Watching the Watchmen: A Multi-Site Contextual Study of Citizen Monitoring and its Impact on Use of Force

General questions about participants:
- Tell me a bit about yourself.
- How are you involved or concerned with policing related issues?

General questions regarding front line police work:
- How is front line police work different and/or challenging in comparison to other aspects of police work?
- In what ways do police interactions with the general public shape your attitudes?
    - *Probe:* Can you think of and explain a particular incident, or group of incidents that changed your attitude toward an element of police work?

Questions regarding the use of force in policing:

- How would you describe the legislation and guidelines surrounding use of force in the police profession?
- Do you think the legislation and guidelines adequately addresses the issues faced by front line police officers today?
    - *Probe:* How so?
- Provided you feel comfortable doing so, can you discuss an incident in which you were required to use force?

Questions regarding citizen monitoring:

- How do you define citizen monitoring?
    - *Probe:* How do you perceive the phenomenon?
- What are your sentiments about the phenomenon of citizen monitoring?
    - *Probe:* How do you feel when you know you are being watched while you work?
- Do you feel current training procedures should be changed to consider citizen monitoring?
    - *Probe:* How so?

Questions regarding citizen monitoring and the use of force:

- How do you feel citizen monitoring impacts your confidence as a police officer?
- Do you feel your attitudes towards citizen motoring impact the ways in which you use justified force?
    - *Probe:* How so?

Questions regarding contextual factors:

- Can you tell me about the environment in which you work?
    - *Probe:* How does citizen monitoring play out in this environment?
- Can you tell me about your department?
    - *Probe:* Do you feel supported by your department?
    - *Probe:* How does your view of departmental support shape the way you experience citizen monitoring?
- How do you perceive citizen monitoring?
    - *Probe:* Have you discussed citizen monitoring with your friends and/or family? How do these conversations play out?

Additional questions:
- Is there anything else you would like to add at this point?

Appendix C.

Interview Guide - Dutch

Interview Guide: Watching the Watchmen: A Multi-Site Contextual Study of Citizen Monitoring and its Impact on Use of Force

General questions about participants:

- Hoe lang werkt u al bij de politie?
- Hoeveel jaar heeft u gewerkt als frontlijn politieagent?
- Wat is het imago van de politie onder burgers en is dit veranderd sinds u politieagent bent geworden?

General questions regarding front line police work:

- In welk opzicht is frontlijn politiewerk anders, dan wel zwaarder dan andere aspecten van politiewerk?
- In hoeverre wordt uw opinie over politiewerk beinvloedt door contact met 't publiek?
    - Probe: Kunt u zich een speciaal geval of aantal gevallen herinneren en toelichten, waarby uw opinie over een bepaald aspect van politiewerk is veranderd?

Questions regarding citizen monitoring:

- Hoe zou u digitale burgermonitoring van de politie omschrijven?
    - Probe: Wat vindt u van digitale burgermonitoring?
- Bent u zelf wel eens in functie door een burger gefilmd of opgenomen?
    - Probe: Hoe vindt u 't als u weet dat u geobserveerd wordt tijdens uw werk?
    - Probe: Hoe vaak is dit daadwerkelijk gebeurd?
    - Probe: In hoeverre bent u zich bewust van digitale burgermonitoring terwijl u werkt?
- Hoe vaak heeft u 't met uw collega's over digitale burgermonitoring?

Questions regarding citizen monitoring and the use of force:

- Welk effect denkt u dat digitale burgermonitoring heeft op uw zelfvertrouwen als politieagent?
- Vindt u dat uw houding ten aanzien van digitale burgermonitoring een rolt speelt in uw wettig gebruik van dwang of geweld?
    - Probe: In welk opzicht?
    - Probe: Heeft u er ooit over gedacht om een incident of geweld te vermijden vanwege digitale burgermonitoring? Leg uit.
    - Probe: Heeft u ooit een incident of een ingreep vermeden ten gevolge van digitale burgermonitoring. Leg uit.
- Is uw gedrag aan verandering onderhevig wanneer u weet of gelooft te weten dat u wordt gefilmd? Zo ja, in welk opzicht?
- Heeft u ooit gezien dat uw collega's een incident of ingreep hebben vermeden vanwege digitale burgermonitoring? Leg uit.

- Bent u zich bewust van gevallen waarbij collega's zijn gereprimeerd naar aanleiding van een gefilmd incident?
    - Probe: In hoeverre veranderde dat uw mening over digitale burgermonitoring?

Questions regarding contextual factors:

- Kunt u uw werkomstandigheden omschrijven?
- Hoe manifesteert digitale burgermonitoring zich onder deze omstandigheden?
- Hoe denkt u over digitale burgermonitoring?
- Heeft u 't wel eens met vrienden en/of familie over digitale burgermonitoring? Wat komt er uit die gesprekken?

Additional questions:

- Is er verder nog iets dat u zou willen toevoegen?

Appendix D.

Translator Confidentiality Agreement

Translator Confidentiality Agreement

As an interpreter hired for the purposes of assisting during interviews for Hilary Todd's doctoral research, I acknowledge that I will maintain the confidentiality of interview participants. Any information divulged during the interview process, including details about the participants' respective police departments, their colleagues, personal disclosures, participants' names, and any other identifying information should be treated in strict confidence. I pledge that I will not disclose any information divulged during these interviews both while working as an interpreter for Hilary Todd, and after my role is complete. I understand that any breach of confidentiality will be violating the terms of my contract.

This the _____ day of _____, 20 _____.

_____
Signature

_____
Witness

Appendix E.

Participant Information Guide

Dear Participant,

My name is Hilary Todd and I am a Ph.D. student in the School of Criminology at Simon Fraser University. Dr. Curt Griffiths at Simon Fraser University is acting as my senior supervisor.

Thank you for your interest in this study. Its purpose is to understand the impact citizen monitoring has on police officers' use of force. Police officers across Canada and the Netherlands will be interviewed, in an effort to determine whether or not citizen monitoring impacts officers differently based on location. The study is expected to have positive implications for members of the police force, and for the general public. Currently little academic literature exists on this topic despite the fact that discussion of the issue permeates mainstream media.

The study will consist of data collected through in-depth interviews with front line patrol officers from Canadian and Dutch police agencies who are, either directly or indirectly, affected by the phenomenon of citizen monitoring of police. The information collected will be presented in my Doctoral Dissertation, and, potentially, in other publications or presentations.

Participation in this project is voluntary on an ongoing basis. Interviewees may choose to withdraw at any time with no fear of repercussion. If at any time an interviewee should choose to withdraw from the study, all data pertaining to said individual (audio recordings, transcripts, or notes) will be destroyed. Furthermore, there is in place a process for handling complaints should there be any. Interviewees can address any complaints to Dr. Jeff Toward of the Director Of The Office of Research Ethics at Simon Fraser University who will investigate and act accordingly.

I guarantee confidentiality to all participants who prefer to remain anonymous. If participants choose to have their name attached to their story and want recognition for their contribution to this project, I will honor and respect this choice, and will include these names in any papers, publications, or presentations that result from the data collected. However, for participants who prefer anonymity in any papers, publications, or presentations that come from this data, pseudonyms will be used and all indirect identifiers such as names of cities or any other identifying information will be removed from any papers, publications or presentations of this data. When an interview takes place, interviewee will be given an opportunity to state their preference regarding confidentiality.

Prior to any sort of publication, participants will be given opportunity to read over and provide feedback about any portions of the research results relating to their particular interview. All feedback will be taken seriously and will be addressed by me. Upon completion, the final Ph.D. dissertation will be sent to all participants.

I would like to conduct interviews in person, and I encourage participants to think of a relatively quiet area where they will feel comfortable speaking of issues that may be private in nature. It is possible that follow-up interviews will be requested. Interviewees will be given the right to refuse participation. During all interviews, an interpreter will be present if this is deemed necessary.

Interviews will be audio-recorded and transcribed. An audio-recorder will be turned on at the beginning of the interview, but it may be turned off at any time at the interviewee's request, and audio-recordings will be deleted upon request. During the transcription process pseudonyms will be given (if requested) and indirect identifiers will be removed (if requested), meaning that transcriptions will not have any identifying information in them (if confidentiality is requested). Audio-recordings will be transcribed within four weeks of the interviews haven taken place, and after Dr. Curt Griffiths has verified the transcriptions, the audio recordings will be destroyed. Unless interviewees request their transcript be destroyed, interview transcripts (both anonymized and non-anonymized) will be kept to provide opportunity for future projects with the data. In the case of requested destruction, the material will be destroyed within 30 days of completion of my Ph.D. dissertation.

Before the interview begins, I will ask participants if they have any questions about confidentiality or the study in general and will ask again if they consent to take part in this study.

Questions about the study can be directed to me, or to my supervisor, Dr. Curt Griffiths. This project has been granted ethics approval through Simon Fraser University (more on the university ethical guidelines can be found at http://www.sfu.ca/policies/gazette/research/r20-01.html).

Thank you,

Hilary Todd, B.A., M.A. Ph.D. Student
School of Criminology Simon
Fraser University 8888 University
Drive Burnaby, BC
V5A 1S6

Appendix F.

Application for Ethics Review: Study Details

Application for Ethics Review: Study Details Hilary Todd, Doctoral Student
School of Criminology, Simon Fraser University

Project Title: Watching the Watchmen: A Multi-Site Contextual Study of Patrol Officers' Perception of Citizen Monitoring

Principal Investigator: Hilary Todd, Doctoral Student at the School of Criminology

Senior Supervisor: Curt Griffiths, Ph.D.; Professor; School of Criminology

Study Background and Purpose

The most visible members of the criminal justice system are the police. While this visibility is not a new phenomenon, recent technological advancements have facilitated the development of policing's "new visibility" (Goldsmith, 2010). The practice of recording the police as they conduct their work and subsequently uploading this footage to the Internet has become prevalent, and this enables the public to 'police the police'. In recent high-profile cases where police have used, and, at times, abused their authority to use lethal force, this form of civilian-led- surveillance, known as citizen monitoring, was used as a device to expose police malfeasance publicly, to encourage retributive action, and to promote justice. As a result, citizen monitoring has contributed to the suspension, dismissal, and investigation of police personnel.

Citizen monitoring typically occurs when some sort of police-citizen encounter triggers an individual who then activates their camera. The phenomenon has the potential to capture police officers engaged in abuses of power, and in situations where this type of behaviour is filmed, the footage can be used by policing authorities to justify disciplinary action. However, the footage captured can also be manipulated—either intentionally or unintentionally—and can show only a portion of a police-citizen encounter as it unfolds. Often, citizen monitoring does not capture an entire incident, and, as a result, can lead to the misinterpretation of an event. This, in turn, can result in the classification of a justified use of force incident as an example of excessive use of force. Preliminary examination of citizen monitoring suggests that front-line police officers are

impacted by citizen monitoring, and further, that the presence of the citizen monitoring can contribute to risk-adverse behaviour among police officers. Due to the increasing visibility of police, it is important to consider the role this surveillance has on officers and how it subsequently plays out in terms of society's reaction to crime. This reaction is an imperative component in the perpetuation and intensification of criminality and delinquency.

The proposed study will examine the impact citizen monitoring has on the attitudes of front- line police officers. The study will address whether front line officers are less likely to use necessary and legitimate force when faced with the possibility of being subject to citizen monitoring. Further, this multi-site study seeks to understand how contextual factors influence officers' perceptions and experiences of citizen monitoring. Surveillance is known to have a significant impact on individuals and their resulting actions (Campbell and Carlson, 2002); however, the impact of surveillance on the police population has not yet been examined. Because of this apparent lack of research in this increasingly relevant issue, the proposed study will seek to answer the questions: "What role does context play in front line police officers' experiences and perceptions of citizen monitoring?" While research examining police use of force is frequently produced, little research exists that seeks to understand the impact surveillance and monitoring have on use of force. This proposed research intends to address this significant deficit, and to inform policy and training procedures.

Participant Role and Research Procedures Participant Characteristics

All participants in the proposed study will be adults, 19 years of age and older.

Participants in this research project will be police officers from jurisdictions across Canada and in the Netherlands. The police officers interviewed will be employed by agencies including, but not limited to:

- The Royal Canadian Mounted Police
- The Vancouver Police Department
- The Delta Police Department
- The Dutch National Police

It is important to note that permission to conduct interviews at the aforementioned agencies has not been granted. Participants will be told that approval from their respective organizations/

departments has not been obtained. The participants will be recruited and approached independently. The Primary Investigator will compensate for this by using pseudonyms and further, by not including the names of their police departments and cities in the study. Essentially, all identifying information will be removed from the study. Furthermore, this information will be clearly outlined in the informed consent handout.

By interviewing individuals who are involved either directly or indirectly in the field of policing, the Primary Investigator hopes to gain a balanced understanding of the implications of citizen monitoring. Access to these individuals will be largely gained through both the Primary Investigator's personal connections, and through the connections of Dr. Curt Griffiths, who, as a key Canadian policing researcher, has connections with numerous interested individuals willing to participate in the study. Additionally, the Dutch police officers will be recruited through the assistance of two gatekeepers, as both are significant policing figures in the Netherlands. These individuals are Aart Garssen and Harry Veneklaas.

Recruitment and Research Methodology

Due to the high level of in-group solidarity among police officers, the identification of a large sample from which to select respondents is an unreasonable expectation. For the purpose of this proposed study, opportunity sampling will be employed. Opportunity sampling is a form of non-probability sampling in which respondents are drawn from a population conveniently located.

Participants will be recruited with the help of the aforementioned gatekeepers. These individuals will either contact potential participants and will ask whether or not they are interested in participating in the study. If they are, they will either be provided with the Primary Investigator's contact information, or, with their consent, they will provide the gatekeeper with their contact information so that the Primary Investigator can contact them independently. The gatekeepers will be given a copy of the Participant Information Sheet and will be asked to send the document to any potential participants so that these individuals have an understanding of the study before they ask to be contacted by/contact the Primary Investigator.

Approximately 40 Dutch police officers and 40 Canadian police officers will be interviewed. Within the Canadian sample, 15-20 officers will work or have worked in rural and remote areas, while the remaining 20-25 officers will be employed or have been employed by agencies responsible

for policing urban or suburban centres. The Netherlands does not have the same rural and remote regions that Canada has, and given this, officers from both urban and suburban regions will be interviewed; however, the emphasis on location will not be as significant in this sample.

After the project has received ethics approval, the prospective interviewees will be contacted via e-mail by the Primary Investigator and will be provided with an information sheet (see appendix A). Once the prospective participants have had the opportunity to read the information sheet and agree to participate, an interview will be scheduled. As aforementioned, the interviews will include approximately 40 Dutch police officers and 40 Canadian police officers. Because of this, there will be approximately 80 participants interviewed in total. There will be no offer made for reimbursement for participation in the study.

The Primary Investigator will conduct in-depth semi-structured interviews that are expected to last between forty-five minutes and an hour and a half. Interviews will be conducted in person and will be recorded. The interviewee will be assured that, while the interviews will be recorded, the recordings themselves will be confidential. Interviews will be audio-recorded with the participants' consent (see Informed Consent section). Additionally, written notes may be taken in a research journal throughout the interview. It is critical to mention that these notes will only be taken with the consent of the participants. For details regarding storage and destruction of audio-recordings, and transcription procedures refer to the Confidentiality section.

Open-ended questions will be posed in order to gain a general understanding of the participants' experience with, and understanding of, policing issues, the impact citizen monitoring has on the profession, and further, the impact various contextual factors may have on the officers' role. Conducting a semi-structured interview leaves room for probing questions to be asked if a participant discusses something that the Primary Investigator would like to explore more in-depth. For a sample of interview questions, please see Appendix B. Participants will be made aware that follow-up interviews may be requested.

Interviews will begin once the SFU Research Ethics Board has granted approval. The interview period is projected to conclude at the end of May 2018, leaving enough time for follow-up interviews if necessary.

Informed Consent

For the purpose of the proposed project, the Primary Investigator intends to obtain oral informed consent from the participants. Because the study will be qualitative in nature, oral informed consent has been elected over written informed consent. In order to avoid a situation with an unnecessary emphasis on legality, and further, in order to secure and uphold trust and rapport with the participants, the Primary Investigator will opt to avoid obtaining written informed consent. Additionally, receiving written consent jeopardizes confidentiality through the creation of a written record of the participants' names. While the study cannot guarantee full anonymity due to the fact that the interviews will be recorded, and are, as such, considered identifiable by the REB, the Primary Investigator will ensure that any identifiable information included in the recordings by the interviewee be struck from the record. In order to do this, the Primary Investigator will anonymize any identifiable information recorded in the interview process.

Furthermore, although the interviews will be recorded and stored before they are transcribed, each interview will be labeled with a unique pseudonym that will be used throughout the study. Interview subjects will be given the opportunity to select their own pseudonym. If they opt not to select their own pseudonym, they will be provided with one by the Primary Investigator.

Prior to the interview starting, the Primary Investigator will inform the interviewee that once the recording process has started, neither party involved will refer to the interviewee directly by name. The intent here is to avoid any instances of the interviewee's name being included in the recording. Should this occur by accident, the Primary Investigator will ensure, as previously noted, that identifying information in the recording be replaced with a pseudonym in the transcript. The act of avoiding reference to the interviewee's name during the interview process is simply an extra precaution and should ensure that the interviewee feels as confident about the process as is possible. For further information on the maintenance of confidentiality within this study please refer to the Confidentiality Section.

Consent will be premised on the fact that the participants are told clearly that the purpose of the study is to satisfy the requirements of the Primary Investigator's Doctoral dissertation. In order to provide informed consent, respondents must have adequate reasoning faculties and be in possession of all relevant facts at the time consent is given. This is not a given, and thus, the Primary Investigator will consider this issue at the point when the participants' informed consent is requested. The interviewees will also be told that, while further presentations of the material

are possible, consent will be obtained again if and when the situation arises. Participants will be asked if they wish to be provided with both the information sheet and the consent script.

Oral informed consent will be achieved after allowing the prospective participants to read an information sheet (see appendix A). Prior to start of the interview, the Primary Investigator will ask the participant if he or she has read the information sheet and if any questions about the research have presented themselves to the interviewee. The participants will also be asked how they would like confidentiality to be maintained (see Confidentiality section). Finally, they will be asked directly if they consent to take part in the study. The key points from the information sheet (Appendix A) that will be emphasized are:

- The Primary Investigator is a Doctoral student, and Dr. Curt Griffiths is the senior supervisor on this project.
- The topic of the study and what the purpose is of the Doctoral dissertation.
- Participation is voluntary and participants may withdraw from the study at any time without giving a reason and without fear of any negative impact from the Primary Investigator.
- In the event that the participant chooses to withdraw from the study, all information (recordings, transcripts, etc.) relating to them will be immediately destroyed.
- The interview is expected to last between 45 minutes to 1.5 hours, with the possibility of a follow-up interview if necessary.
- If a follow-up interview is requested, they have the right to say no, and are not required to say yes.
- Confidentiality and preferences related to anonymity and indirect identifiers.
- Consent regarding audio-recording the interview and transcription of audio-recordings.
- The interviews will be used for the Primary Investigator's Doctoral dissertation and any related journal articles or book publications, and conference presentations.
- The project has been approved (assumed by this point) by the SFU Research Ethics Board. This Board aims to protect the rights of human research participants.
- Questions can be directed to the Primary Investigator, or to Dr. Curt Griffiths.
- Concerns or complaints regarding any part of the research process can be directed to the Director of the Office of Research Ethics, Dr. Jeff Toward.
- Prior to any sort of publication, participants will be given opportunity to read over and provide feedback about any portions of the research results relating to their interview. All

feedback from participants will be taken seriously and consequently addressed by the Primary Investigator.

- Upon completion, the final Doctoral dissertation will be sent to all participants.
- A recording device will begin recording as soon as the interview starts. Participants will be made aware of this in the information sheet sent out (Appendix A). This is to ensure that when the Primary Investigator asks if they consent to take part in the study, there will be a verbal record that consent has been given.

Confidentiality

The identities of all individuals involved in the study will be kept confidential. The individuals taking part in the study will be notified that their identity will be safeguarded, and further, that a pseudonym will be used if direct quotes appear in text. Because preserving a professional and trusting relationship with the interviewees is important to the Primary Investigator, and because it is possible that the interviewees would not participate if their identity were not kept confidential, utmost confidentiality will be maintained.

Indirect identifiers such as the city where they live, which police force they are employed by will be removed from the transcript of the interview unless otherwise indicated during the consent conversation. However, the nation in which the officers work (i.e. Canada or Holland) will remain known. To safeguard third parties, names mentioned by the participant during the interview will be changed or removed from the transcripts and notes.

If participants give permission to be recorded, interviews will be recorded using a digital audio-recording device. The interviewee will be assured that, while the interviews will be recorded, the recordings themselves will be confidential. The recordings and transcriptions will be kept in separate, and secure locations, and will not be labeled with any identifying information.
Immediately after each separate interview is complete, the audio recording will be saved to an encrypted USB. The Primary Investigator will ensure that the interviews will at no point be saved onto the computer itself.

Within four weeks of the interview itself, the recordings will be transcribed. During this transcription process the data will be anonymized. If the participant indicates a preference for anonymity and/or for the removal of indirect identifiers, names will never be recorded in the transcription. Once the

recordings have been transcribed by the Primary Investigator, and Dr. Curt Griffiths has verified the transcriptions, the audio recordings will be destroyed. Dr. Curt Griffiths and the Primary Investigator will be the only ones with access to the original audio recordings prior to their destruction.

All interview transcripts will be anonymized and will be kept by the Primary Investigator after the research project has ended. They will be stored on an encrypted USB in a locked container in the Primary Investigator's home. This is to allow opportunity for the data to be revisited should follow-up research be conducted in this field, including future projects and studies with the data. Participants will be made aware of this.

Dissemination of Results

Participants will be given the opportunity to review the portion of research results pertaining to their interview prior to Doctoral dissertation submission or any publications involving data from their interview. They will be encouraged to provide feedback regarding the information pertaining to their interview in order to ensure accuracy and satisfaction with the results. All feedback will be taken seriously and addressed accordingly until the participant is satisfied with the changes.

The Doctoral dissertation will be sent to all of the participants upon completion.

Risk/Benefit Analysis

Potential Risks

Risk to participants is minimal. As stated in the Confidentiality section, the individuals participating in the study will be guaranteed full confidentiality. Due to the fact that the information the participants provide the Primary Investigator will not pertain to illegal activity, they will be faced with little or no risk as a result of their involvement.

Because it is likely that participants will be asked to relay information that may be sensitive to them, the Primary Investigator will be mindful and attentive to the participants' needs. Furthermore, the interviewees will be routinely asked whether or not they wish to take a break and the Primary Investigator will respect their decisions not to answer certain questions.

Additional safeguards, including restricting the age of participation to 19 years or older, will be put into place.

Demographic information will be collected, including age, gender, and geographic location such as region or province, and vocation. This information will be used for descriptive purposes and to track sample variation. The reason for tracking geographic information will be to see if there are differences in experiences by location.

There will be no risk to third parties, as specific references to names of people will be removed from the transcripts during the transcription process.

There will be no risk to the Primary Investigator. Interviews will be conducted in person in a private, and secure location, that has been confirmed by both parties involved in the interview process.

Based on the aforementioned considerations, this project can be classified as minimal-risk due to the fact that the possible harms to the participants are no greater than what this group of participants is likely to experience in their everyday life, in accordance with SFU's ethics policy R 20.01. Any potential risks will be mitigated by the procedures set out above.

Potential Benefits

While the project is currently merely a proposal, and thus, in its infant stages, the possible implications of the study are substantial. First, and most importantly, whatever the outcome of the study, its findings will be the first of their kind. Currently a jarring disconnect exists between police literature and the environments in which policing occurs. Although the topic of citizen surveillance is prevalent within mainstream media sources, an academic examination of the phenomenon has not yet taken place. Second, current police use of force training models do not examine the impact citizen monitoring has on front line officers, and in particular, front line officers. This study would likely produce several recommendations for change to current use of force training. These proposed changes would serve to improve the application of police services, and the safety of front line officers. Third, because the civilian population typically formulates its understanding of police and their functions through information provided by mainstream media, the proposed research has the potential to provide the general public with a more accurate understanding.

References Cited

Campbell, John Edward, and Matt Carlson. (2002). Panopticon.com: Online Surveillance and the Commodification of Privacy. *Journal of Broadcasting and Electronic Media.* 46(4): 586- 606.

Snyder, M. & Gangestad, S. (2000). Self-monitoring: Appraisal and reappraisal. *Psychological Bulletin*, 126(4), 530–55.

Appendix G.

Minimal Risk Approval

Minimal Risk Approval – Delegated

Study Number: 2017s0086
Study Title: Watching the Watchmen: A Multi-Site Contextual Study of Patrol Officers' Perception of Citizen Monitoring

Approval Date: 2017 March 3 **Expiry Date:** 2018 March 3
Principal Investigator: Todd, Hilary **Supervisor:** Griffiths, Curt
SFU Position: Graduate Student **Faculty/Department:** Criminology

SFU Collaborator: n/a
External Collaborator: n/a
Research Personnel: n/a
Project Leader: n/a

Funding Source: none
Funding Title: n/a

Document(s) Approved in this Letter:
- Study Details, dated 2017 February 28
- Participant Information Sheet, uploaded 2017 February 16
- Oral Consent Script, uploaded 2017 February 16
- Translator Confidentiality Form, uploaded 2017 February 16
- Survey Instrument, dated 2017 February

The application for ethical review and the document(s) listed above have been reviewed and the procedures were found to be acceptable on ethical grounds for research involving human participants.

The approval for this Study expires on the **Expiry Date. An annual renewal form must be completed every year prior to the Expiry Date. Failure to submit an annual renewal form will lead to your study being suspended and potentially terminated.** The Board reviews and may amend decisions or subsequent amendments made independently by the authorized delegated reviewer at its regular monthly meeting.

This letter is your official ethics approval documentation for this project. Please keep this document for reference purposes.

This study has been approved by an authorized delegated reviewer.