Police Culture:

Does Culture Prevent Proper Policing?

Michael McGuffin

University of Alaska Fairbanks

JUST F698: Non-Thesis Research Project

Abstract

This project is about identifying the key issues that police officers face in today's society. There is an emphasis on community policing and to adjust police training to account for the strong pull of the police subculture. The main purpose of this project is to strengthen the bonds between the police and the community and changing how officers approach their interactions within the community. The end goal is to alleviate community concerns that police officers are out to get them while also alleviating the concerns officers have that the community hates them. This project will attempt to quell those concerns while proposing a solution that benefits both officers, the police department, and the community.

Index

Police Culture: Does Culture Prevent Proper Policing?

Introduction

In the United States there has been a long history of crime fighting, peacekeeping, and law enforcement from police and police departments. However, there have been incidents where law enforcement agencies have steered from their original paths and objectives. This has caused police departments and police officers to perform duties that go against the basic tenets that originally defined who they are. There are two recent events, the riots in Ferguson, Missouri and Baltimore, Maryland, that provide anecdotal evidence that, for many community members indicates, at best, a lack of care for the community; and, at worst, malicious intent of police officers and how the quasi-military structure may have been misused in the applications of justice. Sir Robert Peel, created the idea of the modern police force to be "short on power, but long on respect." However, we are seeing a change in Peel's idea and we seem to be coming full circle where we again have conflict between the police and the community (Duke, 2016). Additionally, it seems that these conflicts are with the militarization of police and the us-vs-them mindset that is created, because of the tendency to dehumanize those who do not hold power, wealth, or influence (Duke, 2016). In this paper, I will argue that these conflicts go against officers' moral codes, values, and makes it difficult for them to successfully complete their duties without suffering some sort of negative result (Pollock, 2014; Ivkovic, 2003). Furthermore, I will

argue that police officers may perceive that violence against them has been increasing, as evidenced by their sub-culture and training. Likewise, their perception could be that they are "under-siege" and this mentality could be why they have lost touch with the community. I want to clearly state that officers do not have an "evil" mindset. Instead, they could have a mindset that "we have no idea what to do" and therefore fall back on what they know or were trained to do. It's important to note that police feel that they have a right to protect their lives or in the worse cases, go out with dignity. Duke (2012), identified this issue and labeled it as the "paradox of proximity." Duke (2012) argues police have the potential for a more emotional relationship to crime and the results of crime. In the literature review, the emotional relationship between police and crime is explored, the very elements of crime and how it relates to policing, and how the militarization of police has impacted policing. The first step is to look at community policing and how officers are changing their behaviors from strictly crime control to more of building and fostering relationships between the community and the police department. Next, the militarization of police is explored and how policing utilizes the quasi-military model and how policing has changed after the September 11th attacks. The next step is to look at police training and subculture where the focus will be for the project. Finally, the burdens of proof and police discretion where policing in general is analyzed and the focus is about how officers use their discretion when carrying out the law.

Literature Review

Community Policing

At the very beginning, the police force was a crude and unrefined crime stopping force that originated in London, England during the 1800s (Lewis, 2011). The founder of the policing

force then was Sir Robert Peel, who was considered the father of modern day community

policing in America (Lewis, 2011; Carrique, 2005). Peel developed nine principles of law

enforcement: (1) police are meant to prevent crime and disorder, (2) the performance of police is

dependant on public approval, (3) the police must secure the public's trust and willing

cooperation, (4) the degree of cooperation with the public diminishes the more force police use

to respond to a situation, (5) police seek to preserve public behavior with impartial preservation

of the law and interpretation of justice, (6) police should use force only to the extend necessary

to enforce the law and ensure compliance, (7) police should maintain a relationship with the

public and honor the tradition that the police are the public and the public are the police, (8) the

police should always direct their actions towards their functions and not usurp the powers of the

judiciary, and (9) the test of police efficiency is the absence of crime and disorder and not police

action (Durham Constabulary, 2018). These principles were then used to develop the concept of

community policing which, as a philosophy, is to focus on community and law enforcement

partnerships with an aim at reducing crime. The idea is to have the community and the police act

as stakeholders and extensions of each other to improve the quality of life in the community,

because at the end of the day - the public are the police and police are members of the public

(Lewis, 2011; Carrique, 2005).

Crime Fighter v. Public Servant

Community policing, in general, is a broad term to define the relationship between the

public, police, and the interactions between the police and the public (Pollock, 2014, p. 105;

Carrique, 2005). Therefore, policing can branch into two different disciplines: a crime fighter,

which has a focus on law enforcement first and the community second, or a public servant which

focuses on the core ideals from Peel: the community comes first and the relationship between the police and the community matters (Pollock, 2014, p. 105; Lewis, 2011).

Crime Fighter

The argument of police being crime fighters stems from how the police interact with the community. For the crime fighter, the mindset is about crime control, controlling criminal conduct, maintaining order, efficiency, emphasis on swiftness instead of quality, and a presumption of guilt (Pollock, 2014, p. 105). Police historically have had a function of social control, where sociologists saw policing as a means to deal with crime rather than the only way of dealing with crime. In addition, sociologists argued that policing was an authorized way to use coercive force against others; therefore, societies required certain duties to be done and completed quickly by whatever means necessary (Miller, 2012). However, it's important to note that critics of the crime fighting policing movement have argued the following: police have a duty to enforce the law and in doing so allows them to engage in coercive force. In light of this idea, policing, in general, relies on officers to exercise discretion and make decisions outside of the control of their supervisor (Miller, 2012). They are required to make decisions using their own knowledge and skills, which can lead to officers switching their paradigms from being focused on crime control to focusing on public service (Pollock, 2014, p. 105; Miller, 2012). However, it's important to note that police discretion is complicated, dynamic, and reactive. In order to understand discretion, there needs to be an insight on the decision making process that officers make every day in the field, to which there is little documentation explaining (May, Duke, & Gueco, 2013).

Public Servant

The idea of police being public servants is not new and recently there has been a cultural change or a change in the shared philosophies, ideologies, values, beliefs, and attitudes that knits a community together (Cortrite, 2007). The mindset of police being public servants is directly opposite to police being perceived as being crime fighters. The focus on police as public servants is to think of criminals as not being a distinct group and to treat them as members of the population, to avoid dehumanizing. It's also important to note that police, under the philosophy of being public servants, are meant to serve all people including criminals and should not make quick judgments about a person's character (Pollock, 2016, p. 105). Pollock also argues that the main responsibility of police, in regards to crime control, is order maintenance and police have a limited ability to affect crime rates (Pollock, 2016, p. 105). Furthemore, according to Muir (n.d.), police have this limited ability, because of how officers are measured. A good officer, as Muir describes, is what a policeman's supervisors say it is and at times officers are evaluated based on criteria that may reflect well on the supervisor but not reflect well upon society. In other words, it may very well be that officers have limited ability to affect crime rates, because their supervisors have a different vision of good police work and it may not include affecting crime rates (Muir, n.d.).

Community Oriented Police and Problem Solving (COPPS)

COPPS is a philosophical training program designed to shift cultural thinking through professionalism in training standards. Its goal is to improve the quality of policing by solving problems for the long-term and investing in those who live and work in the community (Peak, 2014, p. 87). COPPS was developed because police administrators needed an alternative to replace the traditional policing methods of crime control, since those methods were failing at

producing the expected results (Villanueva, 2016; Kelling, 1974). The program works by

defining a set of police strategies and problem oriented policing (POP) tactics. Those strategies

and tactics are then used to work towards a reduction in crime - all the while bringing the public

and police closer together (Villanueva, 2016). In addition, the program is also meant to free up

the officer's time, increase community presence by focusing on centralization, and allow officers

to patrol more often. However, the program's success requires officers and the police department

to make an impact on the community whether it's living in a community area (such as a suburb),

forming partnerships with the community, or having the community feel less apprehensive with

communication (Villanueva, 2016; Peak, 2014, p. 87-90). It is also important to emphasize that

the foci of COPPS and POP is to help law enforcement foster relationships with the community,

since the previous law enforcement philosophy of crime control separated officers from the

community and created a barrier for effective communication.

<div align="center">Militarization of Police</div>

The militarization of police started back in the 1800s after Sir Robert Peel established the

London Metropolitan Police Force and during the colonization of America (Lewis, 2011). There

was a need for a policing force to prevent crime and to enforce the laws created by the society at

the time. As the colonies grew, there was a need to have more professionalism with the police

and to develop their identity as a professional policing force (Miller, 2012; Carrique, 2005).

<div align="center">*Quasi-Military Structure*</div>

Police exist to control crime and to uphold the laws of the society. When an extreme

event occurs such as the September 11th attacks, the Columbine shooting, the Sandy Hook

shooting, or any contemporary event – the police react by adapting and changing their policing

strategies in order to tackle the problem (Wyrick, 2013). Wyrick (2013), goes further and

discusses the history of police starting with the professionalization movement. The movement

was an attempt to curb the problems of corruption, political influences in policing, and the lack

of training (Wyrick, 2013). Their mission was to become more proactive instead of reactive and

adopt a humanistic management structure to suit their needs. The environments for policing are

complex and there is a need for innovation, thus the top-down military model, a chain of

command, (which focuses on ranks, titles, a chain of command, etc) was used to increase

policing efficiency while allowing easier command and control from managers (Wyrick, 2013).

This professionalization movement lasted until the early 1930s where a pioneer in the field of

policing, August Vollmer, advocated for radical changes in policing such as college-educated

officers and going so far as to consult police departments and administrators on his methods

(Wyrick, 2013). Additionally, Vollmer argued that police officers should be taken off of foot

beats and put in patrol cars. Vollmer's idea, which we now call the Politics-Administration

Dichotomy, was to reduce the likelihood of corruption by advocating for further separation for

all managers and political leaders, while increasing police efficiency (Wyrick, 2013). However,

the radical changes and the push towards a professional, but more military-like policing force,

lead to problems in the 1960s with the civil rights movement and anti-war protests. These

problems were exacerbated when the police started to use extreme force to quell the protests and

those who dissented with the current treatment of people with color (Wyrick, 2013). These issues

continued until the 1980s where the Supreme Court intervened and laid down the framework for

uses of force and the treatment of citizens.

Use of Force

The use of force has existed since before the professional era of policing with the idea that officers have a duty to uphold the law and the use of coercive force is a standard method of forcing compliance (Wyrick, 2013; Miller, 2012). Even today, there are fears that the military model encourages patrol officers and supervisors to react in a quasi-military fashion, emphasizing only the use of coercive force to solve problems (Wyrick, 2013; Hill & Berger, 2009). Furthermore, police are subjected to increasing dangers, offenders are getting "smarter" by using body armor, automatic weapons, and military tactics, and police paramilitary units such as SWAT are trained to handle extreme situations (Kraska, Peter, & Louis, 1997). There is a constant battle to control crime and both sides will arm themselves better or get smarter to try and win (Kraska, Peter, & Louis, 1997). Another key point about the use of force is its controversy and officers potentially abusing their authority by using too much force (also known as excessive force). The problem lies with the state giving officers legal legitimacy upon the use of force. Meaning, officers can legally use coercive force to overcome citizen resistance and compel citizens to do that which they may refuse to do (Miller, 2012). However, the solution isn't to remove policing and police officers, because ultimately there will be another force or entity that fills in the gap and the market environment will find the most efficient outcome for any change of institutions that society chooses to follow (San José State University Department of Economics, n.d.). It comes down to power and control and the authority to exercise that power and control. Police have a mission of crime control and they are trained to overcome resistance in order to curb crime. This also means that police have a certain amount of discretion in how much force to use or if the use of force is needed at all. In fact, police officers may utilize what is called the "use of force continuum" or as commonly called the escalation of force. They will in

most cases start with verbal warnings followed by non-verbal/physical actions, etc. From there

the officer makes a determination whether there is a need for more force in order to control the

situation. (Miller, 2012). However, the police do not have complete free reign on the use of force

despite popular belief. There are a few rules, court cases, and regulations that prohibit excessive

uses of force. As an example, the U.S.C. (United States Code), specifically title 42 section 1983,

which prohibits any person of authority within a state, city, or territory subjecting a citizen to the

deprivation of any rights, privileges, or immunities shall be liable to the party injured in any

lawful action, a suit, or any other proceedings (42 U.S.C.A. § 1983). In addition, The Supreme

Court has spoken about this very issue and they emphasize the need to restrain the use of force in

search and seizures, under the Fourth Amendment, citing the need for reasonableness (*Graham v.

Connor*, 1989). The Court has also curtailed the use of discretionary functions by making them

only legal if they do not violate clearly established statutory or constitutional rights which a

reasonable person would have known (*Harlow v. Fitzgerald*, 1982). Similarly, if the officer uses

force the following criteria, set by the Supreme Court, determines whether the use force was

necessary or in "good faith:" (1) significant injury; (2) resulting "directly and only from the use

of force that was clearly excessive to the need"; (3) the excessiveness of which was objectively

unreasonable; and (4) that the action constituted an unnecessary and wanton infliction of pain

(*Hudson v. McMillian*, 1982). There is a checks and balances system used, every time an officer

resorts to using physical force. The officer can use force, but they need to prove that their use of

force was justified or in "good faith."

Post-9/11 Policing

The September 11th attacks, on the world trade centers, made a huge impact upon policing that included changes to the organizational structure and operations (Peak, 2016, p. 91). There were also significant changes in a few key areas: a shift from community policing to homeland security (funding was a large part of this change), thoughts about the federalization/militarization of police, changes in personnel recruitment and hiring to include collaboration, multijurisdictional sharing of resources (since agencies did not communicate or share resources that well pre-9/11), and less face-to-face contact with the public (Peak, 2016, p. 91). An empirical study was conducted by MoonSun and De. Guzman, to test whether community policing was supplanted, by homeland security, post-9/11. They found that there was a change in policing post-9/11 with agencies de-emphasizing community policing and shifting attention and resources to homeland security (Peak, 2016, p. 91-92; MoonSun & Guzman, 2012). However, they also found that problem-solving efforts increased a little bit and concluded that intelligence-led and smart policing shared common ground with problem-solving policing, which emphasized the collection of crime data, evidence, and scientific analysis. Additionally, they found that problem-solving partnerships and citizen training continued to remain a valued practice. In the end, they further concluded that policing may change depending on the environment or by extreme circumstances (Peak, 2016, p. 92; MoonSun & Guzman, 2012). It's important to note, however, that because there was an emphasis on evidence-based policing, at this time; these programs flourished, because of the increased funding in the area (Moonsun & Guzman, 2012).

<p style="text-align:center">Police Training and Subculture</p>

Police training is a subject area with a handful of studies on the effects of training and external research on the topic has been limited in volume, quality, and generality (Skogan, Van Craen, & Hennessy, 2015).

Training

Police training in general is a continuous process that serves to constantly update the knowledge, attitudes, and skills of the police officers. When training programs are created well they can increase productivity and commitment from personnel, reduce lawsuits (excessive use of force and other misconduct), and so forth (Lee, Jang, Yun, & Lim, 2010). Furthermore, police training is meant to focus on citizen encounters, weapon tactics, criminal law, and civil liability (Lee et al., 2010). By the same token, police recruits are sent to an academy after the selection process and from there are given approximately 662 hours of academy training which includes training on the above as discussed by Lee et al. (2010). They are then released or hired on to police departments where they undergo on the job training (Lee et al., 2010). The on-the-job training is meant to expose recruits to real world conflict and situations while being under close supervision, so they can learn how to apply the skills and knowledge obtained from police academies (Lee et al., 2010). However, it is important to note that skills and knowledge must be constantly refreshed and reapplied when rules, procedures, and tactics change, because the point of the training is to keep officers safe from dangerous field encounters (Lee et al., 2010; Alpert, Dunham, & Stroshine, 2006).

Chicago

Police training in Chicago follows a similar police training model except recruits are sent to a police academy and from there undergo the rigorous physical and mental hardships that

officers in the field encounter each and every day (Skogan et al., 2015). Additionally, these

recruits are required to undergo academic training that can contain PowerPoint slides, video

clips, and group exercises. Moreover, those same academic courses attempt to have officers

understand the community aspect of policing with exercises focusing on community expectations

from officers and officer expectations from the community. The goals of the training were to

increase citizen cooperation, encourage the public to comply with police instructions, and

maximize officer safety (Skogan et al., 2015).

Subculture

The police subculture developed due to the uniquely stressful work environment, the

closed social system, and the homogenous social group that is formed within police departments.

Police officers are also likely to create stereotypes that identify people with whom they come

into contact with (the "asshole", clown, jerk-off, wise-guy, etc.) (Pollock, 2014, p. 117). This

subculture is one that isolates police officers into their own group and the professional movement

in policing didn't help matters – instead it widened the distance between the police and the

community they served (Pollock, 2014, p. 117). Pollock (2014), describes common themes

running through police attitudes and values of the police culture such as the following: loyalties

to colleagues is essential, the public is the enemy, and the police take into account the identity of

the victim and offender when utilizing their discretion (U.S. Department of Justice, 2016; U.S.

Department of Justice, 2015; Pollock, 2014, p. 117). This is exacerbated by the "cop code" or a

list of informal codes of conduct that define an officer's conduct within the organization. This

conduct can range from "protecting your ass" to "don't give up another cop" (Pollock, 2014, p.

118). Essentially, the cop code is the internal mechanism that keeps officers together and furthers

the idea of the us-vs-them mindset (Pollock, 2014, p. 118). However, while this type of informal

code exists, it is rare for officers to follow it. In fact, the Court, in *Brady v. Maryland* (1963),

also discussed the idea of suppressing evidence or "protecting your ass" and decided it was a

violation of due process and against the fundamental rights of the accused. Consequently, despite

the Supreme Court ruling against suppressing evidence, the justification of this type of

subculture and the treatment of the public came from the concept of noble-cause corruption. The

idea is the end goal of crime fighting justifies any means that might otherwise be illegal or

unethical (Braswell, McCarthy, & McCarthy, 2017; Pollock, 2014, p. 118). The solution to the

us-vs-them mindset and noble-cause corruption is to approach the problem directly and to create

programs for police to learn, adapt, and accommodate the needs and priorities of different groups

(Pollock, 2014, p. 121).

<div align="center">

Corruption

</div>

Evidence of police corruption is extensive, but few studies have been able to measure its

extent and prevalence. However, there has been various investigative bodies (i.e. the Knapp

Commission, the Chicago Police Committee, the Kolts Commission, etc.) that have looked into

the problem (Braswell et al., 2017; Pollock, 2014). Unfortunately, the results from these

investigative bodies could not be reproduced and the results were arguably from researchers who

held some bias and misunderstanding (Braswell et al., 2017; Pollock, 2014). Although this may

be true, other researchers have stated that the issue with police corruption seems to be from the

lack of attention from supervisors (Braswell et al., 2017; Pollock, 2014, p. 177). The lack of

supervision that officers receive when they commit unethical acts could very well contribute to

police corruption. Additionally, some aspects of corruption are so small that they aren't really

thought of as being an unethical act, such as gratuities (Braswell et al., 2017; Pollock, 2014, p. 177). To further explain gratuities and their impacts, some police departments have resorted to adopting a mindset of leaving a large tip that compensates for the gratuity. Thus, any discount that they would have receive is effectively "paid back" without any obligation to the officer(s) (Braswell et al., 2017; Pollock, 2014, p. 177). The primary problem with police corruption is the justifications or neutralization techniques that officers use to excuse their behavior (Braswell et al., 2017). These justifications can range anywhere from the public thinking every cop is a crook, the money is out there; if I don't take it, someone else will, I can use it for a good cause – my son needs an operation, etc (Braswell et al., 2017; Pollock, 2014, p. 198). When police are making these excuses and have a lack of oversight from supervisors, they believe that they are free to engage in these unethical behaviors and may be motivated to do so (Pollock, 2014; Ivković, 2003). However, only a very small handful of officers should be thought of as corrupt or even completely "straight-arrowed", because even officers who engage in these acts may just have ethical lapses, often believe they are acting for the benefit of the community, and believe they are acting within the parameters of a police officer (Braswell et al., 2017; Pollock, 2014, p. 179).

Discretion and Burdens of Proof

Discretion

Police discretion characterizes a wide array of police action and provides officers flexibility to choose an appropriate response to a situation (i.e. whether to write a citation or make an arrest) (Nowacki, 2015). The main issue with police discretion is the amount of freedom it affords an officer, because at times officers may allow the attitude of the offender to affect their decision making or be forced to make a decision with severe time-constraints (Braswell et

al., 2017; Nowacki, 2015). However, police having discretion does not mean that officers will use it maliciously. In fact, giving criminal justice system actors the ability to consider the circumstances when making decisions is essential part of achieving individualized justice, because full enforcement of the law is not feasible (Cihan & Wells, 2011). Additionally, part of the enforcement of crime is to act quickly, with certainty, and with severity in order to create an effective deterrent. According to Cihan & Wells (2011), the point of the criminal justice system and the crime control model is to act quickly without the burden of formality. Furthermore, crime control cannot be effectively achieved unless the public supports sufficient police discretion in the enforcement of criminal laws. In essence, the ability to enforce depends on the level of support given to law enforcement by citizens (Cihan & Wells, 2011). However, it's also important to note that the current literature lacks a true measure of discretion and the department's policy and organizational structure do have an effect on officer discretion; but not all policies will translate into police action (Nowacki, 2015).

Escalation of Force

Police officers have been known to escalate their actions in a given situation in order to force compliance. Officers are exercising their power or authority over a given situation in order to, in effect, control crime and create legitimacy in their actions (Lowrey-Kinberg & Sullivan, 2017; Sousa, Ready, & Ault, 2010). According to Lowrey-Kinberg and Sullivan (2017), a power-holder claims authority and an audience responds. If that fails or succeeds then the power-holder adjusts their claim to authority and the audience responds – this will repeat itself several times until the situation is resolved (the officer makes an arrest, takes an action, or the citizen is released) (Lowrey-Kinberg & Sullivan, 2017). In the escalation of force, it's important

to recognize that the audience matters and their perceptions of the police influence what actions

are taken. If the public distrusts the police, they may be less responsive to the officer's

commands and the officer will escalate their force to ensure compliance (Lowrey-Kinbert &

Sullivan, 2017; Sousa et al., 2010). The use of force continuum then comes into effect where the

officer is allowed to use a certain amount of force depending on the situation and the

circumstances involved. However, it's important to note that officers rarely use force and the

escalation of force only occurs in a small number of cases (Sousa et al., 2010).

Probable Cause

The notion of probable cause is one of controversy and the Supreme Court has

established requirements that balance the interests of effective law enforcement and the

protection of citizen's rights (Newman, 2006). Probable cause, in of itself, is when the officer

had "reasonably trustworthy information" of facts and circumstances that would lead a "prudent

man" to believe that an offense had been committed (Newman, 2006; *Karr v. Smith*, 1985).

Ultimately the court decides if probable cause existed when the officer acts on it, because of the

balance of interests set by the Supreme Court. It comes down to liability and whether the officer

acted in "good faith" and whether the officer met the requirements for probable cause under

statute (Newman, 2006). In any case, the burden of proof is on the officer to justify that probable

cause existed and to prove they acted on good faith to engage in their actions (Newman, 2006).

Burdens of Proof

The burden of proof exists to differentiate or separate the amount of evidence required to

prove a certain fact. Kaplow (2011), describes the burden of proof as the strength of evidence

required for the imposition of sanctions, award of damages, or provision of other forms of relief.

The burden of proof can also extend to different standards of proof such as beyond a reasonable doubt, clear and convincing evidence, preponderance of the evidence, probable cause, reasonable belief, reasonable suspicion, etc (Jurkowski, 2017). Officers can use these burdens of proof to justify warrantless searches and seizures, arrests, and in court prosecutor/plaintiff and defense attorneys can use these burdens of proof to justify whether the defense was guilty or innocent according to the law (Jurkowski, 2017; Kaplow, 2011). Furthermore, officers who use these burdens of proof are subjected to scrutiny in court and courts will evaluate the officer's defense to determine good faith or if the officer was justified in breaching the Fourth Amendment (Kaplow, 2011).

Thesis Statement & Strain Theory

The main purpose of this paper is to identify and analyze two things: (1) whether the quasi-military structure has been misinterpreted by police departments and created an "us-vs-them" mindset and (2) whether the subculture, created by the us-vs-them influences policing and how police respond to calls for service or extreme situations.

The militarization of police and community policing are two philosophies have been the core of the police officer since their inception, but they're in conflict with each another because both philosophies do the exact opposite of each other. This is also known as the conflict between crime control and due process philosophies; thusly, is it the officer's duty to protect society from crime through crime control strategies or is it to ensure that each citizens is afforded their due process rights (innocent until proven guilty). The militarization of police seeks to control crime whereas community policing seeks to establish bonds with the police and the community. On one hand, the crime control philosophy works and it's a valid strategy to reducing crime.

However, on the other hand, the ties between the police and community diminish and the community ties begin to fail when the focus shifts to pure crime control (Villanueva, 2016; Peak, 2014, p. 87-90; Wyrick, 2013). When there is a conflict, such as militarization and community policing, the chance of corruption and delinquency is high - as police officers have trouble enforcing the laws while maintaining community ties (Cortrite, 2007). As Kant stated in his deontology, "mankind's distinguishing feature is our possession of reason, therefore it follows that all humans have universal rational duties to one another, centring on their duty to respect the other's humanity" (Misselbrook, 2013, para. 2). Police officers are no different and are exposed to a stressful environments where they are being prevented from achieving their positively valued goals. These goals include monetary, status, and autonomy, however they also suffer from the removal of positively valued stimuli (such as the death of another officer, family, friends, etc), and are exposed or are threatened to be exposed to individuals with noxious or negatively valued stimuli (verbal insults, physical assaults, threats of death, life and death scenarios, etc) (Agnew, Brezina, Wright, & Cullen, 2002). This strain that the officers endure can lead them to engaging in acts of corruption, racism in the line of duty, and act unbecoming of their core values, depending on the current philosophy that society has embraced (U.S. Department of Justice, 2016; U.S. Department of Justice, 2015). It is important to consider the effect of this conflict and the necessity of checks and balances with community policing (i.e. positive community bonds and relationships between the police and community) (Chriss, 2007). Therefore, this study is meant to look into policing in general and why officers behave the way they do and if there is a positive force of change that can be implemented to mitigate this strain.

When it comes to general strain theory (GST), created by Robert Agnew, the thought is that excessive amounts of strain will create negative emotions such as anger, fear, anxiety, etc and criminality is created as a means of releasing those emotions (Agnew et al., 2002). However, these negative emotions are only created in the following three ways: (1) the inability of individuals to achieve their goals (goal blockage), (2) the presentation of noxious or negatively valued stimuli, and (3) the loss of positively valued stimuli (Brezina, 2017). It is from those "strains" that create criminality and it's all about the absence of positive stimuli and the introduction of negative stimuli. In policing, these strains are present in day to day activities such as traffic stops, crime control, and even public opinions and attitudes (Brezina, 2017). The research proposal below identifies these issues and will work to change or modify police training to have them better prepared for these strains and to work against the instilled us-vs-them mindset and the quasi-military structure.

Proposed Project & Project Discussion

With the technology boom and the need to have an internet connection in order to function, there is also a need for policing to change. It's easier now to video tape, photograph, and spread information across the internet quicker than we ever imagined, ten to twenty years ago. While there are distinct advantages to the rapid increases in technology and the sharing of information there are also inherent disadvantages, specifically to policing. Police officers are being recorded in their activities with dash cams or videos taken by the community and are being held accountable by what's found on that footage. Consequently, we are seeing an age where any small mistake made by officers is shared, critiqued, and spread like wildfire.

Given the rapid spread of information, the public outcry over police officers and their actions, the needs of officers, and the mindset officers have about crime, there might be a mandate to adjust how officers are trained. Police training is not perfect, but it is far from horrible and does well enough to train officers. However, there is always a desire to have training be refined, improved, and adjusted to fit the current needs of our changing society. The objective of this project is to target the us-vs-them mindset and the quasi-military structure that is ingrained into their core. We do not want to not completely remove these mindsets but to break down a "wall" that is created when officers engage in their daily law enforcement routine. It is known in the literature that officers are stressed and put in dangerous environments virtually every day; It's natural they would develop defense mechanisms to survive. In light of this development, the community policing movement has taken steps to alleviate this problem and to make it easier for the police and community to relate to one another. The community policing movement is a good step in the right direction, but there needs to be more of a push and an emphasis on training in the academy. Officers are being trained, in the academy, before being placed on the job and supervised by other officers. If we start early enough we may be able to adjust their mindset quickly enough to prevent the wall from being developed.

With this goal in mind, the idea is that officers will be given more options to handle extreme cases. The "under-siege" mindset is a problem for multiple reasons: (1) officers have little time to react to threats of danger and hostile situations, (2) officers may try to resort to what they were trained to do instead of avoiding conflict, and (3) officers may feel the community is against them and doesn't understand their plight or sense of duty. might make officers react in a certain way towards a threat of danger. This proposed training program will reinforce the idea

that the community isn't out to get them and there should be more of an effort to get to know the

needs and wants of their community members. In effect, it's a more personal approach to

community policing except it starts earlier before the officer has gone through the academy and

is hired on. Now, acknowledging that there are barriers to this such as veteran officers and

funding - there needs to be an incentive to have this training start earlier.

That being said, this proposed training program would work as follows: work on the

academy level to the first few years of an officer's career, attempt to curb the potential mindset

that officers are "under-siege," and help them see a way out instead of having them fallback on

"we don't know what to do, so let's do what we do know." We want to focus on creating a

wayout by focusing on what they do know - trained to behave as officers and members of the

community. This would be accomplished by change agents and reinforced training methods that

identify the key issues with the under-siege mindset. Ideally, the officers would enter a

classroom environment, be presented with literature and real world examples of officers engaged

in stressful environments, and have activities that reinforce the idea that the community is there

to help them (instead of being out there to harm their personal safety). In short, the focus will be

in a classroom training program in the beginning and an emphasis on reinforcing positive

behavior and phasing out the us-vs-them. It's also important to continue this training regime after

the academy with supervised on-the-job training. The objective is to educate officers on current

events, potential pitfalls of law enforcement, what to expect on the job, and how to best handle a

situation. If we give them the tools and the know how, we can mitigate potential causes of injury

or death.

Budget

The project will be in three phases and will rely upon sending law enforcement officers to training conferences, in-house training with change agents, and a grant to get the funding started so donations can be sought after data can be presented. I argue that a program of this nature is new, because there's a lack of literature in policing, policing strategies, and police subculture. Also, attempting to change a mindset that's instilled from the academy and through experience is going to be extremely difficult. We are human beings and arguably seek rewards in avoidance of risk; we also adapt to changes in our environment to best survive.

Phase I: Grant Phase

The grant phase of the project will be used as a starter and fund the first round of training conferences for officers. Ideally, the officers would come back and relay what they have learned to supervisors and discuss the material to each other. This phase will last until all officers have attended the conference and from there phase II will start.

Phase II: In-House/On-the-Job Training

At this point, officers will have attended the required conferences and now change agents will be involved. The goal of the change agents is to help officers transition to the new mindset and apply it in their workplace. This involves randomly selecting officers to document their interactions with the community during their required beat. This stage is to slowly apply what the officers learned during their conferences while minimizing any potential resistance from veteran officers/experienced officers.

Phase III: Data Publishing and Collecting Donations

Throughout phase I and phase II, police officers and the police department will document their interactions with the community as a result from their newfound training regime. Academy

graduates will also be included in the data collection process to determine if there's a change in

policing behaviors. After a period of approximately one year, the preliminary data will be

published and show the results of this project to the community and local government officials

for review. From then on, there will be an attempt to gather donations to pay for publishing costs,

to pay back any debt incurred, and to pay back the grant that was sought in phase I.

Cost Breakdown

All project budget items are estimated based on what would be reasonable. This project

would last approximately two years, however the budget would make estimates on the cost per

year. Appendix B figure 1 and figure 2 are the 2018 approved budgets that contain: the

Anchorage Police Department's allocated monies for the fiscal year, their revenue sources, and

their expenditures. Figure 3 shows the program's total estimated cost per year and is a combined

excel sheet accounting for the Anchorage Police Department's 2017 budget. There is a predicted

total project cost of $300,000.00. The total cost will be divided amongst officer and staff training

at an estimated $120,000.00 including sending officers to conferences, change agents at an

estimated $189,999.96, data collection at an estimated $36,000.00, and publishing results at an

estimated $12,000.00. The cost is mainly focused around training officers and sending them to

the conferences. It is assumed that it will be expensive to fly the entirety of the Anchorage Police

Department to the conference and back again while paying for room and board.

Limitations

The main limitations for this project are time constraints and the possible resistance from

both the police department and the community; below are the limitations that would have a

significant impact upon this project:

1. The Anchorage Police Department is going to need some restructuring and this report may not be the catalyst for change. However, the report is looking to make a positive change and this report will highlight some current problems within the police department.

2. The public perceptions of this project will be mixed at best. Not very many people may be too keen on this project being implemented out of fear of "poking the bear." A lot of communication between the researchers and the public is needed.

3. The project will need focus on targeting the training of officers in order to be successful. I feel as though that's where the majority of the problem lies – the training that officers receive before they are hired from the academy.

4. The lack of policing research and research about police culture may have a significant impact on this project. This project was created based on information that is currently available and it is acknowledged that policing research is incomplete and ever evolving.

Recommended Future Research

Based on my research/project, here is what future researchers should consider if researching this topic. To begin, there is a general understanding that policing research is lacking, is ever evolving, and there is a struggle to answer society's questions about policing. The problems with this type of research can range from police motivation to a lack of research in the field in general. Below there will be four major concerns and recommendations for future research. It is my hope that someone will continue where I left off and use my research as a catalyst to answer the questions we are all asking.

(1). The limited nature of police research into police culture, their mindsets, and the internal structure of the police department has made this proposed project difficult. Some of the

research that we do have, such as the Kansas City Preventive Patrol Experiment, are outdated or cannot be reliably replicated. We face a problem of making an educated guess as to whether this is how they act, this is what they do, and when faced in certain stressful situations - how the community will react to officers. We have the basics, but we lack the fine details of explaining why police officers tend to separate from their communities or why police organizations still adopt a quasi-military structure.

(2). Academics who made arguments about policing and how police subculture functions rarely learn the trade (with few exceptions). We will never truly understand how officers perform on the field unless we are officers ourselves. Most academics will not have served as a police officer and research that is published lacks that first hand experience. It's the outside looking in perspective that really limits how in-depth current policing research can be.

(3). Conferring with fellow academics in the field, they state policing has never been treated as an economic system where rights and ownership were assessed and costs and customer behavior were analyzed. Furthermore they argue, if we did this, I think we would find all sorts of market failures-rendering previous analysis' methods questioned. Based on my research, I agree with their assessment of the situation. We see policing as very black and white and cause and effect instead of acting as a sub-system to the market environment. We narrowly focus our thinking and miss important details of policing that may change the way we view policing and police research.

(4). There is a lack of research on police motivation and what happens when officers are "passed over" for specialized units or promotions. There is research out there showing how motivation affects the workplace environment, but there lacks research on how motivation

affects a police officer's workplace environment and job performance. I would encourage further researchers to explore this topic and determine if a lack of motivation can severely degrade policing performance.

Conclusion

The United States has had a long history of crime fighting, peacekeeping, and law enforcement from police and police departments. Based on the current literature, we see that police undergo constant struggles varying from workplace stress, being "under-siege", and a constant barrage of critique from the community. An officer, according to Sir Robert Peel, is the public and the public are the police. This means that officers are there to serve the public and are an extension of the public's power. What was identified in the literature is a shift in Peel's fundamental principles of law enforcement. Officers no longer follow the principles laid out to the letter, but times have changed and our society has evolved passed what Peel imagined. Officers are exposed to dangerous environments more so now than and have since adapted in order to survive. The main argument for the proposed project was that police were adapting to protect themselves from harm, but in doing so they created a wall or a rift between themselves and the public. A perfect example of this rift going too far and causing a conflict between police officers and the community is the riots in Ferguson, Missouri and Baltimore, Maryland. These incidents show us that policing in the country could be reaching a point of no-return, where officers feel there will be a constant conflict with the community and the community feels they cannot trust law enforcement. The hope with this project is to alleviate the stress officers face and to reinforce the idea the community is working with law enforcement instead of being against them. However, it is difficult to properly identify the chief concerns police officers have

because of the limited research in the field. The research that is present lacks first-hand law enforcement experience and is objectively flawed, but it is the only research that is out there. It is now 2018 and we continue to be puzzled by law enforcement, the policing subculture, and how law enforcement works in regards to police stress. Therefore, my goal is to create more policing research by attempting to shift the mindsets of police and hopefully put enough data in the academic world to foster change or to spark innovation into new research. To end, I challenge those who seek to conduct their own policing research to continue where I have started and strengthen the field while helping alleviate tension between the police and the community.

Appendix A

Figure 1: Anchorage Police Department's Total Operating Budget

	2016 Actuals	2017 Revised	2018 Approved	18 v 17 % Chg
Direct Cost by Division				
PD Admin & Resources	42,144,007	48,706,499	48,929,521	0.46%
PD Chief of Police	3,553,026	3,523,707	3,264,430	(7.36%)
PD Girdwood	156,638	618,000	635,000	2.75%
PD Operations	55,913,404	58,374,280	58,967,426	1.02%
PD Turnagain Arm Police SA	-	50,461	50,461	-
Direct Cost Total	101,767,075	111,272,947	111,846,837	0.52%
Intragovernmental Charges				
Charges by/to Other Departments	10,708,340	11,535,205	11,490,930	(0.38%)
Function Cost Total	112,475,416	122,808,152	123,337,767	0.43%
Program Generated Revenue	(5,877,021)	(7,771,977)	(6,352,332)	(18.27%)
Net Cost Total	106,598,394	115,036,175	116,985,435	1.69%
Direct Cost by Category				
Salaries and Benefits	79,258,633	85,707,543	91,561,031	6.83%
Supplies	1,965,578	2,983,160	2,305,558	(22.71%)
Travel	18,084	29,500	29,500	-
Contractual/OtherServices	19,917,216	22,168,982	17,526,780	(20.94%)
Debt Service	243,593	324,762	364,968	12.38%
Depreciation/Amortization	2,889	-	-	-
Equipment, Furnishings	361,081	59,000	59,000	-
Direct Cost Total	101,767,075	111,272,947	111,846,837	0.52%
Position Summary as Budgeted				
Full-Time	544	599	599	-
Part-Time	-	-	-	-
Position Total	544	599	599	-

Figure 2: Anchorage Police Department's Alternative Revenue Sources

Police
Operating Grant and Alternative Funded Programs

Program	Fund Center	Award Amount	Amount Expended As of 12/31/2017	Expected Expenditures in 2018	Expected Balance at End of 2018	FT	PT	T	Program Expiration
Justice Assistance Grant									
(Federal Grant)	484300	392,943	392,943	-	-	-	-	-	Sep-16
- Provide funding to underwrite projects	484300	417,565	417,565	-	-	-	-	-	Sep-17
to reduce crime and improve public	484300	368,234	348,991	19,243	-	-	-	-	Sep-18
safety.	484300	401,785	165,506	200,000	36,279	-	-	-	Sep-19
	484300	400,494	-	300,000	100,494	-	-	-	Sep-20
Homeland Security Grants									
(Federal Grant)	484300	204,745	-	204,745	-	-	-	-	Sep-17
- AWARN Radios to complete APD	484300	368,500	-	368,500	-	-	-	-	Sep-18
misc EOD/SWAT operational equip	484300	315,000	-	315,000	-	-	-	-	Sep-19
COPS Hiring Recovery Program									
(Federal Grant)	484300	500,000	500,000	-	-	4	-	-	Dec-16
- Provides 100% of entry level funding	484300	250,000	250,000	-	-	2	-	-	Dec-17
for 9 officers to be recovered in lieu	484300	500,000	375,000	125,000	-	4	-	-	Dec-18
of layoff									
AHSO Driving Enforcement									
(State Grant)									
- overtime for DUI violation enforcement	484100	126,560	126,560	-	-	-	-	-	Dec-17
- overtime for seatbelt enforcement	484100	114,000	114,000	-	-	-	-	-	Dec-17
- DUI Unit	484100	2,133,000	2,133,000	-	-	-	-	-	Aug-17
- DUI Unit	484100	1,560,000	350,000	1,210,000	-	8	-	-	Sep-18
Seward Hwy Enforcement- Leg Grant	484100	200,000	50,000	150,000	-	-	-	-	Sep-18
Total Grant and Alternative Operating Funding for Department		8,252,826	5,223,565	2,892,488	136,773	18	-	-	
Total General Government Operating Direct Cost for Department				111,846,837		599	-	-	
Total Operating Budget for Department				114,739,325		617	-	-	

Figure 3: Proposed Budget Example for 2017

CASH AVAILABLE	JAN	FEB	MAR	APR	MAY	JUN	JUL	AUG	SEP	OCT	NOV	DEC	YTD TOTAL	TREND
Monthly Cash	$453,667.67	$453,667.67	$453,667.67	$453,667.67	$453,667.67	$453,667.67	$453,667.67	$453,667.67	$453,667.67	$453,667.67	$453,667.67	$453,667.67	$5,444,012.04	

INCOME TYPE	JAN	FEB	MAR	APR	MAY	JUN	JUL	AUG	SEP	OCT	NOV	DEC	YTD TOTAL	TREND
Justice Assistance Grant	$131,710.58	$131,710.58	$131,710.58	$131,710.58	$131,710.58	$131,710.58	$131,710.58	$131,710.58	$131,710.58	$131,710.58	$131,710.58	$131,710.58	$1,580,526.96	
Homeland Security Grant	$47,770.41	$47,770.41	$47,770.41	$47,770.41	$47,770.41	$47,770.41	$47,770.41	$47,770.41	$47,770.41	$47,770.41	$47,770.41	$47,770.41	$573,244.92	
COPS Hiring Recovery	$104,166.66	$104,166.66	$104,166.66	$104,166.66	$104,166.66	$104,166.66	$104,166.66	$104,166.66	$104,166.66	$104,166.66	$104,166.66	$104,166.66	$1,249,999.92	
AHSO Driving Enforcement	$199,853.33	$199,853.33	$199,853.33	$199,853.33	$199,853.33	$199,853.33	$199,853.33	$199,853.33	$199,853.33	$199,853.33	$199,853.33	$199,853.33	$2,398,239.96	
City	$9,101,952.41	$9,101,952.41	$9,101,952.41	$9,101,952.41	$9,101,952.41	$9,101,952.41	$9,101,952.41	$9,101,952.41	$9,101,952.41	$9,101,952.41	$9,101,952.41	$9,101,952.41	$109,223,428.92	
TOTAL INCOME	$9,585,453.39	$9,585,453.39	$9,585,453.39	$9,585,453.39	$9,585,453.39	$9,585,453.39	$9,585,453.39	$9,585,453.39	$9,585,453.39	$9,585,453.39	$9,585,453.39	$9,585,453.39	$115,025,440.68	

EXPENSES	JAN	FEB	MAR	APR	MAY	JUN	JUL	AUG	SEP	OCT	NOV	DEC	YTD TOTAL	TREND
Salaries and Benefits	$7,078,859.83	$7,078,859.83	$7,078,859.83	$7,078,859.83	$7,078,859.83	$7,078,859.83	$7,078,859.83	$7,078,859.83	$7,078,859.83	$7,078,859.83	$7,078,859.83	$7,078,859.83	$84,946,317.96	
Supplies	$248,596.66	$248,596.66	$248,596.66	$248,596.66	$248,596.66	$248,596.66	$248,596.66	$248,596.66	$248,596.66	$248,596.66	$248,596.66	$248,596.66	$2,983,159.92	
Travel	$2,458.33	$2,458.33	$2,458.33	$2,458.33	$2,458.33	$2,458.33	$2,458.33	$2,458.33	$2,458.33	$2,458.33	$2,458.33	$2,458.33	$29,499.96	
Contractual/Other Services	$1,746,085.25	$1,746,085.25	$1,746,085.25	$1,746,085.25	$1,746,085.25	$1,746,085.25	$1,746,085.25	$1,746,085.25	$1,746,085.25	$1,746,085.25	$1,746,085.25	$1,746,085.25	$20,953,023.00	
Debt Service	$21,035.66	$21,035.66	$21,035.66	$21,035.66	$21,035.66	$21,035.66	$21,035.66	$21,035.66	$21,035.66	$21,035.66	$21,035.66	$21,035.66	$252,427.92	
Equipment and Furnishings	$4,916.66	$4,916.66	$4,916.66	$4,916.66	$4,916.66	$4,916.66	$4,916.66	$4,916.66	$4,916.66	$4,916.66	$4,916.66	$4,916.66	$58,999.92	
	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	
Project Training	$10,000.00	$10,000.00	$10,000.00	$10,000.00	$10,000.00	$10,000.00	$10,000.00	$10,000.00	$10,000.00	$10,000.00	$10,000.00	$10,000.00	$120,000.00	
Project Staff (Change Agent -	$15,833.33	$15,833.33	$15,833.33	$15,833.33	$15,833.33	$15,833.33	$15,833.33	$15,833.33	$15,833.33	$15,833.33	$15,833.33	$15,833.33	$189,999.96	
Data Collection	$3,000.00	$3,000.00	$3,000.00	$3,000.00	$3,000.00	$3,000.00	$3,000.00	$3,000.00	$3,000.00	$3,000.00	$3,000.00	$3,000.00	$36,000.00	
Result Publishing (Per year up to 3)	$1,000.00	$1,000.00	$1,000.00	$1,000.00	$1,000.00	$1,000.00	$1,000.00	$1,000.00	$1,000.00	$1,000.00	$1,000.00	$1,000.00	$12,000.00	
TOTAL EXPENSES	$9,131,785.72	$9,131,785.72	$9,131,785.72	$9,131,785.72	$9,131,785.72	$9,131,785.72	$9,131,785.72	$9,131,785.72	$9,131,785.72	$9,131,785.72	$9,131,785.72	$9,131,785.72	$109,581,428.64	

References

42 U.S.C.A. § 1983 (Civil action for deprivation of rights, any party that impedes on an

individual's rights regardless of protected class shall be liable in an action of law, suit in

equity, or other proper proceeding for redress). *West Law*. Retrieved from

https://1-next-westlaw-com.proxy.consortiumlibrary.org.

Agnew, R., Brezina, T., Wright, J. P., & Cullen, F. T. (2002). Strain, personality traits, and

delinquency: Extending general strain theory. *Criminology, 40*(1), 43-72.

doi:10.1111/j.1745-9125.2002.tb00949.x. Retrieved from

http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com.proxy.consortiumlibrary.org/doi/10.1111/j.1745-9125.200

2.tb00949.x/abstract

Alpert, G. P., Dunham, R. G., & Stroshine, M. S. (2006), *Policing: Continuity and change*.

Waveland, Long Grove, IL.

Brady v. Maryland (1963). 373 U.S. 83, 83 S. Ct. 1194, 10 L. Ed. 2d 215 U.S. Retrieved from

https://1-next-westlaw-com.proxy.consortiumlibrary.org/

Braswell, M. C., McCarthy, B. R., & McCarthy, B. J. (2017). *Justice, Crime, and Ethics*.

Routledge.

Brezina, T. (2017, February). General Strain Theory. Retrieved from

http://criminology.oxfordre.com/view/10.1093/acrefore/9780190264079.001.0001/acrefo

re-9780190264079-e-249

Carrique, T. (2005). *Recruiting with vision: Cultivating a police service that reflects the*

    community (Order No. MR09460). ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global. (89110000).

    Retrieved from

    http://search.proquest.com.proxy.consortiumlibrary.org/docview/89110000?accountid=1

    4473

Chriss, J. J. (2007). The functions of the social bond. *The Sociological Quarterly, 48*(4),

    689-712. doi:10.1111/j.1533-8525.2007.00097.x. Retrieved from

    http://www.jstor.org.proxy.consortiumlibrary.org/stable/40220048?pq-origsite=summon

    &seq=1#page_scan_tab_contents

Cihan, A. & Wells, W. (2011). Citizens' opinions about police discretion in criminal

    investigations. *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies and Management*

    34(2), 347-362.

Duke, R. (2012). Paradox of Proximity.

Duke, R. (2016). Seven Habits for Effective Policing: Using the dispute resolution toolbox.

Durham Constabulary. (2018). Sir Robert Peel's Principles of Law Enforcement 1829. Retrieved

    from

    https://www.durham.police.uk/About-Us/Documents/Peels_Principles_Of_Law_Enforce

    ment.pdf

Graham v. Connor (1989). 490 U.S. 386, 109 S. Ct. 1865, 104 L. Ed. 2d 443 U.S. Retrieved

    from https://1-next-westlaw-com.proxy.consortiumlibrary.org/

Harlow v. Fitzgerald (1982). 457 U.S. 800, 102 S.Ct. 2727, 73 L.Ed.2d 396 U.S. Retrieved from

    https://1-next-westlaw-com.proxy.consortiumlibrary.org/

Hill, S., & Berger, R. (2009). A paramilitary policing juggernaut. *Social Justice, 36*(1), 25-40.

Hudson v. McMillian (1992). 503 U.S. 1, 112 S. Ct. 995, 117 L. Ed. 2d 156. Retrieved from

        https://1-next-westlaw-com.proxy.consortiumlibrary.org/

Ivković, S. (2003). To serve and collect: Measuring police corruption. *The Journal of Criminal*

        Law and Criminology (1973), 93(2/3), 593-650. Retrieved from

        http://www.jstor.org/stable/1144321

Jurkowski, S. (2017, June). *Burden of proof.* Retrieved from

        https://www.law.cornell.edu/wex/burden_of_proof

Kaplow, L. (2011). On the optimal burden of proof. *Journal of Political Economy, 119*(6),

        1104-1140. doi:10.1086/664614

Kelling, G. (1974, January). *The Kansas City preventive patrol experiment.* Retrieved from

        https://www.policefoundation.org/publication/the-kansas-city-preventive-patrol-experime

        nt/

Kraska, Peter, B., & Louis, J. (1997). Militarizing Mayberry and Beyond: Making Sense of

        American Paramilitary Policing. *Justice Quarterly 14:* 607-629

Lee, H., Jang, H., Yun, I., & Lim, H. (2010). An examination of police use of force utilizing

        police training and neighborhood contextual factors: Multilevel analysis. *Policing: An*

        International Journal of Police Strategies Management 33(4), 681-702.

Lewis, M. A. (2011, December 1). *Perspective Peel's Legacy .* Retrieved from

        https://leb.fbi.gov/articles/perspective/perspective-peels-legacy

Lowrey-Kinberg, B. V. & Sullivan, B. G. (2017). I'm giving you a lawful order: Dialogic

    legitimacy in Sandra Bland's traffic stop. *Law & Society Rev, 51*: 379–412.

    doi:10.1111/lasr.12265

May, J., Duke, R., & Gueco, S. (2013). Pretext Searches and Seizures: In Search of Solid Ground

Misselbrook, D. (2013, April). Duty, Kant, and Deontology. Retrieved from

    https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3609464/

MoonSun, K. & De Guzman, M. (2012). Police paradigm shift: The impact of the 911 attack on

    police practices among United States municipal police departments. *Criminal Justice*

    Studies: A Critical Journal of Crime, Law and Society 25(4) (2012): 232-342.

Muir, W. (n.d.). The Professional Political Model of the Good Policeman.

Nowacki, J. S. (2015). Organizational-level police discretion: An application for police use of

    lethal force. *Crime & Delinquency, 61*(5), 643-668. doi:10.1177/0011128711421857

Peak, K. (2016). *Justice administration: Police, courts, and corrections management.* New

    Jersey: Pearson Education Inc.

Pollock, J. (2014). *Ethical dilemmas and decisions in criminal justice.* California: Wadsworth

    Cengage Learning.

Miller, W. R. (Ed.) (2012). *The social history of crime and punishment in America: An*

    encyclopedia (Vols. 1-5). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications Ltd. doi:

    10.4135/9781452218427

Newman, S. H. (2006). Proving probable cause: Allocating the burden of proof in false arrest

    claims under § 1983. *The University of Chicago Law Review, 73*(1), 347-376. Retrieved

    from http://www.jstor.org/stable/4495555

Skogan, W. G., Van Craen, M. & Hennessy, C. J. (2015). *Exp Criminol 11*: 319. Retrieved from

        https://doi-org.proxy.consortiumlibrary.org/10.1007/s11292-014-9223-6

Sousa, W., Ready, J. & Ault, M. J. (2010). *Exp Criminol 6*: 35. Retrieved from

        https://doi-org.proxy.consortiumlibrary.org/10.1007/s11292-010-9089-1

San José State University Department of Economics. (n.d.). Illustration of the Coase Theorem.

        Retrieved from http://www.sjsu.edu/faculty/watkins/coasetheorem.htm

U.S. Department of Justice. (2016, August 10). *Investigation of the Baltimore City Police*

        Department. Retrieved from https://www.justice.gov/opa/file/883366/download

U.S. Department of Justice. (2015, March 4). *Investigation of the Ferguson Police Department.*

        Retrieved from

        https://www.justice.gov/sites/default/files/crt/legacy/2015/03/04/ferguson_findings_3-41

        5.pdf

Villanueva, J. (2016). *Identifying inconsistencies in program administration when developing*

        community policing programs. (Order No. 10125290). ProQuest Dissertations & Theses

        Global. (1807961927). Retrieved from

        http://search.proquest.com.proxy.consortiumlibrary.org/docview/1807961927?accountid

        =14473

Wyrick, P. T. (2013). *Police militarization: Attitudes towards the militarization of the American*

        police (Order No. 1522889). ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global.

        (1368132587). Retrieved from

        http://search.proquest.com.proxy.consortiumlibrary.org/docview/1368132587?accountid

        =14473

Yanez, L. (2004). *Police officer burnout: An examination of officer stress, the policing*

subculture and the advantages of family counseling (Order No. 1424464). ProQuest

Dissertations & Theses Global. (305137156). Retrieved from

http://search.proquest.com.proxy.consortiumlibrary.org/docview/305137156?accountid=

14473