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ADVERTISING UNDERLYING ASSUMPTIONS: A QUANTITATIVE CONTENT ANALYSIS OF MILITARIZED AND COMMUNITY-ORIENTED ARTIFACTS IN POLICE RECRUITMENT VIDEOS

Abstract

by Wendy M. Koslicki, Ph.D.
Washington State University
May 2018

Chair: David A. Makin

Recent scholarly and media attention claims the United States policing institution is growing more militarized in behavior and values. With this renewal of attention towards police militarization, common recommendations have been for police departments to adopt community-oriented policing values and strategies as a way to decrease militarization. However, this assumption has not been empirically tested, and the concepts of police militarization and community policing are vague, lack scholarly consensus regarding definitions and operationalization, and – consequently – are difficult to empirically assess.

The current study establishes a novel method through which to empirically study police militarization and community policing, specifically through a theory-driven quantitative content analysis of police recruitment videos. Recruiting literature demonstrates that recruitment videos act as advertisements for organizations, advertising the organization’s self-depiction and depiction of the occupation. The present study examines these depictions and their variation by analyzing the artifacts in law enforcement agencies’ recruiting advertisements.
The first stage of the current study describes the collection of themes and artifacts from a sample of the 200 largest municipal and county law enforcement agencies’ recruitment videos. Data from the quantitative content analysis of these videos’ themes demonstrate that militarized and community-oriented themes and artifacts are observable in recruitment videos, and principal components analysis results demonstrate that these themes load into separate “militarized” and “community-oriented” factors.

The second stage of the study uses the scores and scales developed from the principal components analyses as outcome variables to assess the effect of theorized predictors of militarization and community policing as predictors of video themes. Ordinal logistic regression models find a positive relationship between drug crime rates and videos with high militarization scores, and negative relationships between violent crime rates, Community Oriented Policing Services (COPS) grants, and agencies that incorporate collaborative problem solving into officers’ evaluation criteria, and videos with high militarization scores. No significant relationships were found between predictors and videos with high community-oriented scores. The study concludes with a discussion of the findings, as well as many avenues of future research utilizing content analysis of law enforcement recruitment videos.
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CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION

Recent attention has been directed towards the claim that United States police have been growing more militarized in equipment, appearance, ideology, and practice. Though scholars at the University of California at Berkeley’s Center for Research in Criminal Justice (1977) called attention to this apparent trend in 1970s, the issue was largely under-researched and unpublicized until Peter Kraska and his colleagues began to research and call attention to this trend in the 1990s (Kraska & Cubellis, 1997; Kraska & Kappeler, 1997; Kraska & Paulsen, 1997). With the publication of Balko’s (2013) *Rise of the Warrior Cop* in a decade of highly publicized police misuses of force and increasing public capability to film and disseminate these instances through social media, there has been rising public attention to police militarization as well. Events such as the highly paramilitary reaction of riot police in Ferguson, Missouri in 2014 have fueled public, political, and media concern regarding this trend (ACLU, 2014; Endebak, 2014; Wofford, 2015), and has sparked a renewed academic focus and debate regarding the state of the field (Bieler, 2016; Coyne & Hall-Blanco, 2016; den Heyer, 2014; D’Esposito, 2016; Johnson & Hansen, 2016; McMichael, 2017; Rivera, 2015; Withers, 2016; Wood, 2015).

**Statement of the Problem**

While there is a renewed focus on police militarization due to these events, many scholars tend to rely on Kraska’s work to support theories on police militarism instead of undertaking new empirical studies (Bieler, 2016; Koslicki, 2017). Likewise, empirical studies on militarization, when undertaken, widely vary in the way the concept of police militarization is
operationalized and measured (Bieler, 2016), leading to confusion regarding the current state of this phenomenon in the United States. In spite of this lack of consensus regarding definitions, measurement, and the current state of militarization, studies still debate whether police militarization is even an unfavorable phenomenon (den Heyer, 2014; Rivera, 2015; Wood, 2015) or, conversely, make claims of pervasive militarization across the entire United States policing institution and warn of its adverse and inevitable outcomes (Boettke, Lemke, Palagashvili, 2015; Campbell & Campbell, 2010; D’Esposito, 2016; Endebak, 2014; Hall & Coyne, 2013; Withers, 2016). Due to this lack of consensus on how to define, measure, and empirically analyze police militarization, reliable conclusions cannot currently be made about this trend. This lack of reliable conclusions leads to a lack of clear, practical implications and ways to address police militarization, given that so little is empirically known regarding this particular form of police culture.

Furthermore, a popular strategy to buffer the seeming rise of police militarization has been to push for United States law enforcement agencies to adopt more community-oriented policing strategies (D’Esposito, 2016; Institute for Intergovernmental Research, 2015; President’s Taskforce on 21st Century Policing, 2015). Community policing is therefore often assumed to be the conceptual opposite of police militarization, though community policing – like the concept of police militarization – is a vague concept that is difficult to define, measure, and implement consistently (Cordner, 1995; Makin & Marenin, 2017; Seagrave, 1996; Zhao, Lovrich, & Robinson, 2001). Moreover, critical scholars have critiqued community policing as being a propaganda technique for legitimizing police repression and concealing aggressive and militarized police tactics (Center for Research on Criminal Justice, 1977; Kappeler & Kraska, 1998; Kraska & Paulsen, 1997; McMichael, 2017; Williams, 2011). Little empirical research has
been done to test this macro-level critical theory (Bieler, 2016), nor has much empirical research been done to test the common assumption that community policing is a conceptually opposite police militarization or a panacea for its rise.

**Purpose of the Study**

Due to the polarized claims of militarization scholars and the dearth of current empirical research – as well as the adverse consequences to public safety and civil liberties if claims of pervasive and unchecked police militarization are valid – the current study encompasses two primary goals. The primary goal of the current study seeks to establish a novel, empirical method through which to assess themes of police militarization; specifically, through the use of police department recruitment videos to assess police department cultural themes and activities. Second, this study seeks to determine whether common predictors of police militarization (and most claim to be its conceptual opposite, community policing) also predict changes in police recruitment video themes. Though police recruitment videos are a unique and heretofore unused method through which to assess police culture, the present exploratory study seeks to examine how and to what extent recruitment videos reflect militarized and community-oriented themes and artifacts. Should the present study detect militarization in police recruitment videos and a relationship between common predictors of organizational cultures and the themes seen in these videos (and, alternatively, a relationship between potential predictors of community policing and community-oriented policing themes), this study will provide the field with a novel methodology through which to assess police ideologies and behaviors, as well as changes in militarization and community-oriented policing trends over time with replication of this method.
The current study approaches police militarization as a phenomenon driven by a particular cultural orientation, as Kraska (2001; 2007) has established that militarism is essentially a set of deeply ingrained beliefs, values, and assumptions that value aggression, coercion, hypermasculinity, and martial metaphors. Militarization is the outcome (in appearance, activity, and operation) of this cultural set of ideals (Kraska, 2007). Though a number of notable scholars in the field see this culture as one that is largely shared among the United States police occupation (with variance only in terms line officers versus supervisory roles) (Brough, Chataway, & Biggs, 2016; Crank, 2004; Manning, 1977; Miller, 1999; Reuss-Ianni, 1983) – at least to varying degrees (Kappeler & Kraska, 2015; Kraska, 2007) – the current study approaches the concept of culture with the assumption that there is variance in police cultures at the organizational level (Alpert, Rojek, & Porter, 2012; Chan, 1997; Cordner, 2017; Paoline, 2004; Paoline, 2003), with United States law enforcement agencies varying in the degree to which they embrace militarized and community-oriented ideologies and strategies.

Police department recruitment videos represent a potential data source through which to examine a department’s values and cultural themes. Recruitment literature has demonstrated that recruitment media often act as advertisements of the aspects of the occupation that are valued as the most important or desirable (Avery & McKay, 2006; Herriot, 2004; O’Reilly, Chatman, & Caldwell, 1991; Schneider, 1987; Walker, Field, Giles, Armenakis, & Bernerth, 2009; Walker & Hinojosa, 2014). This study therefore assumes that police recruitment videos can be seen as instruments through which to assess the department’s self-portrayal and potentially its values, as what is deemed as attractive by each department may largely depend on the department’s cultural values, assumptions, ideologies and resulting behavior (which may then influence advertising). Given that Chan, Devery, and Doran (2003) find that there is cultural variance across police
departments, it can be argued that recruitment messages from the sampled police departments will vary as well, with some focusing on more hypermasculine portrayals and the crime-control aspects of the career, others portraying more service and community-oriented themes, and others portraying a mix or balance of both (or even an entirely different and presently unstudied set of beliefs and values). As this study is exploratory, it is yet unknown as to whether police departments (particularly those that have created and use more than one video) consistently portray the same themes, and whether potential predictors of militarization and community policing – as suggested by the literature in the following chapter – have a relationship with the themes displayed in agencies’ recruitment videos.

Research Questions and Summary of Methods

Working off this concept of cultural variation across police departments in the United States, and the potential for these themes to be observed through recruitment videos, the current study has two primary, exploratory research questions:

1. **To what extent do police department recruitment portray militaristic and community-oriented themes and artifacts?**

2. **What organizational and contextual factors predict the themes found in police department recruitment videos?**

These two primary research questions will be assessed in two stages of the current study.

**Stage I – Assessing the extent to which police recruitment videos portray militaristic and community-oriented themes and artifacts.** The initial stage of the current study will explore police department’s themes, artifacts, and self-portrayals through a quantitative content analysis of police recruitment videos. This quantitative content analysis is firmly rooted in
militarization and community policing literature to assess objective measures of each cultural orientation. A pilot sample of police recruitment videos was also collected and assessed to help inform the content analysis codebook. By conducting this quantitative content analysis on the current study’s sample of police recruitment videos, Stage I will assess how the themes found within the sampled police recruitment videos load on components using principle components analysis. The analytical plan in Stage I will produce scales of militarization and community-oriented policing through which to identify the videos’ scores, and to generate outcome measures for the second stage of the study.

Stage II – Assessing predictors of department recruitment video themes. A number of predictors of police militarization and of community-oriented policing have been discussed in the literature (these predictors and the reasoning behind their selection will be fully explained in Chapters Two and Three). Stage II will use the outcome measures generated in Stage I to assess the relationships between these predictors and departments’ videos’ scores on militaristic and community-oriented scales.

Organization of the Study

Given the variety of scholarly views on police culture, police militarization, and community policing, Chapter Two will review the relevant literature to establish the approach and direction of the current study. Chapter Three will review the methods that will be used for the two primary stages, as well as details regarding the sample size and data sources. Findings of Stage I, the content analysis of police recruitment videos, and the findings of Stage II, the quantitative analysis of predictors of police cultures, will be presented in Chapter Four. These
findings, their potential interpretations, limitations and avenues for future research, and final conclusions will be discussed in Chapter Five.
CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Given the lack of empirical research on police militarization – as well as the vague definitions of community policing and mixed findings on the efficacy of this approach – the present study will first examine the existing literature on police militarization (specifically that in the United States), how existing studies were conducted, and the present difficulties in assessing police militarization (particularly in light of its potential relationship with community policing strategies). The following sections will then clarify the necessity of a richer understanding of police cultural variance and provide a discussion on the current methods through which militarization and community policing are observed and measured. Literature justifying the use of recruitment videos as a lens through which to view department values and self-portrayals will also be addressed. The final section of this chapter will introduce the body of research that lends a foundation to the predictors that will be assessed in the second stage of the present study.

Police Militarization Research in the United States

Police militarization was first brought to light in the United States in the 1970s, when criminal justice faculty at the University of California at Berkeley published a collection of media articles and photographs with the accompanying argument that police are adopting community policing as a “velvet glove” strategy with which to hide the “iron fist” of militarized police repression (Center for Research in Criminal Justice, 1977). Police militarization was not widely explored, however, until Kraska and Kappeler (1997) conducted a survey of a sample of large (more than 100 officers) police departments across the United States to determine if these
departments had paramilitary policing units (PPUs) (special response teams such as Special Weapons and Tactics, or SWAT, teams), the years these teams were formed, and whether departments used these teams for operations such as proactive patrol and drug warrant work. Kraska and Cubellis (1997) replicated this study in a sample of smaller police agencies to determine if results were similar across department types. Both studies found that PPUs increased substantially between the mid-1980s to mid-1990s, with 59% of the larger surveyed departments having a PPU in 1982, to 89% having a SWAT team by 1995 (Kraska & Kappeler, 1997). Kraska and Cubellis (1997) found similar trends, with 25.6% of the smaller surveyed departments having PPUs in 1984, which increased to 52.1% of departments having PPUs by 1990. Both studies showed increases in the use of PPUs for proactive patrol and warrant work as well.

These two studies and their resulting statistics have been primarily cited by militarization scholars for the last two decades. Kraska and colleagues have since contributed a wealth of theoretical knowledge regarding police militarization to the field (DeMichele & Kraska, 2001; Kappeler & Kraska, 2015; Kraska, 2001, 2007) and have inspired other militarization scholars to build upon theoretical explanations for police militarization (Campbell & Campbell, 2010; D’Esposito, 2016; Doherty, 2016; Hall & Coyne, 2013; Hill & Beger, 2009; Weber, 1999). However, there exist few empirical studies regarding militarization beyond Kraska and colleagues’ studies from the 1990s, and the claims that militarization is growing and normalizing in the United States are difficult to empirically test, as there is no established definition or methodology through which to measure police militarization (Bieler, 2016). Critics of Kraska and colleagues likewise suffer from having little basis on which to make counterclaims, with den Heyer (2014) falling into what Kappeler and Kraska (2015) believe to be a false dichotomy of
seeing the police as either militarized or not (Kappeler and Kraska [2015] believe that the police have always been militarized to some degree). Additionally, authors such as Wood (2015) and Rivera (2015) believe the militarization of the police to be a positive development due to these authors’ substantially different definitions of the concept of militarization. The absence of a scholarly consensus and reliable methodology through which to define and measure police militarization has made the claims of both sides of the militarization debate largely untestable, leading the concept to be severely understudied and even less understood.

**Definitions and Origins**

In spite of the lack of consensus regarding the definition and measurement of militarization, most scholars tend to adopt Kraska’s (2007) definition of police militarism as “a set of beliefs, values, and assumptions that stress the use of force and threat of violence as the most appropriate and efficacious means to solve problems. It emphasizes the exercise of military power, hardware, organization, operations, and technology as its primary problem-solving tools” (p. 503). Kraska (2001) further defines militaristic police cultures as those that have a “deeply imbedded ideology of violence and its accomplice, hypermasculinity” (p. 142).

Kraska (2007) asserts that the police have always been militarized to some degree, due to the fact that both the military and the police have a shared mandate to use legitimate (that is to say, state-sanctioned) force to achieve these institutions’ respective ends (international and domestic security, respectively). Kraska and Kappeler (1997) discuss the United States policing institution as having paramilitary roots originating from its development from militia groups, and other scholars have likewise discussed the development of slave patrol groups in the early South as forerunners to United States law enforcement in that region (Hadden, 2003; Reichel, 1988;
While critical scholars tend to understand the United States policing institution as being inherently militaristic due to these historical roots, a second usage of the concept of *militarization* in the literature tends to refer to a historical phenomenon that developed in the 1960s or mid-Cold War era, alongside its seeming conceptual opposite, community policing (Center for Research on Criminal Justice, 1977; DeMichele & Kraska, 2001; Hill & Beger, 2009; Kappeler & Kraska, 1998; Williams, 2011). This is not to say that these are competing definitions (indeed, scholars such as Kraska and Williams employ both usages of the concept); however, it is necessary to understand both usages of *militarization* in order to discuss the complexities surrounding the police militarization and its study.

There is some debate as to the origins of the rise of militarization as a historical phenomenon in the mid-Cold War era. Scholars such as DeMichele and Kraska (2001) and a number of other critical policing scholars have argued that community policing and militarization are actually cohesive strategies, with community policing as the “velvet glove” that surrounds the “iron fist” of police militarization, thus delivering police repression wrapped in palatable rhetoric to gain unwitting public acceptance (Balko, 2013; Kraska & Paulsen, 1997; Center for Research on Criminal Justice, 1977). DeMichele and Kraska (2001) assert that police militarization is a misguided result of the institution’s need to re-establish its prominence and legitimacy in the face of cultural and political forces calling for an untraditional community model. According to the Center for Research on Criminal Justice (1977), law enforcement agencies in the United States saw the riots and crises of the 1960s as stemming mainly from technology and organization failures (rather than the structural purpose and goals of the police institution), leading to an increased focus on technology, research, and applications of military technologies and strategies to policing strategies. With the heavy public and academic criticism
of the police in the late 1960s and pressure to gain community legitimacy, the police institution began to adopt community policing strategies (Center for Research on Criminal Justice, 1977). However, according to the scholars at the Center for Research on Criminal Justice (1977), these community policing strategies seek to decentralize the police function (through community policing strategies such as community involvement and partnerships) while resisting decentralization of police authority. Kappeler and Kraska (1998) advance this argument, specifically stating how the community policing image has assisted in reshaping the police institution’s image:

_The police are becoming the image of responders to community needs, concerns, and desires – a potent role which provides them with tremendous political clout both locally and nationally. They are managing to reconstitute their image away from the citizen-controller paradigm based in the autonomous legal order and toward a more comforting Norman Rockwell image – police as kind, community caretakers. As the language and imagery of community policing has begun to circulate free of its governmental referent and has embraced corporate scientific rhetoric, previous images like those found in the civil rights movement, the Watts riots, and the 1968 democratic convention are beginning to fade...By staging its own death, the strong arm of the government is emerging rapidly in these times of high-modernity as our helping hand, promising us salvation from the irrationality of crime in an increasingly rationalized society_ (p. 306, 308).

Others point to external factors or developments that have occurred to increase militarization in isolation from community policing. Some posit that increasing globalization has introduced new forms of transnational crime (such as drug trafficking), leading to a new moral threat, with militarization as the outcome of the state’s need to regain control (Andreas & Price,
Increased technology transfers from the military, collaboration with the military and training from the military, and government funding in response to the “war on drugs” (a title which, in itself, demonstrates a clear military metaphor) are all observed as salient factors in the rise of militarization as a historical phenomenon (Balko, 2013; Campbell & Campbell, 2010; Endebak, 2014; Haggerty & Ericson, 1999; Hall & Coyne, 2013). Some observe that the “war on terrorism” will likely increase this trend (Caldero & Crank, 2010; Maguire & King, 2004).

The Current Study

It must be noted here that the scholars who ascribe to the “velvet glove/iron fist” argument do not disagree that the “war on drugs” increased the growth of militarization; the difference is in their argument that the underlying structure of policing has been, and will continue to be, oriented towards crime control and state-sanctioned violence. What varies, and what historical factors such as the “war on drugs” have influence on increasing, is the degree to which United States policing is militarized (Kraska, 2007) (Kraska’s [2007] indicators of police militarization will be discussed at length in the following sections). The current study considers the concept of degrees of militarization and applies this to individual police departments, instead of the United States police institution as a whole. While the United States police institution may indeed be influenced by its historical roots of paramilitary state control, the present study approaches law enforcement at an organizational level, recognizing that – while underlying, shared societal culture influences every organization (and indeed, individual) within that society – individual organizations experience sets of cultural influences that are unique to their history, location, and backgrounds. The present study likewise recognizes that, though militarization may
be a cohesive strategy with community policing (little empirical research has been done on this phenomenon since Kraska and Paulsen conducted a mixed-method study on a Southeastern law enforcement agency in 1997), the common indicators for the two concepts or cultural orientations, which will be discussed further in this chapter, are often contrasted with one another in the literature. Measuring these themes as separate theoretical concepts will assist in observing whether they correlate, and whether commonly theorized predictors for one concept also predict the other.

**Police Department Culture**

While the police institution shares a common core, as well as similar values and symbolism across individual law enforcement agencies (Crank, 2004; Manning, 2008), research has also established that there much variance at the organizational level (that is, across individual police departments) (Chan, Devery, & Doran, 2003; Cockroft, 2013; Cordner, 2017; Paoline, 2003). The differences and similarities across organizations within the policing institution do not arise in a vacuum, however, and are influenced by broader social structure. The following section discusses the influence of social structure and concludes that organizations, though sharing many similarities, will also share enough experiential differences to vary in their values and resulting self-portrayals.

**Social Structure**

As discussed previously, there have been distinct socio-historical influences in the formation of the United States policing institution and how it has been shaped over time. Indeed, according to Bourdieu (as interpreted and critiqued by Chan, 2004), significant experiences can
affect the institution’s *habitus* – the interpretation of past events and their application to an unforeseen future – which can in turn affect the *doxa* – or, what that department holds as a “truth” or self-evident fact of policing. In this way, a significant threat can considerably alter an institution’s behavior and culture by altering how it interprets events and responds based on created *doxa*.

This process of preserving a negative trait beyond the time of its need is identified through the journalist Balko’s (2013) observation of the history of SWAT teams and other paramilitary policing policies. According to Balko (2013), the Watts Riots of 1965 and Charles Whitman’s spree shooting of 1966 drove police departments – then unprepared and ill-equipped to deal with such traumatic scenarios – to develop the paramilitary concept of Special Weapons and Tactics (SWAT) units. Indeed, Balko (2013) observes that “when the riots, strife, and unrest finally died down, when the threat of chaos and lawlessness eventually grew remote, the weapons, heavy-duty vehicles, and militaristic culture stuck around” (p. 64). This seems to illustrate how a policy and ideology adopted by certain police departments to adapt to imminent threats may be preserved when the threat has since passed.

Critical scholars, such as those at the Center for Research on Criminal Justice (1977), Williams (2015), and McMichael (2017), see the state (and by extension, police power, as the police institution is sanctioned by the state to use legitimate domestic force) as invested in preserving preexisting race and class structures. These authors posit that the state identifies those that may pose a threat to those in power and defines these as the “dangerous classes” (a category that involves both race and class) (McMichael, 2017; Williams, 2015). While those who fall into the “dangerous classes” vary historically (indeed, Miller [1977] observes that these were mainly Irish and other Caucasian immigrants in the mid-to-late 19th Century, though McMichael [2017]
observes that those of African descent and Native Americans have been categorized as such by the state since the nation’s founding), McMichael (2017) argues that the police institution has existed to ensure that the dominant class structure and economic interests are preserved. McMichael (2017) sees militarization as an observable manifestation of what has always been a social war between the state and threats to the state. Applying Chan’s (2004) interpretation of Bourdieu to this school of thought would result in a habitus of the policing institution that has always been militarized, with state-sanctioned legitimacy to employ amounts of force necessary to repress the “dangerous classes.” This gives rise to doxa that justify the use of violence, such as the deeply-held belief in the police institution that policing is both dangerous and patriotic; McMichael (2017) asserts that this general “truth” about policing is a way in which the police institution justifies its strategies and reason for existence.

Those that do not take a critical approach to policing research and police militarization still recognize that broader social and cultural phenomenon still influence the policing institution and the individuals that comprise it. Manning (2010), for example, views the police institution as being more autonomous and less affected by political forces, though he points to the public as the definers and givers of legitimacy to the police (Manning, 1977). Manning (2008) still observes the influence of the United States’ rational-legal and patrimonial legal structure on the police institution’s development of a legal-compliance organizational structure and core of sacred duty, honor, loyalty, morality, and symbolism. This core gives rise to shared doxa, such as the belief that policing is misunderstood (though Manning also observes some contradicting doxa, such as the belief that police must be visible, but also secretive, and that policing must be equal in a diverse society). While the police seem to be more isolated from political influences in Manning’s view, the institution is also dramaturgical, leading officers and police organizations to
act in visible ways that they believe are best suited to gain public and social acceptance and legitimacy (Manning, 2010).

Taking societal and cultural influence more broadly, there has been some discussion on the influences of popular media on the public’s glorification of the militaristic ideal (Balko, 2013; Kraska, 2001; Gibson, 1994). Gibson (1994) in particular points to the Vietnam War as a time where the public began to lose trust in the government, and popular media images emerged of lone warrior-heroes in the 1980s and 1990s (a decade in which, incidentally, the “war on drugs” was at its peak). Balko (2013) additionally observes a surge of militarized police shows on television in the 1990s and 2000s, stating that “by emphasizing the more aggressive, confrontational aspect of police work over community service – hurting people instead of helping people – they [television shows] may be shifting the profile of the typical young person attracted to police work” (p. 306). Individuals, shaped by societal and cultural messages, in turn comprise the policing institution, which is shaped by broader sociopolitical structures.

**Variance at the Organizational Level**

Regardless of theory, however, scholars have observed that not all American police departments seem to have developed a dramatically (or immediately identifiable) militaristic culture (Alpert, Rojek, & Porter, 2012; Chan, Devery, & Doran, 2003; Cockroft, 2013; Cordner, 2017; Paoline, 2003). Though literature has recently been exploring police organizational culture beyond broader occupational culture, Wilson (1968) observed some variation in the 1960s, identifying three main department styles (the watchman, legalist, and service styles) that typified the departments serving eight different communities across the United States. Paoline (2003) addresses Wilson’s (1968) findings in his discussion of a need for a more sophisticated
understanding of police culture, leading Paoline (2003) to conclude that scholars of police culture must consider both occupational culture (the shared values of the policing institution due to the commonalities of the occupation) and variance in organizational cultures across law enforcement agencies.

Adopting Schein’s (1990) approach to organizational culture, an organization’s culture is a complex formation based off of underlying *assumptions* that are developed over time during the organization’s inception and adaptation (Schein, 1990). The organization’s *values* (or, ideologies) emerge from these basic underlying assumptions, with *artifacts* being the observable manifestations of these values (Schein, 1990). In a police department, therefore, varying values (whether militaristic or community-focused) can be observed through an assessment of the department’s artifacts (which could be militaristic equipment, observable attitudes towards the public, mission statements, and other observable, quantifiable factors). Put another way, an organization’s culture embodies the dominant values and beliefs shared by members of the organization (and often defined by organizational leadership [Schein, 1985]), which can be observed through the behaviors, operations, and practices of members of the organization (Cockroft, 2013; Johnson, Koh, & Killough, 2009).

Therefore, it can be argued that through a complex interplay of outside influences, individual police organizations (departments or agencies) can develop differing *assumptions* during their growth and adaptation processes, giving rise to varying *values* and the observable *artifacts* or self-portrayals, behaviors, and other visible markers of values that are unique to the organization. Indeed, Paoline (2003) assumes that the push for community policing philosophies will change organizations’ adaptations to the recruitment process and patrol strategies. This new adaptation may give way to a development of new values in police organizations (Paoline, 2003).
Indeed, Paoline and colleagues (2000) found evidence of community policing initiatives changing the attitudes and observable behaviors among officers in a department that implemented community policing (Paoline, Meyers, & Worden, 2000). However, other research has shown that the majority of a national sample of police agencies claiming to be community-oriented were largely unaltered by community-oriented policing strategies in function and operation (Zhao, Lovrich, & Robinson, 2001). On the more polarized end of department types, more “militarized” police departments have been described as engaging in highly aggressive policing tactics such as no-knock narcotics raids (Balko, 2013; Kraska & Kappeler, 1997), the aggressive targeting of minority communities during the “war on drugs” (Balko, 2013; Paul & Birzer, 2004), the promotion of hostility and aggressive reactions from the public (Johnson, 2005; Paul & Birzer, 2004), and highly strained police-public relations following events such as those at Ferguson, Missouri in 2014 (Doherty, 2016; Endebak, 2014). Though the United States policing institution may share many similarities in occupational culture (and may even share a militarized *habitus* according to the critical perspective), it is therefore prudent to take this variance in *values* and observable *artifacts* across law enforcements agencies into account when researching police organizational culture. With recent calls for police reform and the adoption of community-oriented policing as a way to ameliorate the feared rise in police militarization (D’Esposito, 2016; Institute for Intergovernmental Research, 2015; President’s Taskforce on 21st Century Policing, 2015), it is particularly important to address both of these potential organizational cultural types.
Measuring Militarization and Community Policing

As can be seen by the existing research and varied definitions and origins proposed for the concept of police militarization, the empirical study of police militarism is difficult and often unclear. Broader, macro-level theories on the origins of police militarism and its potential relationship with community policing have proven difficult to empirically assess (Bieler, 2016), and community policing itself is likewise a vague concept that varies in definition, operationalization, and implementation (Cordner, 1995; Makin & Marenin, 2017; Seagrave, 1996; Zhao, Lovrich, & Robinson, 2001). Two frameworks exist, however, that assist in guiding a theoretical examination and measurement of the two concepts and can assist in identifying clear artifacts stemming from these two potential organizational types.

Measures of Militarization

As previously discussed, Kraska (2007) discusses police militarization as being present in the core of the United States policing institution, though varying in degree of severity. Kraska (2007) has likewise created a four-dimension framework through which to assess police militarization, though there are presently no studies that utilize all four dimensions of Kraska’s framework (Bieler, 2016). As Kraska (2007) has an established history of spearheading police militarization research in the United States, and has likewise published several books on research methodology, his framework of conceptualizing militarization is therefore seen as the most appropriate, given the scholar’s familiarity with both the fields of militarization and research methods. Figure 2.1 demonstrates this framework below, as presented in Kraska and Neuman (2012).
Figure 2.1. Kraska’s four-dimension framework for assessing levels of militarization, as presented in Kraska & Neuman (2012), Criminal Justice and Criminology Research Methods, 2nd Ed., p. 109.

Material indicators. The first of Kraska’s (2007) dimensions through which to measure militarization is the material dimension, or, to use the language of Schein’s (1990) taxonomy as described above, these are the observable artifacts that originate from an organization’s assumptions and values. While these artifacts are the most easily observed (and therefore easily quantified), the existence of these artifacts alone does not prove a militarized culture, as a
researcher must observe how these artifacts are used, and how these artifacts came to be adopted by the police department (Bieler, 2016). However, many militarization scholars tend to focus only on material indicators to make conclusions that the nation’s police are choosing to perpetuate and preserve a militaristic culture of control and hypermasculinity, without empirically examining how these artifacts are actually used by the department (Bieler, 2016). These scholars tend to argue that police departments nationwide have chosen to take on the characteristics of an army, receive federal assistance to do so (particularly through grants such as the Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grant [JAG] program and the Department of Defense’s military equipment transfer program known as the 1033 Program), and have done so at an increasing rate since the 1960s (Balko, 2013; Brandl, 2003; D’Esposito, 2016; Endebak, 2014; Haggerty & Erikson, 1999; Hall & Coyne, 2013; Hill & Beger, 2009). However, the mere use of these programs – in spite of the immediately observable military appearance of some of the equipment obtained through them – cannot be used as the sole indicator of police militarization without assessing Kraska’s (2007) other dimensions.

**Cultural indicators.** As the mere existence of these federal grants and equipment transfers cannot be used as empirical support for the argument that United States law enforcement is choosing to militarize itself for the mere sake of militarization, it is here where many militarization scholars who only assess the material dimension of militarization fall short. Police organizations do not develop or perpetuate assumptions, values, and artifacts without the influence of external factors (Schein, 1990), or underlying social structures. For example, behaviors adapted as a response to external threats can remain as a survival mechanism or accepted way of doing things, leading to the preservation and perpetuation of certain behaviors – or rituals – that can then affect ideologies, values, and their resulting artifacts (Schein, 1985;
Manning, 1977). The acquisition of military equipment through various available programs and policies can be an example of this behavior in certain departments, but one must examine the contributing cultural factors.

According to Chan’s (2004) application of Bourdieu to policing, police culture is a highly responsive organism: significant changes in the field can shift *habitus*, which informs new coping strategies. Because the nature of policing requires officers to rapidly categorize environments and decide upon appropriate actions (what Bourdieu calls *dictionary knowledge*), the *doxa* formed from the evolved *habitus* act as rules or guidelines to streamline decision-making regarding appropriate behavior (Chan, 2004). This can be applied to both a critical and non-critical perspective. While the critical perspective assumes that the *habitus* of policing has always been militarized, new threats to the sociopolitical power structure (such as the Watts Riots and Civil Rights Movement) can increase the degree to which the *habitus* and resulting *doxa* are militarized. To a non-critical perspective, events such as the Watts Riots in the 1960s can dramatically shift the *habitus* from a professional policing model to one which interprets the environment as dangerous or threatening; the resulting *doxa* will center around crime control, exclusivity (an “us versus them” mentality often addressed by police militarism scholars [Benson, 2001]), and physical capital (an officer’s degree of “worth” in features such as physical strength, endurance, and toughness) (Chan, 2004). In both perspectives, police departments may pursue grants and programs that provide better equipment, as they either perceive this as necessary to further their repressive mandate or consider this necessary in assisting in their survival.

It is therefore relevant to include cultural indicators in any empirical examination of police militarization. Kraska (2007) addresses some of these cultural indicators as being the
extent of martial language (such as metaphors for war and an “us versus them” mentality) and the extent of martial beliefs and values (such as the aforementioned values of authority, problem solving through aggression, and hypermasculinity). Though there is little consensus among militarization scholars as to the exact cultural variables that should be examined to indicate police militarism (Bieler, 2016) – with some scholars even arguing that military values are beneficial to police due to their emphasis on discipline and strategy (Rivera, 2015; Wood, 2015) – the current study approaches the cultural dimension with an understanding that most militarization scholars agree that police militarism embodies exclusivity, an emphasis on danger, the use of martial metaphors, and hypermasculinity (Balko, 2013; Benson, 2001; Caulfield, 2001; Chappell & Lanza-Kaduce, 2010; Crank, 2004; Martin, 1988; Miller, 1999; Kappeler, Sluder, & Alpert, 1994; Kraska & Cubellis, 1997; Kraska & Kappeler, 1997; Kraska & Paulsen, 1997; Rabe-Hemp, 2008).

**Organizational and operational indicators.** Kraska’s (2007) organizational indicators are the extent military or paramilitary organizational structures and arrangements, such as the use of COMPSTAT or special task forces such as Special Weapons and Tactics (SWAT) teams. According to Bieler (2016), the existence of these arrangements alone cannot be used to determine the normalization of militarization until it is established that these forces are being used in operations or activities that are deemed “militaristic” (though there is little consensus on what this entails). Kraska and colleagues have connected SWAT teams with an increase in narcotics warrant activities to assist in making conclusions regarding SWAT teams and their actual usage (Kraska & Cubellis, 1997; Kraska & Kappeler, 1997), though a replication by Koslicki (2017) using a separate data source demonstrated that a large percentage of increased narcotics warrant activity originated from nine law enforcement agencies out of a national
sample of 341. Bieler (2016) has also suggested examining changes in a department’s use of force rates as a potential indicator for militaristic behavior stemming from the use of SWAT teams.

**Measures of Community Policing**

As was observed by DeMichele and Kraska (2001), the community-oriented policing model emerged simultaneously alongside its conceptual opposite, militarism. Though scholars largely agree that community policing is an ambiguous concept, numerous community policing scholars have agreed upon the main principles of community policing, which are decentralization, a service orientation, community partnerships and cooperation, and proactive policing (Friedmann, 1992; Oliver & Bartgis, 1998; Seagrave, 1996; Somerville, 2009; Trojanowicz & Bucqueroux, 1990). Others have criticized community policing as being merely image management, “rhetoric without reality” or “old wine in new bottles” (Barlow & Barlow, 1999; Bayley, 1988; Hunter & Barker, 1993; Kappeler & Kraska, 1998; Klockars, 1988; Lyons, 1999; Manning, 1988), and research is mixed on whether the nationwide and international push to adopt community policing has actually affected police structure and functions (Makin & Marenin, 2017; Zhao et al., 2001). Though there has been difficulty in defining community policing, Cordner (1995) provides one of the clearest frameworks through which to conceptualize community policing.
Figure 2.2. Cordner’s (1995) four-dimension framework for assessing community policing, as modeled according to the table presented in Kraska & Neuman (2012), *Criminal Justice and Criminology Research Methods, 2nd Ed.*, p. 109.

The above figure demonstrates Cordner’s (1995) framework as depicted in the same way of Kraska and Neumann’s (2012) four-dimension scale. As with Kraska’s (2007) typology, Cordner illustrates dimensions that include cultural (philosophical), behavioral, and organizational factors to provide a fuller understanding of the concept, and scholars of
community policing largely agree on the majority of these dimensions (Somerville, 2009; Oliver, 1998; Seagrave, 1996; Friedmann, 1992; Greene, 2000; Normandeau & Layton, 1990; Skogan, 1990).

**The philosophical dimension.** Though community policing has been criticized for being merely a philosophy, Cordner’s (1995) philosophical indicators remains an important dimension to assess, given that many police departments may state that they participate in community policing without actually embracing the values and ideals that community policing entails (Klockars, 1988; Maguire & Katz, 2002; Manning, 1988). Given Schein’s (1990) framework as previously discussed, these underlying assumptions and values, when truly held by the organization, should lead to outcomes and artifacts associated with community policing, as Cordner (1995) covers in the other dimensions. Cordner’s (1995) philosophical dimension comprises the value system of community policing and holds to the ideals of positive public and police interactions, police investment in their communities and empowerment of community members to assist in problem solving efforts. These values and philosophies are put into practice in the strategic and tactical dimensions, with the organizational dimension being the structure that (theoretically) allows these values and actions to be put into practice.

**The strategic and tactical dimensions.** Much of the literature on community policing focuses on the significance of the development and implementation of strategies that focus on positive public interaction, problem solving, permanency of beat, and community partnerships (Somerville, 2009; Oliver, 1998; Seagrave, 1996; Friedmann, 1992; Greene, 2000; Normandeau & Layton, 1990; Skogan, 1990). Trojanowicz and Bucqueroux (1990) and Mastrofski and colleagues (1995) go further in identifying several additional principles, such as the protection of vulnerable or underrepresented groups within the community (such as minorities, the elderly, and
those in poverty), and the preference of human interpersonal skills over the use of technology. Friedmann (1992) also recognizes the significance of the human element in community-oriented policing, stating that proper implementation of the model requires officers to develop essential social skills, such as respect, genuineness, and understanding. At the program level, community policing involves specific policies that implement police and community partnerships, such as assigned foot patrols, neighborhood watch programs, police storefronts, and police-initiated community meetings (Oliver & Bartgis, 1998; Seagrave, 1996), and further community relations through the increased hiring of women and minorities (Miller, 1999; Skolnick & Bayley, 1988).

**The organizational dimension.** Many community policing scholars call for structural changes to police department organizations to better enable the successful implementation of community policing (Friedmann, 1992; Oliver & Bartgis, 1998; Sommerville, 2009; Trojanowicz & Bucqueroux, 1990). Though this is often thought of as decentralization, Cordner (1995) includes other rearrangements, such as despecialization or (somewhat to the contrary) specialized community policing teams, as well as evaluation and information systems to keep departments better accountable to their mission and enable them to approach problem solving with better information. Though police departments have remained largely the same in terms of organization since the advent of community-oriented policing (Hassell, Peyton, Zhao, & Maguire, 1999; Maguire, 1997) – thus making it difficult to research whether decentralization or flattening will actually assist in making community policing initiatives more effective (Maguire & Wells, 2002) – there is some evidence that organizational restructuring for the purposes of community policing can positively affect police officer attitudes and morale (Cordner, 1995; Wycoff & Skogan, 1993).
**Other factors.** There are other factors that may contribute to the development (or lack of development) of a true community policing style that embodies both the values and the activities of community policing. Friedmann (1992) observes that police departments often reflect the communities that they are in, along with that community’s dominant method of social control. If the majority of the community sees crime as an acceptable means of conflict resolution, that community’s police will also likely have a higher incidence of use of force (Friedmann, 1992). This is again indicative of the tendency for police organizational culture to vary and adapt, depending on immediate, external influences. Therefore, the principles and programmatic aspects of community policing will be more likely observed in communities that prefer prosocial methods of social control. Paoline (2003) adds that increased diversity in police employment and representation may assist in breaking up the more homogenous, previously-held cultural beliefs (at both the organizational and occupational levels), and Dodge and colleagues (2011) likewise have observed that what they call the “cult of masculinity” that exists in many paramilitaristic police departments will begin to disappear when more women enter all divisions of police departments and drastically shift the demographics to be more reflective of the civilian workforce.

**Recruitment Videos as Sources of Cultural Themes and Artifacts**

As the current study seeks to determine whether recruitment videos can effectively assess department cultural themes through an analysis of their artifacts, it is necessary here to examine the literature on the purpose and methods of organizational recruitment. The primary purpose of recruitment, according to Breaugh and Starke (2000), is to capture the attention of potential applicants, inform them about the career and organization, and persuade them to apply. Though
individuals have their own personal characteristics that attract them to the career in general, an organization’s recruitment methods seek to attract that individual to apply to that specific organization above other competition (Allen, Van Scotter, & Otondo, 2004; Barber, 1998; Popovitch & Wanous, 1982).

An organization’s recruitment policies attempt to achieve this purpose by tailoring their organizational image – that is, the way they assess potential applicants’ perceptions and then project themselves to come across as favorable to these potential applicants – and marketing this image through diverse methods (Ellis, Marshall, Skinner, & Smith, 2005; Barber, 1998; Tom, 1971). The organizational image is therefore an advertising strategy, whereby the organization estimates how it is perceived, how it wishes to be perceived, and then tailors its message to make itself desirable to targeted candidates. Indeed, according to Wanous (1980), the traditional method of recruiting involves the organization deciding what its most positive and attractive attributes are, and then focusing on these aspects to attract individuals who also view these attributes as attractive. Tom (1971) found that recently graduated job-seekers prefer recruiting organizations whose images reflect the job-seekers’ own self-images. The main goal of recruitment, then, is for an organization to decide which aspects of the job are most attractive and desirable, advertise these attributes, and then receive like-minded applicants who value the same aspects (Avery & McKay, 2006; Herriot, 2004; O’Reilly, Chatman, & Caldwell, 1991; Schneider, 1987; Walker, Field, Giles, Armenakis, & Bernerth, 2009; Walker & Hinojosa, 2014), thus leading to a matching between the organizations’ and applicants’ values and goals and leading to a perpetuation of the organization’s culture.

Research focusing on military recruitment following the all-volunteer force era demonstrates this variance in organizational image, with separate branches of the United States
military advertising themes and insignia that both conveys their cultural self-perception and is tailored to increase interest in like-minded recruits (Brown, 2012; Padilla & Laner, 2002). Scholars have additionally found that military recruitment strategies are responsive to general motivations of potential recruits, and that branch-specific advertising is the most successful when it appeals to potential recruits’ intrinsic motivations and values (such as the values of patriotism and a sense of national duty) (Brockett, P., Cooper, W., Kumbhakar, S., Kwinn, M. & McCarthy, D., 2004; Eighmey, 2003; Reichert, Kim, & Fosu, 2007). However, as will be examined further as a theoretical limitation of the recruitment advertising approach, some scholars of military recruitment have found that potential applicant interest may be more strongly influenced by peers and other close social ties, and not by mere exposure to recruitment advertisements (Reichert et al., 2007). Nevertheless, Brown (2012) touches on socially constructed ideologies and beliefs – specifically constructions of gender and masculinity – conveyed by different branches of the military in their recruiting advertisements to target desired recruits, indicating a consistent appeal to more macrosocial themes that may influence potential applicants in addition to microsocial ties.

Though many methods of recruitment exist, recruitment methods that keep up with technological innovation, such as internet and online video, have consistently been shown to be highly effective tools for attracting applicants to a variety of organizations (Allen et al., 2004; Fielder, 1993; Popovitch & Wanous, 1982). Walker and colleagues (2008) and Fielder (1993) have demonstrated that video advertisements, particularly the first several minutes, are highly effective in influencing the application behaviors of job applicants, with the included aesthetic factors (such as the attractiveness of individuals featured in the videos) being likewise effective in attracting job applicants with lower levels of job experience (such as college students).
Following personal communication with a recruiter, recruitment videos with audio have been found to be the most effective recruitment medium, due to their inclusion of language intonation, multiple visual and auditory cues, and information depth (Adams, Morris, & Van Scotter, 1998; Walker & Hinojosa, 2014).

Studies concerning recruitment specific to the policing career have also shown video recruiting methods to be the most effective in attracting potential applicants (Ellis et al., 2005; Kanable, 2001; The RAND Corporation, 2009; Wilson, Dalton, Scheer, & Grammich, 2010). Specifically, Wilson and colleagues (2010) found in a study of Los Angeles Police Department’s (LAPD) reality TV-style online recruitment videos that the videos were highly effective in generating interest, as well as in transmitting an organizational image of a diverse, passionate workforce that balanced crime-control and community-oriented strategies. Sycz (2014) has likewise found that police recruits and patrol officers possess nearly the same values and beliefs as outlined in their departments’ recruitment videos, further demonstrating that organizational recruitment of likeminded applicants can lead to a perpetuation of the organization’s culture.

**Theoretical Limitations**

Though it has been argued here that the police organization’s observable artifacts, as observed through recruitment videos, will assist in reflecting that department’s underlying ideologies, it must be recognized that the possibility exists to make incorrect inferences from artifacts, and not fully understand how they connect with assumptions of an organization (Wilkins, 1983). Additionally, it is assumed here that potential recruits will choose to apply to the police department that most accurately mirrors that individual’s own ideology. However, it is important to note that some recruits may have other reasons for applying to a specific police
department (such as proximity to one’s hometown), and even when hired, have the autonomy to
choose which aspects of that department’s culture, if any, to accept (Fielding, 1988). For the
purposes of this study, however, it is assumed that Barber (1998) Tom (1971), Schneider (1987)
and Sycz (2014) are accurate in asserting that most potential applicants are attracted to an
organization when that organization’s recruitment tools closely reflect those applicants’ own
personal values.

**Potential Predictors of Recruitment Video Thematic Variation**

As the second stage of the present study seeks to determine whether common predictors
of cultural variation are linked with thematic variation in police departments’ recruitment videos,
it is necessary to outline several potential predictors and the justification for each. The first of
these potential predictors are high violent crime rates and high drug crime rates. Paoline (2003)
and Wilson (1968) discuss how environment may affect a department’s adaptation, suggesting
that more service and community-oriented policing departments may be found in lower-crime
areas – where there is a low perception of danger and low perceived need to use force – while
more aggressive, legalistic departments may be found in higher-crime areas, where there is high
officer perception of danger. Applying Schein’s (1990) framework to this theory, one may
hypothesize that a department’s adaptations to high volumes of violent crime and consequent
high perception of danger may shape its *underlying assumptions*, giving rise to more aggressive,
potentially militaristic *values* and *artifacts*. For this reason, changes in violent crime rates in a
police department’s jurisdiction may lead to a shift in the values of local police departments
(whether towards a more crime-control orientation in the case of increases in violent crime, or
towards a more community-orientation in the case of decreases in violent crime and perceived
danger), with research showing that violent crime rates do have a positive relationship with use of force (Alpert & MacDonald, 2006; Hickman & Piquero, 2009). Balko (2013) has also placed particular importance on the use of paramilitary police tactics during the “war on drugs,” and Kraska and colleagues have examined police departments’ use of SWAT teams to serve drug warrants (Kraska & Cubellis, 1997; Kraska & Kappeler, 1997). Given the importance (and lingering effects) of the “war on drugs” on police operations, drug crime rates may also have a relationship with a departments’ values, behaviors, and ways it presents itself in its recruitment video.

Location of the department itself may likewise affect its cultural orientation, given that there are significant regional cultural differences across the United States, and police – often reflecting the ideals of the culture wherein they are situated to reflect legitimacy (Crank, 2004; Manning, 1977) – may vary across these regional lines. Research on community policing has likewise suggested that police departments in the South and Midwest are more likely to make general claims that they are community-oriented (Maguire & Katz, 2002; Kraska & Paulsen, 1997), though many of the specific case examples of police militarization and misuse of force provided by Balko (2013) originated from the South as well. An additional cultural predictor that has recently been suggested to affect the militarization of police department cultures has also been the targeted hiring of military veterans for patrol officer positions (Niman, 2014; Tinoco & Arnaud, 2013). As the military and police institutions, in spite of their many differences, share values of a sense of duty and loyalty, there may be increased military value transfers with recruiting practices that target and hire veterans (Tinoco & Arnaud, 2013).

Counter to hiring practices that may increase military cultural values, hiring practices that target women and minorities have been seen as conducive to fostering a community-oriented
culture (Dodge et al., 2011; Miller, 1999; Skolnick & Bayley, 1988), with women and minorities in supervisory positions being held as a particularly powerful indicator of a more diverse and community-responsive department culture (Dodge et al., 2011; Miller, 1999; Rabe-Hemp, 2008). Hickman and Piquero (2009) state that it has been a commonly held assumption that when police demographics match community demographics, community-police relations will be improved (though they do not find a relationship in their study).

On the material level, participation in programs that enable the transfer of military equipment to police departments, such as the Department of Defense’s 1033 Program, may indicate or encourage a more militarized department culture (Balko, 2013; D’Esposito, 2016; Endebak, 2014; Johnson & Hansen, 2016). Conversely, receipt of the U.S. Department of Justice’s Community Oriented Policing Services (COPS) grant program has been previously used to determine a community policing orientation (Worrall & Kovandzic, 2007; Zhao, Lovrich, & Robinson, 2001; Zhao, Schneider, & Thurman, 2002).

On the operational level, SWAT teams have been consistently suggested as indicative of the rise and normalization of militarization (Balko, 2013; Koslicki, 2017; Kraska & Kappeler, 1997; Kraska & Cubellis, 1997). It has also been previously discussed that prior militarization literature has not examined the effects of having a SWAT team to determine if there is a true militarization effect that comes from having specialized task forces such as SWAT, though Bieler (2016) suggests using changes in use of force rates as an indication for growing militarization.

Lastly, on the organizational level, Maguire (1997) has previously assessed organizational changes in United States police departments to determine whether there was a widespread movement to decentralize – as suggested by community policing scholars. Though
Maguire (1997) found organizational structure to be largely unchanged, the use of several organizational structure and complexity measures (largely borrowed from Maguire, 2003) as control variables may assist in determining whether there is a relationship between organizational structure and complexity and the themes and artifacts displayed in sampled agencies’ recruitment videos.

Using police recruitment videos and the themes and artifacts that they contain, research can assess whether these commonly discussed indicators of police militarization and community policing values and behaviors can predict video themes as well. Though recruitment videos cannot be said to directly embody the entirety of the cultures of their departments, assessing whether these aforementioned predictors have relationships with video themes can assist in furthering the field’s understanding of how and to what degree police organizations reflect these two conceptual value systems.
CHAPTER THREE
RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Overview

The purpose of this study is to assess artifacts and themes of police militarization and community policing through an analysis of police department recruitment videos, as well as the aforementioned possible predictors for any variance found in the themes of the videos. The present study therefore focuses on two research questions:

1. To what extent do police department recruitment portray militaristic and community oriented themes and artifacts?

2. What organizational and contextual factors predict the themes found in police department recruitment videos?

To address the above research questions, this study contains two main components. First, Stage I of the present study determines how department recruiting videos portray their departments and the policing career based on a quantitative content analysis of observable artifacts and themes that may represent militarism and community policing. The data generated from the quantitative content analysis is assessed through principal components analysis (PCA) to determine the component loading pattern of the themes and create composite variables for elements of militarism and community policing based on these components. Second, Stage II of the present study assesses whether several contextual and organizational variables predict these composite variables in sampled recruiting videos. This chapter describes the sample collection method, the quantitative content analysis coding scheme, a brief summary of the analytical plan for Stage I, the data collected for Stage II, and a brief summary of the analytical plan for Stage II.
Sample

The population for the present study is all local (municipal and county) police departments in the United States. The sampling frame is a purposive sample of the 200 largest local and municipal police departments of the United States, as determined through amount of sworn personnel, and gathered by the 2013 Law Enforcement Management and Administration Statistics (LEMAS) survey and cross-referenced with the most recent (as of the year 2008) ranking by the U.S. Bureau of Justice Statistics (BJS). The largest police departments were selected due to their likelihood of having the resources necessary to maintain accessible websites and online recruitment videos. Only local police departments (including county police departments, but excluding sheriff’s offices and state departments) were selected, so as to increase the sampling frame’s representation across the United States.

The unit of analysis for Stages I and II is the current recruitment video (or videos, in the case of multiple videos currently being used by a department) from each of the sampled law enforcement agencies, which are coded according to a quantitative content analysis coding scheme, as will be described in Stage I.

Video collection method. Beginning in June, 2017, an online search was conducted to find the websites and most recent contact information for recruiting personnel from each department from the sample. Recruitment videos were also obtained from those departments that had embedded their videos on their websites through Adobe Shockwave Flash, or through the online video hosting platforms YouTube or Vimeo (no other external video hosting platform was found to be used by the departments in the sample). Searches were also conducted on YouTube, Vimeo, Facebook, and Twitter to obtain recruitment videos on these social media platforms. Only the official department accounts were used to obtain videos, with exceptions made when
the videos on departments’ official websites were hosted by a YouTube or Vimeo channel that was owned by the department’s city government, owned by a video production company that was employed by the department, or owned by an individual officer who created the video on behalf of the department. These videos were verified as being official through contacting the recruiting supervisors (as explained below) or due to their being directly linked or embedded on a department’s official website. An additional exception was made for alternative websites or YouTube/Vimeo channels being directly provided by a department contact.

Recruiting contact information (or general contact information when specific recruiting contact information was unavailable) obtained from the sampled departments’ websites was used to verify whether the videos obtained were currently used or considered to be current videos, or – in the case of departments that had no videos available online – whether the departments had videos that could be shared. A second online search of all sampled departments was also conducted in the beginning of October, 2017 to capture any videos posted after the initial search. All online searches and contact with the sampled departments concluded in October, 2017.

**Video descriptives.** Table 3.1 depicts the descriptive statistics of the sampled departments, while Table 3.2 provides the descriptive statistics of the videos obtained (N = 206) from the sample.

*Table 3.1. Descriptives of Sampled Law Enforcement Agencies (N = 200)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>% / $\bar{x}$ (sd)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average Number of Videos per Department</td>
<td>1.13 (1.07)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Number of Videos per Department; Departments with No Videos Removed</td>
<td>1.63 (0.92)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Departments with No Videos Found</td>
<td>30.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As illustrated in Table 3.1, the average number of recruitment videos produced by each department was 1.13 (sd = 1.07), with 26.7% of the sample (61 departments) not having any videos at all. When removing these departments, the average number of videos per department increases slightly to 1.63. Of the 61 departments that did not have findable recruitment videos, 23% were confirmed to not have any videos at all by the department’s contacts, while 77% were unconfirmed due to department nonresponse.

A total of 227 videos were collected from the sampled departments. Of these 227, 23 were considered viral challenge videos, such as the Running Man Challenge and the Mannequin Challenge. Those viral challenge videos that did not contain a specific recruiting message at some point in the video (14 videos) were removed from the sample, as were videos that solely focused on explaining the expectations of the physical fitness exam without an additional recruitment message (6 videos). One video was also excluded from the sample due to the video file being corrupted. This resulted in a total number of 206 recruiting videos.

Table 3.2. Descriptives of Videos Obtained from Sampled LEAs (N = 206)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>% / $\bar{x}$ (sd)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year of Creation</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-2013</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>32.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confirmed current</td>
<td>62.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unconfirmed, on official dept. website</td>
<td>19.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unconfirmed, on official dept. social media page</td>
<td>12.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confirmed not current, on official dept. website</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confirmed not current, on official dept. social media page</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confirmed not current, provided by dept. contact</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Length</td>
<td>02:39 (02:48)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Of the videos themselves (N = 206), the majority (32.5%) were created in 2017, followed by 32% created in 2016. Approximately 6% did not have dates that could be identified, and dates were not provided by department contacts. The majority (62.1%) were confirmed to be currently used by their departments. Approximately 32% were unable to be confirmed by department contacts, but were either embedded on official department websites (19.4%), or were hosted by official social media platforms such as YouTube, Vimeo, Facebook, or Twitter (12.6%). Approximately 6% were confirmed by department contacts to no longer be current, but were either still found on official department websites (2.4%) or highlighted on official social media pages (2.9%). One video (.5% of the sample) was provided by the contact as a good representation of the department, though the contact confirmed that it was no longer in use. A fair amount of variation was found in the lengths of the videos, with the average length of the sampled videos being 2 minutes and 39 seconds (sd = 02:48).

**Video description.** While the sample displayed a variety of filming techniques and video presentation methods, many of the videos followed a basic format. The sampled videos generally open with a brief introduction to the department, or with an inquiry directed towards the viewer asking if the viewer would like to join a department that embodies several stated values (alternatively, the viewer is asked whether they [the viewer] embody several desired values). Throughout the duration of the video, several scenes are displayed to portray different aspects of the officer’s job and/or academy training. These scenes are usually accompanied by a video narrator, or – in the videos with no voiceover or narrator – short paragraphs or sentences of written text displayed on the screen. Many videos (full descriptives of the data obtained through the quantitative content analysis will be provided in Chapter Four) also include brief personal interviews of officers describing their experience as a police officer and their experiences
working with their departments and in their jurisdictions. Some videos highlight these interviews and the interviews continue for the duration of the video; others intersperse the interviews with the aforementioned collection of scenes. A video may then discuss benefits and financial opportunities (generally near the conclusion of the video), and concludes with a directive towards the viewer to join the police department. Most videos conclude with written contact information (such as the department or recruiting website) and a brief written or spoken statement about how to apply or how to find out more information.

Some sampled videos deviate from this typical presentation style in several ways. Several departments filmed brief “episodes” of fictional incidents or events and followed officers through these events, with an overall presentation much in the style of a reality television show. Some videos offered very brief snapshot scenes – sometimes humorous – with accompanying text that simply stated “We’re Hiring” (the majority of these videos were found on social media sites such as Facebook and were likely created to be shared as brief notifications to followers’ accounts). Some videos solely described the requirements for the department’s physical testing tests, and some were produced as responses to viral social media challenges (such as the Running Man Challenge and the Mannequin Challenge) (as previously discussed, both of these categories of video were excluded from the content analysis based on their exclusive foci and reasons for creation, with exceptions made for those videos in these categories that specifically contained a targeted recruitment message). All videos in the sample varied on their production quality, though it was not possible to determine in all cases whether the department was responsible for creating their own video, or whether an outside contractor was used in the production of some videos.
Stage I: Quantitative Content Analysis Method and Procedure

Quantitative Content Analysis

Department recruitment videos were assessed through a quantitative content analysis of all recruitment videos obtained from the sample, with the exception of the non-recruitment viral challenge videos and physical testing videos. According to Riffe, Lacy, and Fico (2005, p. 25), quantitative content analysis is

*the systematic and replicable examination of symbols of communication, which have been assigned numeric values according to valid measurement rules and the analysis of relationships involving those values using statistical methods, to describe the communication, draw inferences about its meaning, or infer from the communication to its context.*

By *systematic*, Riffe and colleagues (2005) require that a quantitative content analysis must be theory-driven, as well as replicable based on clear reporting of all coding procedures. Symbols of communication are verbal, auditory, textual, or visual cues (Riffe et al., 2005), or to use the previously discussed framework of Schein (1990), these are the *artifacts* that stem from the *values* and *assumptions* of a given organizational communication source.

The current study’s quantitative content analysis follows this definition, with the addition of Bell’s (2001, p. 15) delineation of content analysis as opposed to semiotic analysis:

*Visual content analysis usually isolates framed images (in publication) or sequences of representation (scenes or shots in television or film). But unlike semiotic analysis, content analysis classifies all the tests on specified dimensions (variables) to describe the filed or totality. It is not concerned with ‘reading’ or interpreting the texts individually.*
Rather than seeking the viewers’ interpretations of the sampled recruitment videos, the current study assesses the department’s portrayed themes through the scenes and sequences contained in the videos. Though the evolution of content analysis as a practice has come to involve the study of semiotics and viewer interpretation (see Macnamara, 2003), the present study’s focus on department self-portrayal (not the targeted viewer’s interpretations of the footage while watching the department’s video) is best suited for quantitative visual content analysis. However, the present study includes two variables of the coders’ overall sense of each sampled video’s level or tone of militarization and community-oriented policing, as an assessment of subjective video differences, in addition to the objective measures of the quantitative content analysis.

**The importance of time and duration.** Theory-driven visual quantitative content analysis can be used successfully with video footage (Krippendorff, 2004; Riffe et al., 2005), and has had established use in the criminal justice field to analyze fictional and news media portrayals of crime and law enforcement (Brouwer, Clark, Gerbner, & Krippendorff, 1969; Chermak, 1994; Graber, 1980). However, when assessing video footage using visual quantitative content analysis, an analysis of themes and their frequencies is insufficient in capturing the full context, focus, and emphasis of themes in a piece of video or visual footage (Bell, 2001; Macnamara, 2003).

In Macnamara’s (2005) best practices for media content analysis, variable positioning within a medium (such as on the front page, if in a newspaper) and size or length of the medium (such as the size of a text article or the length of a television segment) are among the most important variables to collect (others provided by Macnamara, such as cited sources and media weighting, are not relevant to the study at hand), as these can assist in measuring the focus and emphasis of a media source on a certain subject. Bell (2001) likewise advocates measuring focus
and emphasis by capturing the duration of a theme portrayed in video footage, with the length of time contributed to a certain theme acting as a proxy for how much emphasis the media source ascribes to that theme. Previous studies have assessed duration of themes in video footage as part of larger content analyses of political news media (see Bell, Boehringer, & Crofts, 1982; Brekken & Aalberg, 2010) and more recently, studies of police use of force have coded for duration of force observed through police body-worn camera footage (see Willits & Makin, 2017).

Coding for time and duration of themes is of particular importance to the current study, due to the varying lengths of the sampled videos. While quantitative content analysis has traditionally counted frequencies of variables (Macnamara, 2003), comparisons are difficult when video segments are of widely varying lengths. For example, a variable (such as the display of a drawn firearm) could occur three times in a 10 minute video. However, the same variable could occur three times in a second video that is only two minutes long. While the variable occurs at the same frequency for both videos, the eight-minute difference between the two videos makes accurate comparisons difficult and potentially inaccurate.

Therefore the codebook (contained in the Appendices) uses an event modeling approach by assessing the duration of time that is devoted to a theme in each video to obtain information on emphasis. Overall duration of each theme is then divided by overall video length and multiplied by 100 to provide a percent duration that each sampled video devoted to each theme, as this provides for more accurate and clear comparisons between videos (Bell, 2001). While some frequencies are obtained to collect relevant information (such as the number of certain types of statements made within videos), predominate themes are coded by percent duration and time of occurrence to capture emphasis and positioning in the video. The following section
describes the measures and their comprising variables, as well as the time variables attached to these measures and their justification.

**Coding Procedure**

Coding of the videos was conducted in a 2-stage consensus coding process with three undergraduate coders, a graduate coder, and the researcher. All coders were trained extensively on the codebook measures (described in detail in the Appendix), provided visual examples of each theme in a document that was always accessible when coding, and were instructed in the use of Microsoft Access to annotate the codes. All videos in the sample were divided amongst the undergraduate and graduate coders for Level 1 coding.

As will be discussed at length below, the first level of coding captured dichotomous measures of whether variables occurred, as well as the start and end times of the occurrence (if applicable) to capture the duration of the themes relative to the overall length of each video. Student coders also indicated whether there were additional instances of each theme, to assist in the collection of data for Level 2.

All videos were again coded with the Level 2 coding scheme, and were coded by the researcher. The Level 2 coding scheme was populated by the Level 1 timepoint codes for each video annotated by the original round of coders as a way for the researcher to confirm the accuracy of the timepoints while coding. In addition to verifying the data collected by Level 1, Level 2 also collected all repeat occurrences of the codebook’s themes by indicating the start and end times of each occurrence per video. Level 2 likewise collected some contextual variables; namely, the gender of interviewees and the context of drawn firearms (whether a firearm was depicted as being drawn in a training context or a non-training context).
Codebook Measures

As discussed above by Riffe and colleagues (2005), quantitative content analysis must be theory-driven. For clarity and systematic organization, this content analysis is based off of the two primary frameworks for measuring militarization and community policing. The measures for militarization were primarily informed by Kraska’s (2007) four-dimension framework. Community policing was likewise assessed through variables that could fall into the four categories of Cordner’s (1995) four-dimension framework as put forth by Cordner (1995) as a clear and practical way to assess the vague concept of community-oriented policing.

While these two four-dimension frameworks are beneficial in organizing their respective concepts, relevant literature was consulted to assist in identifying objective, quantifiable variables. Following Macnamara’s (2005) recommendation to conduct exploratory work when developing a coding scheme for media analysis, the following coding scheme was developed through a preliminary semi-inductive assessment of 25 recruitment videos to identify repeated, quantifiable themes that were supported by the literature review. The final codebook themes, as well as their supporting literature, will be discussed in the following section.

Militarization. Utilizing Kraska’s four-dimension framework as presented in Chapter 2, as well as a pilot sample of recruitment videos to assess common observable themes and items, variables that were commonly observed in the pilot sample were categorized according to each of the four dimensions: the material, the cultural, the organizational, and the operational dimensions. As most studies of police militarization focus primarily on one of Kraska’s (2007) four dimensions (Bieler, 2016), the current study will include variables that fall into each of Kraska’s four indicators to create a more robust measurement of the concept of militarization. Figure 3-1 demonstrates Kraska’s four dimensions, the comprising concepts of these dimensions
(based on prior literature), and the main variable groupings that comprise the narrowed concepts. Though this table does not contain all variables contained in the codebook, it demonstrates how primary variable groupings were founded in Kraska’s (2007) framework and prior literature definitions of militarization. A complete codebook detailing each variable and examples can be found in the Appendix.

*Figure 3.1. Organization of Militarization Themes and Variables*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>Comprising Concepts</th>
<th>Variable Groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Material Indicators</td>
<td>Military/Paramilitary Equipment</td>
<td>Display of Military Vehicle*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Indicators</td>
<td>Martial Language/Warrior Mentality</td>
<td>Display of Military Weaponry*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Display of Tactical Vests on Officers*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Display of BDUs on Officers*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Aggressive Statements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Indicators</td>
<td>Normalization of PPU’s</td>
<td>Exclusive Statements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operational Indicators</td>
<td>Military Operational Patterns</td>
<td>Statements Emphasizing Danger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Active Pursuit of Civilian*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Civilian in Handcuffs*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Firearm Drawn in Non-Training Context*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Gender Imbalance*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Active Deployment of SWAT*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not Observable in Stage I</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Indicates variable measured by both start and end time points (size/length/duration of segment)
**Material indicators.** As many scholars have measured police militarization primarily through department acquisitions of military equipment or the use of paramilitary equipment and technology transfers (Balko, 2013; Bieler, 2016; Brandl, 2003; Center for Research on Criminal Justice, 1977; Haggerty & Erikson, 1999; Hall & Coyne, 2013; Hill & Beger, 2009; Kraska, 2001; Kraska & Kappeler, 1997), the variables shown under the material dimension of Figure 3-1 are supported by the literature as being the most commonly used material indicators of militarization. Each variable category was measured in Level 1 by a dichotomous indicator of whether the display occurred, the start and end timepoints to capture display duration, and a dichotomous variable of whether an additional display occurs later in the video (many of the following variable groups follow this variable pattern; refer to the Appendix to see specifics regarding these variables and how they are coded). Level 2 continues this format by measuring the start and end timepoints of each additional display of each theme, per sampled video. The first of these variable categories captures the displays of military vehicles (such as an armored personnel carrier or a Mine-Resistant Ambush-Protected [MRAP] vehicle), as a number of scholars, including Kraska and Neuman (2012), and the media have recently focused on the acquisition of military vehicles as representative of the increase of United States police militarization (Balko, 2013; Bieler, 2016; Endebak, 2014; Institute for Intergovernmental Research, 2015; Withers, 2016). The second variable category, military weaponry portrayals, indicates the portrayal of firearms that are also used in military combat, such as an M-16 or other rifles chambered for 5.56 mm ammunition. The third variable category, displays of visible tactical vests on officers, is likewise counted due to the concern that tactical vests, though often used for riot control or special operations (such as SWAT or hostage rescue operations), is also symbolic of police officers taking on the appearance of military personnel (Balko, 2013; Brandl,
The final variable category, the display of battle dress uniforms (BDUs) on officers, is counted due to several militarization scholars’ focus on police use of military uniforms as indicative of militarization (Maguire & King, 2004; Kraska, 2001; Kraska & Kappeler, 1997). Though Kraska & Neuman (2012) consider the use of BDUs as a cultural indicator, they are counted under the material dimension here to avoid overlap, as they are a material that can be acquired from the military (Else, 2014), and are explicitly mentioned as an indicator of militarization (alongside military vehicles and tactical vests) in the After-Action Assessment of the Police Response to the August 2014 Demonstrations in Ferguson, Missouri (Institute for Intergovernmental Research, 2015). Coders were also extensively trained in the identification of each of these material indicators, with pictures and descriptions provided to assist coders in differentiating between military vehicles and standard SWAT vehicles, military weapons compared to standard-issue police sidearms and shotguns, and tactical vests compared to more traditional police body armor. Coders were also trained to record BDUs only when uniforms clearly displayed any form of camouflage pattern, or were tactical uniforms of Army or olive green. The coding scheme was also careful to differentiate Army green BDUs from the olive green and khaki trousers and shirt combination often worn by officers from county police agencies.

Cultural indicators. The second of Kraska’s (2007) dimensions, cultural indicators, is defined as the extent of martial language and the extent of militaristic values and beliefs. Due to Kraska’s (2001) and other scholars’ primary focus on hypermasculinity as another name for militaristic values and beliefs (Benson, 2001; Kraska & Cubellis, 1997; Kraska & Kappeler, 1997), cultural indicators has further been divided under two subcategories: “Hypermasculinity” and “Martial language/warrior mentality.”
“Martial language/warrior mentality” encompasses language and statements made by officers that involve metaphors of war (such as the so-called “wars” on drugs and terrorism) or convey an “us versus them” mentality, identified by many scholars as a defining cultural component of militarism (Balko, 2013; Benson, 2001; Caulfield, 2001; Chappell & Lanza-Kaduce, 2010; Crank, 2004; Doherty, 2016; Martin, 1988). The first comprising variable, aggressive statements, is a continuous variable that counts the frequency of any statements made by officers in the recruitment videos that use war-like metaphors or promote toughness, roughness, or violence. An example of this kind of statement would be: “people sleep peacefully only because rough men are willing to do violence on their behalf.” The second variable, exclusive statements, is a continuous variable that counts the frequency of any statements that generalize the population as a potential threat, often referring to this population as an undefined “they,” and often referring to the danger that this population may present to officers, who are regarded as warriors, or forces of good. An example of this category of statement would be: “they’re tough out there; we’ve got to be tougher.” The third variable, statements emphasizing danger, is a continuous variable rooted in several scholars’ (Crank, 2004; Kappeler, Sluder, & Alpert, 1994; Kraska & Kappeler, 1997; Kraska & Paulsen, 1997) findings that paramilitary police cultures often emphasize and exaggerate the danger of police work in order to build a sense of exclusivism and camaraderie. Examples of these statements collected from the sampled videos include: “it’s a war out there,” and “the more you sweat when you train, the less you bleed on the street.” These three aforementioned statement variables are also accompanied by variables measuring the start time point of each statement to assess positioning (a measure of potential emphasis, according to Macnamara [2005]). The final two variable categories comprise the concept of civilians being portrayed as dangerous, and are portrayals of active pursuits and
portrayals of suspects in handcuffs (with start and end time point variables associated with each). These variables are rooted in the same aforementioned literature that finds that paramilitary police cultures view the public with suspicion and view offenders as the “enemy” or the “them” in an “us versus them” mentality.

The second subcategory of the cultural dimension, hypermasculinity, is an aggressive focus on American cultural definitions of male power and dominance, and has been identified by critics as an integral part of a militarized culture (Benson, 2001; Crank, 2004; Kraska, 2001; Kraska & Cubellis, 1997; Martin, 1988; Miller, 1999; Messerschmidt, 1993; Rabe-Hemp, 2008). The first variable group assesses portrayals of drawn firearms, with a dichotomous variable capturing whether a drawn firearm occurred in the video, time variables to capture start and end times of the display, and the start and end times of each additional display per video. Wozniak and Uggen (2009) have identified the vital role firearms play in the concept of hypermasculinity; therefore a long duration of video focused on a drawn firearm is seen as potentially indicative of hypermasculine ideals. However, the current coding scheme was developed to capture the context of drawn firearm depictions, as it was common in recruiting videos for the narrator or an interviewed officer to speak about standard academy training while the video would provide images or footage related to the speaker’s subject material. Conversely, some videos included fictional (and, in one instance, live footage) depictions of officers drawing their firearms and pointing them at suspects. This latter category of depiction seemed to better reflect the aforementioned cultural assumption of civilians being dangerous. Bieler (2016) likewise discusses militarization as measured by the “weapons effect” (wherein a weapon displayed at a civilian may increase the likelihood of civilian aggression, thus increasing the likelihood of police use of force). Therefore the Level 2 coding scheme captured context to differentiate
between firearms portrayed as being drawn in training contexts (such as at a firing range when the video is discussing academy training) and those drawn in non-training contexts (such as being depicted as being drawn at a suspect), with the former being considered a measure of hypermasculinity. The second variable category, gender imbalance, was identified by Benson (2001), in his identification of female officers as less aggressive and authoritarian, and less likely to embrace the concept of “machismo.” Many feminist criminal justice scholars have also identified the condemnation of anything deemed “effeminate” in hypermasculine police cultures (Benson, 2001; Dodge, Valcore, & Gomez, 2011; Miller, 1999; Messerschmidt, 1993; Rabe-Hemp, 2008; Wozniak & Uggen, 2009). For the purposes of the present study, any time an officer spoke to the camera (coded as an interview), the officer’s gender and start and end timepoints of the interview are recorded. This pattern repeats for every interview per video to capture the overall duration of time devoted to officer interviews, and the percent of that interview time that consists of female officers with speaking roles. An additional variable was included to capture the gender of the video’s narrator (if applicable). It is therefore assumed here, based on the aforementioned literature, that recruitment videos seeking to attract more women will show a higher percentage of women than the imbalanced reality, as well as a longer duration of portrayal, and recruitment videos that advertise more militaristic themes will downplay the role of women in the department’s ranks.

**Organizational indicators.** The organizational dimension is defined by Kraska (2007) as the extent of martial arrangements, such as “command and control” centers and the normalized use of paramilitary policing units (PPUs), such as Special Weapons and Tactics (SWAT) teams. Due to the difficulty in observing organizational structures and militaristic operations such as “command and control” centers, there is only one observable variable category in this dimension,
which is the depiction of active SWAT deployments, the duration of their portrayal, and the start and end timepoints of each additional portrayal per video. The SWAT variables were collected due to critics’ concerns that the increasing frequency of police department use of PPUs reflects a militaristic trend in police nationwide (Balko, 2013; Benson, 2001; Kraska, 2001b; Kraska & Cubellis, 1997; Kraska & Kappeler, 1997). However, Bieler (2016) argues that the presence of a SWAT team in a department is a problematic indicator of militarization if researchers do not assess the actual use of the SWAT team by the department (both the frequency and reasons for deployment). Coders were therefore trained to only capture active SWAT deployments and not any depiction of a SWAT team, as the former captures deployment behavior (an example from a sampled video being a SWAT team entering a house during a hostage situation) while the latter is merely a passive indicator of existence (such as a picture of a standing SWAT officer while a video’s narrator discusses the department’s special units). To avoid inflation, the variables included in the *material* dimension excluded any paramilitary equipment carried or used by a SWAT officer portrayed within the same video.

*Operational indicators.* Kraska (2007) defines the final dimension, *operational*, as the degree to which a law enforcement agency patterns its operations and behavior after the military (such as the use of SWAT teams for no-knock drug raids, or aggressive zero-tolerance policing). Due to the difficulty in obtaining data regarding specific police operations, some scholars have measured this dimension in terms of training of officers received from the military (Campbell & Campbell, 2010; Hall & Coyne, 2013; Kraska & Kappeler, 1997). The sampled videos did not show any observable artifacts that could objectively measure this dimension. Therefore, at this stage, there are no variables directly measuring this dimension.
**Community-Oriented Policing.** There has been little scholarly consensus regarding community policing, both in what it is and whether it has truly been implemented in the United States. However, it was demonstrated that Cordner (1995) offers one of the clearest frameworks for understanding community policing. For the purposes of the content analysis, therefore, codes have been created using his framework’s four dimensions, as illustrated in Figure 3-2.

*Figure 3.2. Organization of Community Policing Themes and Variables*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>Comprising Concepts</th>
<th>Variable Groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Philosophical</td>
<td>Values of Citizen Interaction/Personal Service</td>
<td>Community Engagement Statements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Empathy/Emotional Attachment Statements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Portrayal of Minority Officers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic</td>
<td>Patrol/Face-to-Face Interaction</td>
<td>Non-Motor Vehicle Patrol*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social Welfare Orientation</td>
<td>Positive Interaction with Juvenile*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Assistance of Vulnerable Person*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tactical</td>
<td>Positive Public Interaction</td>
<td>Positive Verbal and Nonverbal Interaction*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Officer Speaks in Citizen's Language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational</td>
<td>Mission</td>
<td>Statement of Importance of Foreign Language Proficiency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Problem Solving Statements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Statement of COP Mission</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Indicates variable measured both start and end time points (size/length/duration of segment)
**The philosophical dimension.** Cordner (1995) identifies several philosophical themes that are consistent throughout most community policing literature, including values of police-citizen interaction, personal service from police to citizens, and citizen input. Though some of these themes are put into practice in the later *tactical dimension* – such as positive police-citizen interaction – variables were identified that are deemed to embody the values and beliefs of the *philosophical dimension*. The first of these variable categories captures whether a community engagement statement is made in the video, the time at which the statement occurred, and whether an additional statement is made later in the video. Community engagement statements are defined as statements made by officers that emphasize working with or engaging with the community, gaining community trust, or being part of the community. Examples from the sampled videos include statements such as “we pride ourselves in working together to build stronger communities” and “we’re committed to helping our community.” The second variable category captures whether officers make an empathy or emotional attachment statement in the video, the time at which the statement occurred, and whether an additional statement is made later in the video. Emotional attachment statements are defined as statements that emphasize the officer’s emotional engagement or empathy towards individuals in the community, with examples from the sampled videos being “I was that kid that didn’t have anywhere to go. It makes me want to be there for every kid that I work with” and “when someone calls 911, they’ve reached a moment in their lives where they need additional help; being a person who gets to...come alongside those individuals is really, really rewarding.” The third variable group in the *philosophical* dimension assesses whether or not any minority (Black, Hispanic/Latino, Asian, and Other Race/Ethnicity) officers were depicted in the videos.
The strategic dimension. Cordner’s (1995) strategic dimension is the link between the philosophical dimension and the tactical dimension, and embodies practical steps to put the values and philosophies of community policing into tangible action. Included in the strategic dimension are an emphasis on face-to-face interaction, foot patrol, permanency of beat assignment, and a social welfare orientation (Cordner, 1995), which are likewise emphasized by community policing scholars such as Skogan (1990), Seagrave (1966), and Oliver and Bartgis (1998). As permanency of beat assignment is not easily observable in a recruitment video, two subcategories were identified for the strategic dimension, patrol/face-to-face interaction and a social welfare orientation.

Patrol/face-to-face interaction is primarily measured in the content analysis through assessing portrayals of non-motor vehicle patrol, which includes any police patrolling activity that is non-motorized (such as foot or bicycle patrol). Patrol has been identified as an integral part of proactive policing, but should not be at odds with community-oriented policies that encourage police-community interactions and accessibility (Cordner, 1995; Seagrave, 1996). Therefore only non-motorized patrolling was annotated when conducting the content analysis, as non-motorized patrol increases the opportunity for police-citizen face-to-face interaction. This variable group follows the established dichotomous occurrence-start and end timepoint-start and end timepoint for every additional occurrence variable pattern.

A social welfare orientation is comprised of two variable groups in the content analysis. The first, positive interaction with a juvenile, is specifically identified by Cordner (1995) as an integral part of the strategic dimension, as police with a welfare orientation can act as positive role models for youth. This continuous variable therefore captures the occurrence of positive (as determined by relaxed, open body language, positive facial expressions, and low vocal intensity
interactions between police and juveniles. The second variable group captures depictions of officers assisting vulnerable persons (such as the elderly, homeless, or disabled). Scholars have identified the assistance and protection of vulnerable groups as a salient part of community policing (Friedmann, 1992; Trojanowicz & Bucqueroux, 1990), and it is categorized under the strategic dimension, as it assists in further identifying whether a police department has a social welfare orientation. These two variable groups consist of the dichotomous occurrence-start and end timepoint-start and end timepoint for every additional occurrence variable pattern.

**The tactical dimension.** The tactical dimension is identified by Cordner (1995) as the tangible behaviors, practices, and activities that put the philosophies and strategic plans of community-oriented police departments into action, and is the most studied dimension of community policing due to the ease of observing and measuring concrete police activities. Identified within this dimension as measurable concepts are positive public interaction and problem solving.

Positive public interaction is consistently discussed as one of the primary goals and activities of community policing in the literature (Cordner, 1995; Friedmann, 1992; Oliver & Bartgis, 1998; Seagrave, 1996; Skogan, 1990; Sommerville, 2009; Trojanowicz & Bucqueroux, 1990), and can enable a sense of trust in the police and encourage police fairness and accountability (Gill, Weisburd, Telep, Vitter, & Bennett, 2014). This behavior is also seen as a primary component of procedural justice, where police officers foster citizen trust by giving them the ability to voice their concerns and provide input (Gill et al., 2014; Jonathan-Zamir, Mastrofski, & Moyal, 2015; Mazerolle, Bennett, Antrobus, & Egging, 2012). Comprising variable groups in this category include positive verbal or nonverbal communication, officer(s) speaking in citizen’s language (if not English), and a statement (written or spoken) within the
video emphasizing the importance or desire for officers to have foreign language proficiency. The first of these variable groups includes both verbal and nonverbal communication given the variety of filming techniques in recruitment videos, as some display a montage of still pictures with music or a voiceover, while others display an active conversation with audio from that conversation. Nonverbal positive communication is measured through indicators such as open or polite body language (such as a handshake), positive facial expressions (such as a smile or laughter), and expressions indicating active listening (such as eye contact, raised eyebrows, and mimicry of the speaker’s body language and expressions) (Jonathan-Zamir et al., 2015). Positive verbal communication during police-public exchanges with audio is assessed through the nonverbal measures, and coders were trained in identifying these indicators for both positive juvenile and citizen interaction measures. To avoid inflation, this variable will not be counted when officers positively interact with juveniles, as that is, as previously discussed, a separate code that falls under the strategic dimension. This variable group follows the dichotomous occurrence-start and end timepoint-start and end timepoint of each additional occurrence variable pattern. The second and third variables (speaking in citizen’s language and statement of importance of foreign language proficiency) are dichotomous variables.

Problem solving, as with positive police-public interaction, is likewise a central component of community policing activities (Cordner, 1995; Friedmann, 1992; Oliver & Bartgis, 1998; Seagrave, 1996; Skogan, 1990; Sommerville, 2009; Trojanowicz & Bucqueroux, 1990). Due to the difficulty in observing actual problem solving behaviors in the relatively short duration of a recruitment video, there is only one variable group in this category: problem solving value statements. This variable group captures the occurrence of officer statements such
as “we believe in problem solving strategies,” and “we pride ourselves in working together to solve complex problems.”

**The organizational dimension.** According to Cordner (1995), the organizational dimension includes a decentralized – rather than a hierarchical – structure, as well as management that fosters community policing values (such as training, mentoring, and a clear mission statement). As with the organizational dimension of Kraska’s (2007) militarization framework, it is difficult to observe these organizational structures and behaviors in relatively short recruitment videos. This dimension therefore comprises of one theme, community-oriented policing (COP) mission statements. These statements are any explicit statements made by interviewed officers, the video narrator, or appearing in written form during the video that claim that the department is community-oriented or committed to a COP mission. An example from the sampled videos is “Community policing isn’t a division; it’s who we are.” These statements are measured through a dichotomous variable assessing whether or not there a statement occurs in each sampled video.

**Other variables.** Several other variables were identified that did not fall fully within the two frameworks, but were still necessary to capture to provide more understanding of the data and avoid misinterpretation of the videos. These variables include dichotomous measures of whether the video was a viral challenge video (such as Mannequin or Running Man Challenge video) with a recruiting message (coded as “non-traditional), and whether there was an obvious humorous or joking tone to the video. This latter variable was an essential variable to add context to a video that may appear aggressive when annotated with the objective coding scheme, but was depicted in such a way as to communicate that the display was farcical. Bell (2001) describes the importance of coding for depiction or genre (such as comedy versus reality, or drama) when
creating a visual content analysis coding scheme, as this assists in understanding the message that is being conveyed.

Two final variables were included to capture a more subjective, semiotic measure of what tone the content analysis coders felt each video portrayed overall. Specifically, these variables capture the coders’ overall sense of the level of militaristic tone (defined as having an overall aggressive, crime-control oriented, and hypermasculine feel to the video) in the video, and the level of community-oriented tone (defined as having an overall sense of community empathy and engagement, and positive citizen-focused feel to the video) in the video. These are two separate four-point Likert-scale (not at all, slightly, moderately, extremely) variables, with both included in the coding scheme, as a recruitment video may both convey a sense of being, for example, slightly community-oriented and slightly militaristic. Coders at Level 1 were directed to provide their overall ratings for these two variables, and the researcher likewise provided ratings to these two variables in Level 2.

Analytical Plan

Descriptive results of the themes gathered by the quantitative content analysis will first be presented to assist in describing the sampled recruitment videos, as well as the average durations and positioning of their comprising themes. The data obtained from the quantitative content analysis will then be analyzed using PCA. PCA is used to assist in the identification of a data pattern matrix (that is, how measures load on related components), and is primarily used as a data reduction technique used to reduce a large number of variables into several related components (Dunteman, 1989; Park, Dailey, & Lemus, 2005; Trendafilov, Unkel, & Krzanowski, 2013). While PCA does not allow for the proper identification of latent constructs
(which is the goal of exploratory factor analysis, or EFA) (Conway & Huffcutt, 2003), PCA is beneficial in creating a smaller set of variables to use in future analyses, such as regression (Dunteman, 1989). As the second stage of the present study seeks to assess potential predictors of themes of militarization and community policing found in the sampled recruitment videos, PCA is beneficial in reducing the large number of measures for each broad concept of “militarization” and “community policing” into a smaller set of outcome variables that can be analyzed in Stage II of the present study, while also allowing for the identification of the pattern of the data to ascertain whether the measures of the quantitative content analysis load onto theoretically expected components.

To avoid violation of the independence assumption, the 206 videos in the sample were filtered by primacy to limit the sample to one video per sampled law enforcement agency. In cases where a sampled law enforcement agency had more than one video, the primary video was selected first by status (as demonstrated earlier in Table 3.2), with the first status (Confirmed Current) taking precedence over the others. In cases where multiple videos from the same agency had the same Confirmed Current status, the primary video was selected by most recent year created. When videos still shared the same status and date, the video with the longest duration was chosen. There were two agencies with multiple videos that were still equal after addressing the above criteria; the primary videos for these two agencies were selected at random using an online generator. This filtering process resulted in a sample of 135 videos used for PCA. This sample size and the number of measures analyzed by PCA results in a ratio of approximately 9:1, which falls within the recommended sample size guidelines of Costello and Osborne (2015).
An oblique rotation method (oblimin) was selected, as oblique rotation allows for factors to be correlated, as is a recommended best practice for social science research (Costello and Osborne, 2015). As some correlation is expected between some of the quantitative content analysis measures (for example, BDUs were frequently observed on actively deployed SWAT officers), oblique rotation was selected as the best approach.

The PCA components will then be saved to create scores for the filtered sample of 135 videos, as well as additive z-score scales that mirror the same components found by the PCA models. These scores are used as the outcome variables for Stage II of the study to examine possible predictors of recruitment video themes. Lastly, bivariate correlations of the subjective tone measures included in the codebook and the theme scores are assessed to examine the relationship between the overall subjective tone of the videos and the scales created by the objective measures of the codebook.

**Stage II: Organizational and Contextual Predictors**

**Overview and Hypotheses**

Using the PCA and z-score scales created from the objective measures of the quantitative content analysis as outcome variables, Stage II involves the analysis of potential predictors of the themes and artifacts in the sampled recruitment videos. Drawing from the literature discussed in Chapter Two, the following hypotheses will assess the predictors of militarized video themes:

\[ H_1: \text{There will be a positive relationship between high local violent crime rates and agency recruitment videos with high militarization scores.} \]

\[ H_2: \text{There will be a positive relationship between high local drug crime rates and agency recruitment videos with high militarization scores.} \]
H3: There will be a positive relationship between agencies that facilitate the hiring of military veterans and agency recruitment videos with high militarization scores.

H4: There will be a positive relationship between agencies that acquired military equipment through the 1033 Program and agency recruitment videos with high militarization scores.

H5: There will be a positive relationship between an agency’s SWAT team and agency recruitment videos with high militarization scores.

The following hypotheses will assess predictors of community policing themes:

H6: There will be a positive relationship between levels of agency diversity (women and minorities) and agency recruitment videos with high community policing scores.

H7: There will be a positive relationship between percent of female supervisors in an agency and agency recruitment videos with high community policing scores.

H8: There will be a positive relationship between COPS grant acquired and agency recruitment videos with high community policing scores.

H9: There will be a positive relationship between one or more of the LEMAS 2013 COP behavior measures and agency recruitment videos with high community policing scores.

While the hypotheses are directional – given that they are informed by the literature that treats militarization and community-oriented policing as separate cultural value systems – it must be noted that other relationships may be found in this exploratory study. Particularly given the critical literature that treats community policing as being a cohesive strategy with militarization, analyses may find a positive relationship between militarization indicators and community-oriented themes in agencies’ videos. Conversely, predictors may also prove to be reverse indicators – such as the belief shared by the President’s Task Force on 21st Century Policing.
(2015) and others (D’Esposito, 2016; Institute for Intergovernmental Research, 2015) – and may show negative relationships between militarization indicators and community-oriented video themes, or negative relationships between hypothesized indicators of community-oriented policing and militarized themes in videos.

Sample and Data

The sample for both stages remains the same, using the largest (by number of sworn officers) local (municipal and county) law enforcement agencies, as determined by the 2013 LEMAS, and the scores developed from these agencies’ recruitment videos, filtered by primacy (described above in the discussion of PCA methods). The matched sample of both agencies and videos, with agencies with no videos (or videos that were PT or viral challenge videos with no recruitment message) removed, resulted in a final sample of 135 agencies and scores for their respective 135 videos.

Predictors. Table 3.3 describes the predictors – as well as several control variables, their sources, and the relevant supporting literature justifying their selection, as discussed in Chapter Two. Each data source is described at length following the table.
**Table 3.3. Independent Variables, Data Sources, and Supporting Literature**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Data Source</th>
<th>Relevant Literature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Violent Crime Rate</td>
<td>Rate (per 100,000 population) of UCR Part I violent crimes, cleared by arrest per agency, 2013</td>
<td>UCR</td>
<td>Alpert &amp; MacDonald (2006)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Balko (2013)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Paoline (2003)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hickman &amp; Piquero (2009)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug Crime Rate</td>
<td>Rate (per 100,000 population) of total drug offenses cleared by arrest by department, 2013</td>
<td>UCR</td>
<td>Same as above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military Hire Facilitation</td>
<td>Department counts military service in lieu of education requirement</td>
<td>LEMAS 2013</td>
<td>Niman (2014)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tinoco &amp; Arnaud (2013)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1033 Military Acquisitions</td>
<td>Whether department obtained military or military firearm equipment from the 1033 Program, 2012-2014</td>
<td>DOD 1033 Program National Acquisitions</td>
<td>Balko (2013)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>D’Esposito (2016)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Endebak (2014)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWAT Team</td>
<td>Whether department has a dedicated SWAT team</td>
<td>LEMAS 2013</td>
<td>Johnson &amp; Hansen (2016)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Balko (2013)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kraska &amp; Cubellis (1997)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kraska &amp; Kappeler (1997)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Women</td>
<td>Percent of female sworn officers</td>
<td>LEMAS 2013</td>
<td>Schuck (2017)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dodge et al. (2011)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Miller (1999)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rabe-Hemp (2008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bayley (1988)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Minorities</td>
<td>Percent of minority sworn officers</td>
<td>LEMAS 2013</td>
<td>Hickman &amp; Piquero (2009)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Miller (1999)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rabe-Hemp (2008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COPS Grants</td>
<td>Whether department received a COPS grant between 2012-2017</td>
<td>DOJ Community Oriented Policing Services</td>
<td>Zhao et al. (2001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Zhao et al. (2002)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEMAS COP Measures</td>
<td>COP behavior measures, including SARA projects, Problem Solving in Eval. Criteria, Local Partnership, Community Survey, and In-Service COP Training</td>
<td>LEMAS 2013</td>
<td>Cordner (1995)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Somerville (2009)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Trojanowicz &amp; Bucqueroux (1990)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department Location</td>
<td>Regional location of department</td>
<td>LEMAS 2013</td>
<td>Maguire &amp; Katz (2002)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kraska &amp; Paulsen (1997)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Control variable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Politics</td>
<td>Majority voting decision (Republican or Democrat) in department’s county for the 2016 Presidential Election</td>
<td>Leip, 2017</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department Size (Sworn Officers)</td>
<td>Department size as determined by number of full-time sworn officers</td>
<td>LEMAS 2013</td>
<td>Maguire (2003)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Functional differentiation of department</td>
<td>Number of specialized units in a department</td>
<td>LEMAS 2013</td>
<td>Maguire (2003)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nowacki &amp; Willits (2016)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**UCR.** Data for violent crime rates were obtained from the *Uniform Crime Reporting Program: Offenses Known and Clearances by Arrest, 2013* (ICPSR 36122). Data for drug crime
rates were obtained from the *Uniform Crime Reporting Program: Arrests by Age, Sex, Race, 2013* (ICPSR 36115). Data from the year 2013 were chosen due to the measures from the LEMAS data also being collected for the year 2013. However, due to missing data from the latter UCR dataset, some data were gathered from the 2015 version of the same dataset (ICPSR 36794), with population data from the 2015 dataset used to accurately calculate the drug crime rates. This generated data for agencies in the state of Alabama.

**LEMAS 2013.** Much of the data were obtained from the 2013 LEMAS survey (ICPSR 36164-v2) collected by the U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics (2015). The first of these, *Military Hire Facilitation*, is included based on the arguments made by Niman (2014) and Tinoco and Arnaud (2013) that increased direct links between the military and the police, such as police departments targeting veterans when recruiting and hiring, will increase police militarization. *SWAT Team* measures whether a department has a full- or part-time SWAT team, based on the concerns raised by Kraska and colleagues. *Percent Women, Percent Minorities*, and *Women in Supervisory Roles* capture a department’s diversity and commitment to equity, with Schuck (2017) recently finding that a department’s gender diversity is a significant predictor of the adoption of community policing behaviors (though not in the reverse temporal order; thus justifying diversity as a predictor of community-oriented themes, and not an outcome).

The 2013 LEMAS also includes several measures of community-oriented policing activities. Several are used in the present study; namely: *SARA Projects* (SARA-type problem-solving projects are actively encouraged in an agency), *Problem Solving in Eval. Criteria* (agencies include collaborative problem solving in officers’ evaluations), *Local Partnership* (agencies have problem-solving partnerships or written agreements with local organizations),
Community Survey (agencies utilize information gathered by community surveys), and In-Service COP Training (agencies require at least 8 hours of in-service community policing training for sworn officers). These measures were included as they represent the most obtainable data on community-oriented policing activities (as opposed to passive statements of community-oriented commitment, such as having a statement of community-oriented policing in an agency’s mission statement).

Several controls are also obtained from the 2013 LEMAS to provide organizational context. Department Location assesses regional location of the sampled departments, as Maguire and Katz (2002) have found a relationship between departments in the South and Midwest and department claims of being community-oriented (reflecting an earlier, though smaller-scale finding of Kraska and Paulsen [1997]). Regional location was divided into four main regions based on the United States Census Bureau’s (n.d.) Census Regions and Divisions of the United States. Maguire (2003) determines organizational size through number of full-time personnel; therefore Department Size is obtained through the 2013 LEMAS measure of number of full-time sworn officers in an agency. Lastly, borrowing from Maguire (2003), Functional Differentiation is included as a measure of organizational complexity. Functional Differentiation is measured through the division of tasks in an agency, and here is determined by the number of specialized units per agency (Langworthy, 1986; Maguire, 2003).

The 1033 Program. The dataset used by Koslicki and Willits (forthcoming) was used to assess military transfers to the sampled police departments from 2012-2014. The original data were obtained through the DLA’s Law Enforcement Support Office (LESO) and included all transfers to all participating departments since the beginning of the program. Data were trimmed to the dates of 2012-2014, and were categorized based on general type, with specific categories
created for protected military items (such as 5.56 mm caliber rifles, mine-resistant ambush assault [MRAP] vehicles, assault armor, and other protected categories). Categorization of this data was necessary to exclude those 1033 Program items that were obtained but are not deemed protected military items, such as furniture and vehicle parts. For the purposes of the present study, a dichotomous indicator of military materials obtained through the program is used as a predictor to assess the influence of Kraska’s (2007) material dimension of militarism on agencies’ video scores.

**DOJ COPS.** Receipt of a COPS grant is accessed through the Department of Justice’s Community Oriented Policing Services (COPS) website, which lists all grant recipients from 2012 to present. COPS grants are divided into six categories: the COPS Hiring Program (CHP), the Community Policing Development Program (CPD), the Coordinated Tribal Assistance Solicitation (CTAS) program, the Anti-Gang Initiative (CAGI), the Anti-Heroin Task Force (AHTF) Program, and the COPS Anti-Methamphetamine Program (CAMP). However, only the CHP and CPD provided detailed agency data that could be linked to the sample. These two categories were grouped and measured by an indicator variable of whether or not a sampled agency obtained a COPS grant (whether CHP or CPD) between the years 2012 to 2017.

**Leip (2017).** The final data source used for the predictors of Stage II is data obtained from Leip (2017) that provides the final voting tally, per county, for the 2016 Presidential Election to generate the variable *Local Politics.* This control variable assists in providing local context for each sampled agency.
Analytical Plan

Bivariate correlations were first assessed between predictors and the PCA and z-score scales, as well as multiple recoded versions of these scales. Appropriate regression models were conducted on each of these scales, with the models using an ordinal z-score scale presenting the best overall model fits. Further discussion of these models and the results are provided in Chapter Four.
CHAPTER FOUR
FINDINGS

Stage I Results

The following analyses assist in describing the findings of the quantitative content analysis of the sample of 206 recruitment videos. Univariate statistics are first provided to assist in describing the militarization and community policing themes found in the videos. Upon describing the themes found within the sampled videos, principal components analysis (PCA) results are presented to demonstrate how the measures of militarization and community policing – as informed by the literature and gathered through the quantitative content analysis – load on components in a meaningful and interpretable way. A description of the creation of scales using PCA results follows, as these scales will be used as the outcome variables in Stage II. Lastly, bivariate correlations are presented to demonstrate how the subjective measures included in the quantitative content analysis relate to the scales constructed from the objective measures. These results and their relation to the first research question of the study are summarized before presenting Stage II results.

Descriptive Results

Table 4.1 provides the univariate descriptives of the militarized themes observed from the entire sample of videos (N = 206). Non-italicized rows provide the percent of sampled videos that displayed each theme, while italicized rows display the mean percent of overall video duration that was devoted to that theme. Of the sampled videos, 4.4% displayed a military vehicle, such as an MRAP or Bearcat. Of this 4.4%, the average percent of overall video duration
devoted to military vehicle displays was 5.11% (sd = 4.74). Other aspects of military hardware occurred more frequently in the sampled videos, with 34% featuring military weapons, 32% featuring tactical vests, and 32.5% featuring BDUs on officers. Of the videos that showed these themes, an average of 5.79% (sd = 7.96) of overall video duration was devoted to military weapons, 7.71% (sd = 9.35) was devoted to tactical vests, and 8.32% (sd = 9.26) was devoted to BDU displays.

Table 4.1. Descriptives of Militaristic Themes Found in Sampled Videos (N = 206)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>% / $\bar{x}$ (sd)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Drawn Firearm</td>
<td>42.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Percent of Firearms, Drawn in Training Contexts, Filtered</td>
<td>3.42 (3.73)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Percent of Firearms, Drawn in Non-Training Contexts, Filtered</td>
<td>3.65 (6.34)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military Weapon</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Percent of Time Devoted to Military Weapons, Filtered</td>
<td>5.79 (7.96)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BDU</td>
<td>32.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Percent of Time Devoted to BDUs, Filtered</td>
<td>8.32 (9.26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tactical Vest</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Percent of Time Devoted to Tactical Vests, Filtered</td>
<td>7.71 (9.35)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWAT Deployment</td>
<td>27.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Percent of Time Devoted to SWAT Deployments, Filtered</td>
<td>6.48 (12.69)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civilian in Handcuffs</td>
<td>20.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Percent of Time Devoted to Handcuffs, Filtered</td>
<td>3.48 (4.34)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active Pursuit</td>
<td>13.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Percent of Time Devoted to Active Pursuits, Filtered</td>
<td>5.06 (5.62)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danger Statement</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military Vehicle</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Percent of Time Devoted to Military Vehicles, Filtered</td>
<td>5.11 (4.74)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggressive Statement</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Number of Aggressive Statements, Filtered</td>
<td>1.33 (0.71)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exclusive Statement</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Militaristic Tone</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at All Militaristic</td>
<td>56.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slightly Militaristic</td>
<td>25.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately Militaristic</td>
<td>13.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Militaristic</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The two measures for the concept of civilians being depicted as dangerous, Active Pursuit and Civilian in Handcuffs occurred less frequently, with 13.1% of the sampled videos depicting at least one instance of an active pursuit (averaging to 5.06% of video duration, sd = 5.62) and
20.4% depicting at least one instance of a civilian in handcuffs (averaging to 3.48% of video duration, sd = 4.34).

*Drawn Firearms* occurred frequently in the sampled videos, with 42.7% of the sample displaying at least one drawn firearm. Of these videos, the average amount of video time devoted to firearms drawn in a non-training context (such as being depicted as being drawn at a suspect or during a fictional depiction of a SWAT deployment) was 3.65% (sd = 6.34).

*SWAT Deployment* was present in 27.7% of the sampled videos, and the videos that contained depictions of *SWAT Deployment* were highly varied in the percent of overall video duration contributed to active SWAT deployment depictions. The average percent of overall video duration was 6.48%, with a standard deviation of 12.69.

Many of the depictions of the measures overlapped in the sampled videos, such as during SWAT deployments. SWAT officers were often depicted wearing BDUs and tactical vests, with drawn M-16 caliber rifles in simulated “real-time” deployments. These depictions also co-occurred with other measured behaviors, such as the drawing of the military weapons in a non-training context (the “real-time” deployment) and the handcuffing of suspects. Figure 4.1 illustrates some example scenes from sampled videos. The images on the left column (from the top to the bottom) depict a SWAT team loading into their vehicle, surrounding a house, and handcuffing two suspects. The images on the right column were obtained from another agency’s video, but depict a similar co-occurrence of measures, with the same resolution. The majority of the *SWAT Deployment* depictions often incorporated one or more of these additional measures.
The three statement categories that were included as measures of martial language or a warrior mentality (a subcategory of the cultural dimension of militarization) occurred less frequently in the sampled videos. *Aggressive Statements* occurred in 4.4% of the sample, *Exclusive Statements* occurred in 1.9% of the sample, and *Danger Statements* occurred in 5.8% of the sample. Of the videos that featured *Aggressive Statements*, these videos had an average of
1.33 (sd = 0.71) statements. No videos in the sample had more than one *Exclusive Statement* or *Danger Statement*.

Lastly, *Overall Militaristic Tone* was assessed as a subjective measure of the coder’s perception of the degree of militarization of each video. The researcher’s Level 2 ratings are displayed here. Of the sampled videos, the majority (56.8%) were rated as being *not at all militaristic*. Approximately one-quarter of the sample (25.7%) were rated as being *slightly militaristic*, and 13.1% were rated as being *moderately militaristic*. A minority of the sample (4.4%) fell into the extreme end of being perceived as *extremely militaristic*.

Table 4.2 provides descriptive results of the community-oriented themes present in the sampled recruitment videos. A majority of the sample (51.9%) contained *Community Engagement Statements*, and each of these videos contained an average of 2.27 (sd = 2.15) statements. The second measure of the *philosophical dimension* of community policing, *Empathy/Emotional Attachment Statements*, was present in 35.9% of the sampled videos, and each of the videos where these statements were present contained nearly three statements (2.78, sd = 2.51) per video. The third indicator of the *philosophical dimension*, “depiction of minority officers” was captured with several variables. Eighty-five percent of the sample portrayed female officers, and 91.7% of the sample portrayed officers of minority races/ethnicities. Female narrators were infrequent, with 6.8% of the sample featuring a female narrator, as compared to 27.2% of the sample featuring a male narrator (66% of the sampled videos featured no narrator). Male interviewees were slightly more frequent than female interviewees (49% and 36.9%, respectively; many videos featured interviews from both female and male officers). However, male interviewees contributed to more than 2/3 of the overall duration of interview time, with female officers contributing to an average of 31.36% of overall interview time in the sample.
Table 4.2. Descriptives of Community-Oriented Themes Found in Sampled Videos (N=206)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>% / $\bar{x}$ (sd)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Videos with Minority Race/Ethnicity Officers</td>
<td>91.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Videos with Female Officers</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Engagement Statement</td>
<td>51.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Number of Community Engagement Statements, Filtered</td>
<td>2.27 (2.15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Motor Patrol</td>
<td>43.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Percent of Time Devoted to Non-Motor Patrol, Filtered</td>
<td>9.85 (12.74)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Citizen Interaction</td>
<td>43.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Percent of Time Devoted to Positive Citizen Interactions, Filtered</td>
<td>8.74 (12.13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Juvenile Interaction</td>
<td>41.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Percent of Time Devoted to Positive Juvenile Interactions, Filtered</td>
<td>10.52 (12.90)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empathy/Emotional Attachment Statement</td>
<td>35.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Number of Empathy/Emotional Attachment Statements, Filtered</td>
<td>2.78 (2.51)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COP Mission Statement</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Number of COP Mission Statements, Filtered</td>
<td>1.41 (0.80)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem Solving Statement</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Number of Problem Solving Statements, Filtered</td>
<td>1.32 (0.65)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistance of Vulnerable Person</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officer Speaks in Citizen’s (Non-English) Language</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement of Value for Foreign Language Proficiency</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narrator Gender</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>27.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Applicable (No Narrator)</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewee Gender</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Percent of Time Devoted to Male Interviewees, Filtered</td>
<td>68.64 (31.98)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>36.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Percent of Time Devoted to Female Interviewees, Filtered</td>
<td>31.36 (31.98)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Applicable (No Interviews)</td>
<td>45.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Community-Oriented Tone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at All Community-Oriented</td>
<td>23.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slightly Community-Oriented</td>
<td>39.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately Community-Oriented</td>
<td>23.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Community-Oriented</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Many of the behaviors identified by the literature as indicators of the strategic dimension of community-oriented policing occurred relatively frequently in the sampled videos, with 43.7% of the sample including at least one depiction of Non-Motor Patrol and 41.3% including at least one depiction of a positive interaction between a police officer and a juvenile. While there was high variance in the percentage of overall video time devoted to each of these themes, an average of 9.85% (sd = 12.74) of overall video time was devoted to Non-Motor Patrol depictions, and an
average of 10.52% (sd = 12.90) was devoted to Positive Juvenile Interactions. However, the third measure of the strategic dimension of community policing, Assistance of Vulnerable Person, occurred very infrequently, and was present in only 2.9% of the sample. Positive Citizen Interactions occurred in 43.2% of the sample, and an average of 8.74% (sd = 12.13) of overall video time was devoted to Positive Citizen Interactions. Other indicators of the tactical dimension occurred less frequently, with only 2.9% of the sampled videos featuring an officer speaking in a citizen’s native language (if not English), and 1.5% of the sampled videos containing a statement regarding the department’s value of officers having foreign language proficiency. Problem Solving Statements were present in 10.7% of the sample, and of the videos that had at least one Problem Solving Statement, there was an average of 1.32 (sd = 0.65) statements per video. COP Mission Statements occurred slightly more frequently, with 15.5% of the sample featuring at least one such statement. Of these videos, there was an average of 1.41 (sd = 0.80) COP Mission Statements per video.

Lastly, the ratings for the categories of Overall Community-Oriented Tone were slightly more evenly distributed than the ratings of Overall Militaristic Tone. Videos rated as not at all community-oriented consisted of 23.8% of the entire sample, and 39.3% of the sample was rated as slightly community-oriented. Moderately community-oriented videos were present in 23.3% of the sample, and 13.6% were rated as being extremely community-oriented. It must be noted here that videos were not rated exclusively as being “militaristic” or “community-oriented”. That is, each video was rated on both the Overall Militaristic Tone and Overall Community-Oriented Tone scales; therefore a video receiving, for example, a rating of slightly militaristic could also receive a rating of moderately community-oriented.
As discussed in Chapter Three, the quantitative content analysis was also designed to capture positioning of themes within the videos to assess how early in the videos certain themes occurred. Table 4.3 provides the average positioning of each theme within the sampled videos. While there was high variance in overall video lengths in the sample, these averages can only provide an approximation, and there is high variance throughout the themes. As some themes occurred in varying percentages of the sample (as demonstrated in Tables 4.1 and 4.2), the positioning of each of these themes was obtained after filtering out the videos of the sample that did not contain any instance of the respective theme. Additionally, as some themes were only present in less than 4% of the entire sample, these themes have been excluded from Table 4.3 and from the future analyses. The specific excluded themes are: *Exclusive Statements, Assistance of Vulnerable Persons, Officer Speaks in Citizen’s (Non-English) Language, and Statement of Value of Foreign Language Proficiency.*

Table 4.3. Average Positioning (m:ss) of All Major Themes, Filtered

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>( \bar{x} ) (sd)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Military Vehicle</td>
<td>1:42 (1:02)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military Weapon</td>
<td>1:01 (1:32)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tactical Vest</td>
<td>0:58 (1:28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BDU</td>
<td>0:52 (1:26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active Pursuit</td>
<td>1:00 (0:44)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civilian in Handcuffs</td>
<td>1:15 (1:18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drawn Firearm</td>
<td>0:44 (0:55)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWAT Deployment</td>
<td>1:05 (1:45)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggressive Statement</td>
<td>2:28 (2:46)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danger Statement</td>
<td>2:06 (1:21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Motor Patrol</td>
<td>0:44 (1:13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Juvenile Interaction</td>
<td>1:08 (1:12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Citizen Interaction</td>
<td>1:12 (1:43)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Engagement Statements</td>
<td>1:00 (1:26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empathy/Emotional Attachment Statements</td>
<td>1:19 (1:55)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem Solving Statements</td>
<td>2:00 (2:43)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COP Mission Statements</td>
<td>1:35 (1:47)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Interviewee</td>
<td>0:22 (0:47)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Interviewee</td>
<td>0:32 (1:01)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As demonstrated in Table 4.3, most measures of the *material dimension* of militarization occurred approximately one minute into the sampled videos, with *Military Vehicles* taking slightly longer to first occur in the videos. Due to the high variance of video lengths and filming styles, the standard deviations of these measures vary between one and one-and-a-half minutes. The time to first *Active Pursuit* occurrence occurred at an average of 1:00 (sd = 0:44), with *Civilian in Handcuffs* (the second measure capturing the concept of a civilian being depicted as dangerous), first occurring at an average of 1:15 into the videos (sd = 1:18). Time of first *Drawn Firearm* occurrence was slightly shorter, at an average of 0:44 seconds into the sampled videos (sd = 0:55). *SWAT Deployment* occurred at an average of 1:05 (sd = 1:45) into the videos.

The statement measures of militarization, *Aggressive Statements* and *Danger Statements*, took slightly longer until first occurrence, with the average time of first occurrence of *Aggressive Statements* being 2:28 (sd = 2:46), and the time of first occurrence of *Danger Statements* being 2:06, with a lower standard deviation of 1:21.

As for the community-oriented themes, *Non-Motor Patrol* had a relatively early average occurrence in the videos, with time to first occurrence being 0:44 seconds (sd = 1.13). *Positive Juvenile Interaction* and *Positive Citizen Interaction* both had a first occurrence slightly after one minute into the videos, at 1:08 (sd = 1:12) and 1:12 (sd = 1:43) respectively.

Time to first *Community Engagement Statement* was approximately one minute into the videos (sd = 1:26), and time to first *Empathy/Emotional Attachment Statement* was an average of 1:19 (sd = 1:55) into the videos. Time to first *Problem Solving Statement* occurred slightly later into the videos, at an average of two minutes (sd = 2:43). The last statement measure, *COP Mission Statements*, had an average first occurrence measure of 1:35 (sd = 1:47).
Lastly, interviews occurred relatively early into the videos, as often videos would substitute interviewed officers for video narrators. Male interviewees began speaking slightly earlier than female interviewees with time to first occurrence for males being 0:22 seconds (sd = 0:47) and the average time to first occurrence for females being 0:32 seconds (sd = 1:01).

Principal Components Analysis Results

As discussed in the Analytical Plan in Chapter Three, PCA was used to analyze the themes measured in the quantitative content analysis. PCA models were first conducted on all videos in the sample, and then conducted with the sample of 135 after filtering videos to examine the single primary video of each sampled agency. Results were substantively similar with oblique rotation. Some variables from the quantitative content analysis were removed before the final PCA models were conducted: Exclusive Statements, Assistance of Vulnerable Persons, Officer Speaks in Citizen’s (Non-English) Language, and Statement of Value of Foreign Language Proficiency were excluded due to these variables’ having a frequency of 3% or lower in both the entire and trimmed sample. The interview variables were also excluded as well. These were converted into a variable calculating the percent of women in the overall video to be a similar measure to the others included in first PCA model (described below). However, Percent Women created a fourth factor in the first PCA model. As Costello and Osborne (2005) recommend that factors contain at least three variables, this variable was excluded from the model (future research examining demographics is suggested in the following chapter).

The first of two measures for the militarization concept of civilians being depicted as dangerous, Active Pursuit, presented problems in both the entire sample PCA and the trimmed sample PCA. The variable caused two other variables, Military Vehicles and Non-Motor Patrol,
to cross load into an extra component (potentially due to vehicles and some forms of non-motor patrol being used in suspect pursuits). *Active Pursuit* was a variable created as a possible observable measure of the concept of civilians being depicted as dangerous, based on observations of the pilot sample used for the development of the quantitative content analysis. As it is not explicitly mentioned in the literature as being a direct measure of the *cultural dimension* (or any other dimension) of militarization, and due to Costello and Osborne’s (2005) recommendation that problematic, cross-loading variables may be dropped if their exclusion does not harm data integrity, *Active Pursuit* was excluded from PCA.

Two final PCA models were created, with the first assessing the measures of militarization and community policing behaviors that were calculated by percent of video devoted to each theme’s duration, and the second assessing the statement measures. The first PCA resulted in three components with eigenvalues greater than 1. The first component contained communalities greater than .40 for *Military Weapons, Civilian Depicted in Handcuffs, Firearms Drawn (Non-Training Context),* and *SWAT Deployment,* with the latter three sharing high (> .90) communalities. Due to the active, behavioral nature of these variables, this component was labeled “Militaristic Behaviors.” The second component contained three variables with communalities of approximately .70 and higher, with these being *Military Vehicles, Tactical Vests,* and *BDUs.* As these variables have all been defined in prior literature (see Bieler, 2016) as being material indicators and were included as measures of the *material dimension* of militarization in the quantitative content analysis, this component was labeled “Militaristic Materials.” The final component contained three variables, though one (*Non-Motor Patrol*) had a low communality, though at .38 this communality meets the minimum recommended value of .32 (Costello & Osborne, 2005; Tabachnick & Fidell, 2001). The other
two variables, *Positive Juvenile Interaction* and *Positive Citizen Interaction*, shared moderate and high communalities, respectively. Due to these variables being measures of the *strategic* and *tactical dimensions* of community policing, this third component was labeled “Community-Oriented Behaviors.” The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) measure of sampling adequacy is middling at .724.

**Table 4.4. Oblique Rotated Pattern Matrix for Percent Duration Variables**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Factor Loading</th>
<th>Cronbach’s α</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Militaristic Behaviors</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military Weapons</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civilian Depicted in Handcuffs</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Firearms Drawn (Non-Training Context)</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWAT Deployment</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Militaristic Materials</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military Vehicles</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tactical Vests</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BDUs</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community-Oriented Behaviors</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Motor Patrol</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Juvenile Interaction</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Citizen Interaction</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It must be noted that there was a cross-loading present for *Military Weapons*, which appeared in the “Militaristic Materials” component with a communality of .37. According to the literature and the construction of the quantitative content analysis, *Military Weapons* is often conceptualized as a material indicator for militarization, so the loading of *Military Weapons* on the “Militaristic Materials” dimension is theoretically reasonable. However, the higher (.49) loading on the “Militaristic Behaviors” dimension would indicate that these military weapons were often depicted as being used, such as during an active SWAT deployment or when drawn firearms were depicted. This frequently proved to be the case, according to the researcher’s observations when coding the sampled videos using the Level 2 coding scheme. Additionally, the strong (.90) loading of *Civilian Depicted in Handcuffs* in the “Militaristic Behaviors”
component may seem at first to be unexpected or counterintuitive, as the act of handcuffing a suspect upon arrest is a standard and expected policing practice. However, as illustrated earlier in Figure 4.1, the depiction of civilians in handcuffs in the sampled recruitment videos often followed depictions of SWAT Deployments, with Military Weapons as Firearms Drawn (in Non-Training Context) (the average times to appearance of these measures illustrated in Table 4.3 support this observation), lending to an overall aggressive depiction of policing activities.

Table 4.5 presents the results of the second PCA, conducted on the statement variables of the sample. The statements split into two components as theoretically expected, with the statement measures for community policing loading on the first component, and the statement measures for militarization loading on the second, with moderate to high communalities among the variables in both components. The KMO is mediocre at .66.

Table 4.5. Oblique Rotated Pattern Matrix for Statement Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Factor Loading</th>
<th>Cronbach's α</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community-Oriented Statements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Engagement Statements</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empathy/Emotional Attachment Statements</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem Solving Statements</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COP Mission Statements</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Militaristic Statements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggressive Statements</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danger Statements</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The “Militaristic Statements” component, however, is somewhat problematic with only two variables; Costello and Osborne (2005) recommend that factors contain a minimum of three variables. However, the third statement measure of militarization, Exclusive Statements, occurred at too low a frequency to be reliably included in the PCA. Given the moderate to high
communalities of the other two statements in the “Militaristic Statements” factor and the limitations of the sample, the component is preserved.

As demonstrated by the two PCA models provided in Table 4.4 and 4.6, the Cronbach’s alpha levels of most components (“Militaristic Materials,” “Community-Oriented Behaviors,” and “Militaristic Statements”) are at unacceptably low levels, with only “Militaristic Behaviors” surpassing the desired statistic of >.70, and “Community-Oriented Statements” nearing the acceptable range at .65. As the quantitative content analysis and its codebook were informed by the literature on militarization and community-oriented policing, these low reliability statistics indicate that more research is needed to ascertain how to operationalize these concepts. While Kraska’s (2007) four-dimension framework is the most well-known and comprehensive outline of the concept militarization, and Cordner’s (1995) framework is likewise the best summary of community-oriented behaviors and values, the PCA results demonstrate that only militaristic operations and some aspects of hypermasculinity (captured by the “Militaristic Behaviors” factor), and statements of community-oriented values and problem solving (captured by the Community-Oriented Statements” factor) are somewhat reliable scales in the context of recruiting videos (though insufficient for capturing the entire concepts of police militarization and community-oriented policing). In spite of the factors with low alpha levels, there is still value to examining the second research question of the current study to determine whether the common predictors of militarization and community policing – as found in much of the literature on these concepts – have a relationship with the themes found in the quantitative content analysis.
Creation of Scales

As PCA is primarily a data reduction technique, preparation for Stage II of the current study involved the creation of additive scales from the resulting components of the PCA. Scores were saved from the PCA models, resulting in the generation of weighted component scores for the five aforementioned components for each of the sampled videos. Cronbach’s alpha statistics were calculated to determine the internal validity of the additive scales. Combining the scores for the “Militaristic Behaviors,” “Militaristic Materials,” and “Militaristic Statements” generated an acceptable Cronbach’s alpha statistic of .70; an additive scale was therefore created from these three factor scores to create a single militarization scale. Conversely, combining the scores for “Community-Oriented Behaviors” and “Community-Oriented Statements” generated a Cronbach’s alpha statistic of .37, which is lower than the alphas of the separate components (.40 and .65, respectively). These two scores were therefore retained as separate scale measures. This process resulted in three dependent variable scores: Militarization Score (PCA), COP Behaviors Score (PCA), and COP Statements Score (PCA).

A second set of additive scores was also generated using the standardized z-scores of each of the measures used in the PCA models. The z-scores were added together according to the PCA models’ pattern matrices generating three z-score dependent variable scores: Militarization Score (Z), COP Behaviors Score (Z), and COP Statements Score (Z). Cronbach’s alpha statistics for these additive scales using the variables’ z-scores were substantively similar to those of the PCA scales.
Objective and Subjective Agreement

The calculation of PCA and additive z-score scales not only contributed to the preparation of Stage II, but additionally assisted in comparing the subjective variables (Overall Militarized Tone and Overall COP Tone) to the scores generated by the objective measures.

Table 4.6. Bivariate Correlations Between PCA Scales and Subjective Tone Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Militarization Score (PCA)</th>
<th>COP Behaviors Score (PCA)</th>
<th>COP Statements Score (PCA)</th>
<th>Overall Militaristic Tone</th>
<th>Overall COP Tone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Militarization Score (PCA)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COP Behaviors Score (PCA)</td>
<td>-.080</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COP Statements Score (PCA)</td>
<td>-.208*</td>
<td>.133</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Militaristic Tone</td>
<td>.743***</td>
<td>-.223**</td>
<td>-.156†</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall COP Tone</td>
<td>.306***</td>
<td>.573***</td>
<td>.785***</td>
<td>-.395***</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

†p > .10, *p > .05, **p > .01, ***p > .001

Table 4.6 illustrates the bivariate correlations between the calculated PCA scales and the subjective tone variables coded for each of the sampled videos. There is a significant positive relationship between the Militarization Score (PCA) and the subjective measure of the Overall Militaristic Tone ($r_s = .743, p > .001$), and a significant negative relationship between the Militarization Score (PCA) and the Overall COP Tone ($r_s = -.306, p > .001$). The COP Behaviors Score (PCA) likewise correlates as expected, having a significant positive relationship with the Overall COP Tone ($r_s = .573, p > .001$), and a significant negative relationship with the Overall Militaristic Tone ($r_s = -.223, p = .009$). The COP Statements Score (PCA) nearly follows this same pattern, with a significant positive relationship with the Overall COP Tone ($r_s = .785, p > .001$), but with a marginally significant, negative relationship with the Overall Militarization Tone ($r_s = -.156, p = .070$). The PCA score variables therefore reflect the overall subjective sense of how militarized and how community-oriented the sampled videos were upon viewing.
The same analysis using the z-score scales reveals similar results (see Table 4.7 below), though the negative relationships between the COP Behaviors Score (Z) and COP Statements Score (Z) and the Overall Militarization Tone are not found to be significant.

**Table 4.7. Bivariate Correlations Between Z-Score Scales and Subjective Tone Measures**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Militarization Score (Z)</th>
<th>COP Behaviors Score (Z)</th>
<th>COP Statements Score (Z)</th>
<th>Overall Militaristic Tone</th>
<th>Overall COP Tone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Militarization Score (Z)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COP Behaviors Score (Z)</td>
<td>-.017</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COP Statements Score (Z)</td>
<td>-.094</td>
<td>.130</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Militaristic Tone</td>
<td>.772***</td>
<td>-.193</td>
<td>-.132</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall COP Tone</td>
<td>-.298***</td>
<td>.543***</td>
<td>.646***</td>
<td>-.395***</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

†p > .10, *p > .05, **p > .01, ***p > .001

**Stage I Summary**

Stage I involved the quantitative content analysis and assessment of themes in the sampled recruitment videos to answer the study’s first research question: *to what extent do police department recruitment portray militaristic and community oriented themes and artifacts?* While the results of the quantitative content analysis demonstrate that the measured themes have a high variance across the sampled videos, the majority of the measures in the created codebook were present at varying durations and amounts across the videos. The results of the PCA models likewise demonstrate that these measures do tend to load on separate components, with no cross-loadings between the measures for militarization and the measures of community policing. However, Cronbach’s alpha statistics demonstrated that, though the “militaristic behaviors” factor may be a reliable scale – as well as the additive scale of the measures of militarism combined – the alpha levels of the community policing factors are unacceptably low. This may
indicate that more measures of community policing be developed and added to future iterations of the quantitative content analysis codebook.

The scores calculated from the PCA models, as well as the additive z-score scales created to mirror the PCA scores, were also used to compare the coders’ subjective measures of the Overall Militarized Tone and the Overall COP Tone of the videos. These models likewise found significant correlations between the researcher’s subjective sense of militarization and community policing and the additive scores of the concepts as derived from the objective measures of the quantitative content analysis. In summary, the results of Stage I demonstrate that it is possible to observe the majority of militaristic and community-oriented themes as defined by the literature and measured through the codebook, though the duration and time to display of these themes varies widely across the sampled recruitment videos.

**Stage II Results**

The following section presents the findings of Stage II, which examines the relationship between possible predictors of police militarization and community policing (as defined by the literature) and the themes present in the sampled agencies’ recruitment videos. Following the univariate descriptives of these predictors, ordinal logistic regression models are presented to demonstrate the relationship between these variables and recruitment videos with high militarization scores (no significant predictors were found for videos with high COP behavior scores or high COP statement scores). Lastly, these results and their relationship to the second research question of the study are summarized at the end of the chapter.
Descriptive Results

Table 4.8 describes the predictors obtained by each agency of the sample. The average violent crime rate (per 100,000 residents in the agency’s jurisdiction) for 2013 was 975.09 (sd = 584.51), and the average drug crime rate (per 100,000 residents) for 2013 was 127.30 (sd = 74.67). The majority of agencies (65.6%) did not allow military service as a substitute for their educational requirements when hiring, though nearly one-fourth of the sample does allow military service as an alternative, and 11.5% of sampled agencies marked “not applicable” to this question in the LEMAS 2013. Between the years of 2012-2014, an average of 27.2% of the sample (n = 114, upon matching the DOD 1033 dataset with the 2013 LEMAS) had acquired at least one item from the 1033 Program that was categorized as being military in nature (as opposed to the general equipment available through the program, such as furniture or office supplies). The majority of the sample (61.7%) responded to the 2013 LEMAS as having a full-time SWAT team, with 35.5% having a part-time SWAT team, and a small minority (3%) not having a full- or part-time team.

Sampled agencies had an average of 13.3% (sd = 4.82) of full-time female sworn officers, and agencies had a slightly higher average percent of full-time sworn minority officers (29.87%), though there was much variance in the percentage of minority officers in the sampled departments (sd = 20.28). Sampled agencies had an average of 11.9% (sd = 7.75) of supervisory roles (such as police chief, immediate supervisor, or sergeant) staffed by female officers. Between the years of 2012 to 2017, the majority of the sampled agencies (57.5%) received a COPS grant, either for hiring more community-policing officers (the CHP), or for developing more community policing strategies (the CPD).
Table 4.8. Descriptives of Predictors obtained by Agency and Agency Location

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Min.</th>
<th>Max.</th>
<th>% / $\bar{x}$</th>
<th>$s$</th>
<th>$n$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Predictors</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violent Crime Rate</td>
<td>55.30</td>
<td>3372.30</td>
<td>975.09</td>
<td>584.51</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug Crime Rate</td>
<td>4.46</td>
<td>407.89</td>
<td>127.30</td>
<td>74.67</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military Hire Facilitation</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>65.6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1033 Military Acquisitions</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWAT Team</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-Time</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>61.7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-Time</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>35.3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Full- or Part-Time Team</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Women</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>13.30</td>
<td>4.82</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Minorities</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>29.87</td>
<td>20.28</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women in Supervisory Roles</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>11.90</td>
<td>7.75</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COPS Grants</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>57.5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SARA Projects</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>78.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem Solving in Eval. Criteria</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>57.4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Partnership</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Survey</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>56.8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-Service COP Training</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Officers</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some Officers</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>38.2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Officers</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>30.5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Control Variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midwest</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>51.9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Politics</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>73.3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>25.2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Split Vote</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department Size</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>12042</td>
<td>1057.45</td>
<td>1564.33</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Functional Differentiation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>11.06</td>
<td>14.72</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As for control variables, the majority of the sampled agencies (51.9%) were located in the South, followed by the West (24.4%), the Midwest (16.3%), and the Northeast (7.4%). The sampled agencies were located in counties where the majority (73.3%) voted Democrat for the 2016 General Presidential Election, a quarter (25.2%) voted Republican, and a slim minority...
were located in counties where there was a split vote. As for organizational descriptives, the average department size (by number of full-time sworn officers) was approximately 1,057 officers, with wide variance between departments (sd = 1,564.33), and sampled agencies had an average of 11.06 units dedicated to specialized tasks (Functional Differentiation), with wide variance between departments (14.72).

**Predictors of Video Scores**

Predictors of high militarization scores in the videos are presented in Table 4.9. These models used Militarization Scores (Z) (calculated in Stage I) as the dependent variable, recoded based on quartiles (with the first as “low,” second and third quartiles as “medium,” and fourth as “high”) to generate an ordinal measure of low, medium, and high for video militarization themes. Though the video scales were created using both PCA scores and z-scores in Stage I, these models present the findings using Militarization Scores (Z), as these models had the best model fit statistics. However, a number of other models were conducted: ordinal logistic regression PCA scores (recoded by quartiles, as with Militarization Scores (Z)), separate binomial regression models of PCA scores and z-scores recoded to dichotomous outcome measures (using a 50% cutoff point for “low-to-medium” and “medium-to-high”), and ordinal logistic regression of an additive scale of dichotomous indicators for the presence of militarization measures. The findings of these models mirror the findings of the final z-score scale models, though none of these models reached significant overall fit statistics.

appropriate models were also conducted for COP Statement Scores and COP Behavior Scores, with both the PCA and z-score versions of these scales being recoded into the same separate variables as the recoded Militarization Scores. None of these models were found to be
significant. One binomial regression model using the dichotomized *COP Behavior Score (PCA)* indicated a significant, negative relationship (OR = .86, p = .027) with the percent of female sworn officers in an agency, as well as a significant, positive relationship (OR = 1.08, p = .045) with the percent of female supervisors in an agency, but the overall model fit was not significant ($x^2 = 14.15, p = .117$). Other models with the recoded *COP Behavior Scores* found the relationship between female supervisors and high COP behavior scores in an agency to be marginally significant and positively related. However, none of the models were found to be significant. None of the models assessing the various recodes of *COP Statement Scores* found any significant relationships. Therefore only the results of the predictors on the *Militarization Scores (Z)* are presented.

Due to the size of the sample and data obtained for the various predictors, separate models were conducted to preserve statistical power. Table 4.9 therefore does not present blocked models, but presents four separate models together in one table for ease of presentation and readability. These models were divided based on rough categorizations of types of predictors, with Model 1 assessing crime rates, Model 2 assessing common predictors of militarization (other than crime rates), Model 3 assessing predictors of organizational diversity and community-oriented policing, and Model 4 assessing the specific LEMAS 2013 COP measures as predictors. Control variables (*Region, Local Politics, Department Size*, and *Functional Differentiation*) are included in each of the models.
Table 4.9. Ordinal logistic regression results with recoded *Militarization Score (Z)* as dependent variable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Covariates</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Model 3</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Model 4</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wald X2</td>
<td>Logit (SE)</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>Wald X2</td>
<td>Logit (SE)</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>Wald X2</td>
<td>Logit (SE)</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>Wald X2</td>
<td>Logit (SE)</td>
<td>OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Thresholds</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>-.990 (.61)</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>8.10**</td>
<td>-1.16 (.41)</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>2.83†</td>
<td>-1.14 (.68)</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>4.62*</td>
<td>-1.60 (.75)</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>.823 (.61)</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>.587 (.39)</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.632 (.67)</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.204 (.73)</td>
<td>1.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Region</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coastal</td>
<td>8.22**</td>
<td>-1.29 (.45)</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>-.475 (.46)</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>3.99*</td>
<td>-1.16 (.41)</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>4.02*</td>
<td>-1.869 (.43)</td>
<td>.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midwest</td>
<td>3.69†</td>
<td>-1.08 (.56)</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>-.346 (.54)</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>-.335 (.51)</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>4.77*</td>
<td>-1.16 (.53)</td>
<td>.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South (Ref.)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Politics</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democrat (Ref.)</td>
<td>2.87†</td>
<td>-.747 (.44)</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>-.279 (.43)</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>-.444 (.42)</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>-.331 (.42)</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department Size</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>.000 (.00)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.610 (.00)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>.000 (.00)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>.000 (.00)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Functional Differentiation</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>-.014 (.02)</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.007 (.02)</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.003 (.02)</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.002 (.02)</td>
<td>.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violent Crime Rate</td>
<td>5.11*</td>
<td>-.001 (.00)</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug Crime Rate</td>
<td>7.63**</td>
<td>.009 (.00)</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military Hire Facilitation</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.013 (.46)</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1033 Military Acquisition</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.041 (.47)</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWAT Team</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-Time</td>
<td>3.05†</td>
<td>-1.739 (.42)</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Full-Time (Ref.)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Women</td>
<td>2.83†</td>
<td>.076 (.05)</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Minorities</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.002 (.01)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Female</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>-.032 (.03)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COPS Grant</td>
<td>7.68**</td>
<td>-1.05 (.38)</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SARA Projects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS in Eval. Criteria</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>.796 (.52)</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Partnership</td>
<td>11.85***</td>
<td>-1.43 (.41)</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Survey</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-.132 (.41)</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-Service COP Training</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>.403 (.39)</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Officers</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>-.570 (.48)</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some Officers</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>.090 (.48)</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Officers (Ref.)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Model Fit</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chi-Square</td>
<td>18.68*</td>
<td>6.44</td>
<td>17.30*</td>
<td>23.81*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negelkerke R²</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test of Parallel Lines (p)</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

†p<.10, *p<.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001
Model 1. The first model assesses the effect of 2013 drug and violent crime rates obtained from the UCR for each agency in the sample on the Militarization Scores (Z) (recoded to low, medium, and high) of the sampled videos, while controlling for region of agency, local politics, department size, and functional differentiation. Both crime rate predictors were found to be significant, though in opposing directions. Violent crime rates were found to be significantly negatively related (OR = .99, p = .024), indicating that, for every unit increase in local violent crime rates, agencies have a 1% decreased propensity for having a video displaying a high militarization score (as opposed to a low or medium score). Drug crime rates were positively related (p = .006) to high militarization scores, however, indicating that for every unit increase in local drug crime rates, agencies have a 1% increased propensity of having a recruitment video with a high militarization score increases by 1%.

As for the control variables, region was also found to be significant (p = .004), with agencies in coastal regions (the West and East coasts) having a 72% decreased propensity for having a video with a high militarization score. Being located in the Midwest and in counties that voted majority Democrat for the 2016 General Presidential Election were also both negatively related to high militarization scores, though both were only marginally significant (p = .055, and p = .090, respectively).

All of the variables in Model 1 combined were found to be significant ($\chi^2 = 18.64$, p = .009), though with a pseudo-$R^2$ of .18, the variables in Model 1 explain 18% of the variance in militarization scores in the sampled recruitment videos.

Model 2. The second model tests the effect of common indicators of militarization on video militarization scores, with the control variables included. None of the variables included in Model 2 reached significance. Having a full-time SWAT team (as opposed to part-time team or
having dedicated personnel only) was found to be marginally significant (p = .081), with a negative relationship with high video militarization scores. The overall model fit was also not significant.

**Model 3.** The third model tests the effect of organizational diversity and COPS grants on militarization scores, with the control variables included. While none of the indicators of organizational diversity were found to have a significant relationship with videos with high militarization scores (*Percent Women* is marginally significant at p = .092), obtaining a COPS grant was found to be a reverse indicator for high militarization video scores. Specifically, agencies that obtained a COPS grant between the years of 2012-2017 were found to have a 65% decreased propensity of having a recruitment video with a high militarization score (p = .006). Of the control variables, region was again found to be significant, with agencies located in coastal regions having a significant (p = .046), negative relationship with high militarization scores.

As for the overall model fit, all of the variables in Model 2 combined were found to be significant ($x^2 = 17.30$, p = .044), and explained 15% of the variance in militarized scores in the sampled recruitment videos.

**Model 4.** Model 4 tested the relationship between the LEMAS 2013 COP measures and the sampled videos’ militarization scores, with controls included. One of the LEMAS 2013 COP measures (*PS in Eval. Criteria*) was found to be a reverse indicator of high militarization scores. Specifically, agencies with collaborative problem solving included as part of their officers’ evaluation criteria were found to have a 76% decreased propensity of having a recruitment video with a high militarization score (p = .001).
Regional location of agency was again found to be significantly related, with agencies in coastal regions having a 58% decreased propensity of having a video with a high militarization score \( (p = .045) \), and agencies in the Midwest having a 69% decreased propensity of having a high militarization score \( (p = .029) \).

Overall, Model 4 was found to be significant \( (x^2 = 23.81, p = .022) \), and explains 21% of the variance in the sampled videos’ militarization scores.

None of the four models violated the parallel lines assumptions, as the tests of parallel lines were found to be not significant for all models. Some multicollinearity was present in Model 1, with *Drug Crime Rates* and *Department Size* having a correlation coefficient of -0.81. These variables were still retained in the model given the theoretical importance of drug crime rates in the militarization literature (however, the specific data used for the present study’s *Drug Crime Rates* will be discussed in the limitations section of the following chapter). No other multicollinearity was found to be present in the models. Filtering the sample to ensure only one video was examined per agency ensured that the independence assumption was not violated.

As previously discussed, models were also conducted for various recoded treatments of the *Militarization Scores*. While the other models had unacceptable model fit statistics, these models were consistent in finding *Drug Crime Rates* as having a significant, positive relationship with high militarization scores, and *COPS Grants* and *Problem Solving in Eval. Criteria* as having significant, negative relationships with high militarization scores. These models varied between significant and marginally significant for *Violent Crime Rates*, though the negative direction was consistent across all models. Lastly, the dichotomous recoding of *Militarization Scores (PCA)* and *Militarization Scores (Z)* found politics to be significant (with counties that voted Democrat having a negative, significant relationship), whereas the ordinal recoded scales
found region (mostly Coastal, but also Midwest, as demonstrated in the presented models) to be significant. This is likely an artifact of the different cut points of the dichotomous measure as compared to the ordinal one.

**Stage II Summary**

Stage II assessed potential predictors of recruitment video themes, based on possible predictors of militarization and community policing found in the literature. Findings relate to two of the specific hypotheses provided in Chapter Three. Namely, Hypothesis One was not supported, though violent crime rates were found to be significant in the opposite direction. However, Hypothesis Two found support, with a significant, positive relationship being found between high drug crime rates and high militarization scores in agency recruitment videos.

Two variables were found to be reverse indicators of high militarization scores, as discussed in Chapter Three. Specifically, agencies that were recipients of COPS grants have a significant, decreased propensity of having videos with high militarization scores, and the same relationship was found for agencies that include collaborative problem solving projects as part of officers’ evaluation criteria. While no significant relationships were found between agency predictors and agency recruitment videos with high COP behavior or statement scores, these two hypothesized predictors of community policing were significant reverse indicators of high militarization scores. The findings of Stage II therefore answer the second research question of the study by finding that the aforementioned four variables are significantly (one positively and three negatively) related to high militarization scores in recruitment videos in the present study.
CHAPTER FIVE

DISCUSSION

The purpose of the current study was to collect and analyze themes of militarization and community policing in police recruitment videos, and to ascertain whether commonly theorized predictors of militarization and community policing were related with the themes found in law enforcement agencies’ videos. While there are a number of limitations to this exploratory study – as will be discussed in the latter part of the chapter – the findings offer valuable insight into law enforcement agencies’ self-portrayals in recruitment videos and the contextual factors that may influence the creation of more militarized recruitment videos. These findings additionally offer several important avenues for future research using quantitative content analysis and police recruitment videos to examine militarized and community-oriented artifacts, values, and behaviors.

Study Findings

The findings of Stage I, the quantitative content analysis, demonstrate that it is possible to observe militarized and community-oriented themes and artifacts in law enforcement recruitment videos, with a number of militarization measures being present in approximately one-third of the sampled videos (and others, such as statements, occurring less frequently), and a number of community-oriented behavior measures being present in one-third to one-half of the sampled videos (with some measures, such as the diversity measures, occurring less frequently). Specifically, the militaristic materials and behavior measures, such as military weapons, tactical vests, and BDUs, and SWAT deployments, were present in about one-third of the sample, though
these measures varied widely in average duration and positioning (time to first occurrence) in the sampled videos. In regards to the subjective measure of Overall Militarized Tone, the majority of videos were rated as not at all militaristic, approximately one-quarter were rated as slightly militaristic, and 17.5% were rated as moderately-to-extremely militaristic. Bivariate correlations demonstrated strong, significant correlations between the scales created for militarization scores and the subjective Overall Militarized Tone measure.

As for community-oriented policing themes, the majority of videos (50% and higher) contained community engagement statements, male interviewees, and at least one female officer and at least one non-white officer. Non-motor patrol, positive juvenile and community interactions, and most statement variables (statements of emotional attachment/empathy, problem solving statements, and COP mission statements) were present in approximately 30-40% of the sampled videos. Some measures, however, were not frequently present, these being depictions of officers assisting vulnerable civilians, officers speaking in a civilian’s (non-English) language, and statements of the department’s value of officer foreign language proficiency. Reflecting the frequencies of most of these measures, slightly less than one-quarter of the videos were rated as not at all community-oriented with the subjective Overall Community-Oriented Tone measure, approximately 40% were rated as at least slightly community-oriented, and 37% were rated as being moderately-to-extremely community-oriented. Bivariate correlations demonstrated strong, significant relationships between the PCA-generated COP statement and behaviors scores and the Overall Community-Oriented Tone measure.

Stage II of the present study found significant relationships between several hypothesized predictors. Two of these were found to be reverse indicators, with COPS grants and collaborative
problem solving in officers’ evaluation criteria being found as negatively related to agencies with recruitment videos that had high militarization scores. COPS grants are particularly interesting as a significant reverse indicator of high militarization scores, as it has been suggested by both scholars and media that federal grants can be used by law enforcement agencies to obtain military equipment or enhance paramilitary tactics (Balko, 2013; DemocracyNow, 2011; Hill & Beger, 2009; ). While an examination of recruitment videos alone cannot reveal how these agencies are using the grants they are obtaining from the COPS office, this finding may indicate that these agencies are using their grants to enhance community policing strategies and recruit officers that agree with community policing values. Future research may do well to examine whether any COPS grant funds were specifically used for these agencies’ recruitment advertising and media, if possible.

The significant, negative relationship between agencies with collaborative problem solving in their officers’ evaluation criteria and videos with high militarization scores is more straightforward from a theoretical lens. Many measures of community-oriented policing are, as has been previously discussed, vague in both definition and operationalization, and even the LEMAS 2013 COP measures include several vaguely defined questions. For example, the question of whether an agency has a community-oriented component in their mission statement can be easily marked as “yes” by an agency, but this does not inform researchers as to whether these agencies are actively employing the strategies and behaviors that are outlined in their mission statement. Some of the more objective, behavior-based LEMAS COP measures included in the present study are likewise still problematic. For example, the measure for SARA-type problem solving projects being actively encouraged can be marked as ‘yes’ by a surveyed law enforcement agency, though deeper information, such as how many projects are encouraged,
whether these projects that the agencies define as “SARA-type problem solving projects” fit a service orientation or a more “zero-tolerance” policing style, and what an agency considers to be “active” encouragement, are not captured by the survey. The measure for collaborative problem solving being in officers’ evaluation criteria, however, is rather more concrete. Though agencies may still vary in their interpretations of what “collaborative problem solving” entails, its insertion into individual officers’ evaluation criteria entails a sense of officer accountability, and touches on one of Miller’s (1999) recommendations for fostering an effective community policing model. Again, while video themes cannot directly be linked to law enforcement agency cultures – only their self-portrayals and artifacts – this finding indicates that agencies that include an accountability feature for collaborative problem solving are less likely to produce highly militarized recruitment videos.

Significance was found for another hypothesized predictor, violent crime rates, but in a different direction than hypothesized in Hypothesis One. Specifically, violent crime rates – though hypothesized as being positively related to high militarization scores in videos, were found through ordinal logistic regression to have a significant, negative relationship. This finding runs counter to the suggestions made by Paoline (2003) and Wilson (1968) that law enforcement agencies in higher-crime areas may adapt a more aggressive, legalistic organizational culture due to higher perceptions of danger. While Paoline (2003) and Wilson’s (1968) suggestion may follow somewhat of Lawrence and Lorsch’s (1968) contingency theory model of organizational change – whereby organizations’ responses are driven by external and internal concerns, such as external threat perceptions and internal concerns for officer safety (Nowacki & Willits, 2016) – the findings here may indicate an alternative theory of organizational decision-making, such as Cohen and colleagues’ “garbage can model”. This model suggests a complex interplay of
problems, interpretations, and solutions encountered by an organization, which often leaves problems unresolved due to the opportunity for problem-solving (enabled by the right combination of timing, organizational energy, and decisionmakers) having a short (or mistimed) window of time (Cohen, March, & Olsen, 1972). According to this model, agencies in areas with high violent crime rates may not automatically adopt a more aggressive, crime-control response or other adaptations (such as obtaining military equipment through the 1033 Program) due to a yet unexplored interplay of these organizations’ decisionmakers, their interpretations of this problem, and the context surrounding possible solutions.

However, contrary to the finding of violent crime rates and their relationship with high militarization video scores, high drug crime rates were found to be positively related to high militarization scores, thus supporting Hypothesis Two. This is theoretically unsurprising, given the relationship between the “war on drugs” and paramilitary policing explored by scholars like Kraska and Cubellis (1997) and Kraska and Kappeler (1997), and brought to public attention by journalists such as Balko (2013). However, caution must be taken when assessing the causality of this relationship. While the regression model uses drug crime rates as a predictor of agencies having videos with high militarization scores, readers must keep in mind that the UCR data for drug crime rates obtained for this study records total arrests for all drug offenses. A high rate of drug offense arrests may either indicate overall high drug usage in an area, or may indicate an aggressive targeting of drug offense crimes by law enforcement. This relationship therefore can either be an indication of law enforcement agency adaptation to the external environment, driving organizational adoption of aggressive tactics (that are then reflected in their recruitment videos), or it can be an indication that some law enforcement agencies are already aggressively targeting drug offenses, leading to higher drug offense arrest rates and recruitment videos that
reflect these organizations’ already aggressive values. The relationship found in the current study cannot establish which came first: the high drug crime rate or the department organizational culture and consequent behaviors (or a mixture of both). However, whether as a perceived need for aggressive drug crime control or as a preexisting value system, these agencies have a significantly higher propensity for creating recruiting videos that contain more militarized themes and artifacts.

Several of the non-significant predictors are intriguing, given their strong emphasis in the literature. While the lack of relationships between the community policing-related predictors and the COP statement and behaviors scores may be due to the lack of sufficient measures to create the scores, as discussed previously, it is interesting that no relationships were found between SWAT Team or 1033 Acquisitions and militarization scores. This would indicate that, for the current sample, departments with full-time SWAT teams or who have acquired military equipment through the 1033 Program were not “showing these off” to potential applicants at a statistically significant rate.

**Theoretical Discussion and Additional Avenues of Future Research**

Reflecting back to the original supposition of the present study, law enforcement recruitment videos were selected as a potential data source due to the themes and artifacts they contain that may possibly reflect their departments’ cultural values. While the results of the present study cannot be used to support arguments that these videos directly reflect the organizational cultures of their originating departments, the themes and artifacts observed in the sampled recruitment videos do reflect these departments’ choices of self-portrayal through an advertising medium (Barber, 1998; Wanous, 1980).
The findings of the present study therefore cannot claim to provide any “answers” to the discussion of the origins of police militarization, such as the “iron fist and velvet glove” paradox. Indeed, the present sample of law enforcement agencies may share militarized historical roots, and some may embrace a hypermasculine, aggressive culture while outwardly embracing the rhetoric of community policing as a strategy to gain public legitimacy, as asserted by Kappeler and Kraska (1998). It is certainly clear that the majority of the sample portrayed more community-oriented themes than militarized ones, though a minority displayed a high concentration of militarized themes and artifacts without apparent constraint to the pressures to display outward appearances of COP rhetoric. This latter category is particularly interesting, given its deviation from Kappeler and Kraska’s (1998) assertions. However, returning to the recruiting literature, the display of artifacts and themes in a recruiting advertisement to attract likeminded applicants reflects a choice of what the agency would like to reflect about itself, as well as how the agency chooses to portray the policing job (Avery & McKay, 2006; Herriot, 2004; O’Reilly, Chatman, & Caldwell, 1991; Schneider, 1987; Walker et al., 2009; Walker & Hinojosa, 2014).

These choices in self-portrayal and advertising were observed throughout the sample, with several striking examples of differences in agency self-portrayal and artifacts. For example, Figure 5.1 contrasts a nearly first-person perspective from one department’s video that received a moderate-to-extreme rating for *Overall Militaristic Tone* with another department’s video that received a moderate-to-extreme rating for *Overall Community-Oriented Tone*. These two scenes both provide the viewer an opportunity to see a civilian interaction through an officer’s perspective, though the differences between these interactions are rather dramatic.
Though it could be argued that both positive interactions with community members and higher intensity encounters that would justifiably lead an officer to draw a firearm are both involved in the policing occupation, these are portrayed in a medium that is specifically created
for advertising to potential recruits. Additionally, the particular video from which the scene on
the left of Figure 5.1 was taken portrayed 25 and 15 percent durations of firearms (in non-
training contexts) and active pursuit measures (respectively), and only 4 and 1 percent durations
of positive juvenile and civilian interaction measures (respectively): an unbalanced reflection of
the policing career, the majority of which is comprised of welfare tasks and administrative work.

If recruitment media acts primarily as an advertisement to attract applicants who find the
portrayed artifacts and themes to be appealing (Schneider, 1987; Tom, 1971), the two law
enforcement agencies that created the videos portrayed in Figure 5.1 are attempting to attract two
very different potential recruits: one finding appeal in the idea of positively interacting with
citizens and handing children stickers, and another finding appeal in intense encounters that
involve firearms and the potential use of force. While individuals may find appeal in both
situations, depending on the context, the high percent of duration of community-oriented themes
and nonexistent percentage of militarized or crime-control themes in the video of the second
agency, and the reverse in the video of the first agency, seems to present a focused choice to
advertise one value system to the exclusion of others. (It must be noted, however, that a number
of videos in the sample shared a balance of themes; future research would do well to assess these
departments as well).

It should be recognized that some law enforcement agencies may be focusing on the
themes that it considers will be the most exciting to the widest audience, which may not be
entirely reflective of the agency’s own organizational value system. While this may indeed be
the case for some departments, the themes that an agency thinks will appeal to applicants and
that the agency approves of enough to include in a recruiting video that represents them are still
indicative of conscious organizational decisions. For example, an additional example from a
different department is illustrated in Figure 5.2. The video includes, among other produced scenes, a segment of live footage, perhaps from a dashboard camera, of a Black civilian who hits a ball with a baseball bat. An officer enters from the viewer’s left, pointing a long gun at the civilian. The civilian leaps back, and then brings up the bat. The footage is cut short and the recruitment video switches scenes before the viewer is given any information as to why the officer entered the scene with a long gun raised at a single minority civilian that is not involved in any obvious criminal infraction. The lack of any contextual information surrounding this footage segment leads one to question why the creators of the video decided to include this footage in their recruiting advertisement and ultimately, who they are attempting to attract with this choice of inclusion.

*Figure 5.2. Live Footage Segment in a Sampled Video (Lubbock Police Department, 2016)*
In contrast, several departments filmed viral challenge videos – such as the Running Man Challenge – depicting numerous positive interactions between the police and diverse groups of civilians, such as in Figure 5.3. While some may suggest that these videos are a public relations technique and image management, these videos, as well as the second video illustrated in Figure 5.2, portray dramatically different advertising choices. The researcher noted intentional statements in many of the videos that scored highly on the COP statement and behaviors scales as well, indicating that many of these departments were conscious in their efforts to attract applicants that valued community engagement (actual frequency of these departments should be determined by future research examining transcription and textual analysis of the videos, as will be discussed later in the present chapter).

*Figure 5.3. An Officer Dances During a Running Man Challenge Recruiting Video (Raleigh Police Department, 2016)*
It must be noted that these videos are primarily a reflection of the themes, artifacts, and self-portrayal chosen by the upper administrators of an agency, and may not be a reflection of line officers, who can have separate cultures (Caldero & Crank, 2010). Likewise, an outside third party may professionally produce a video by contract with a law enforcement agency (indeed, future research would do well to control for production type if this information is possible to obtain). However, individual agencies’ organizational culture is often formed and constructed by the upper administration and passed down the organizational hierarchy (Paoline, 2003; Schein, 1992). While the line-level officers of an agency may share a sub-culture somewhat separate to that of the administrators of an agency (and may indeed acculturate new recruits into this line-officer culture), organizational values and artifacts may still be defined at the upper administrative level and are likewise communicated in recruiting messages. Externally produced videos are also still subject to the approval of the upper administrative level, and therefore may still communicate the artifacts and organizational image that the agency’s administration would like to use to attract applicants. Indeed, future research would do well to examine the approval process in these agencies.

In the case of law enforcement agencies that create a video of themes and artifacts that they think are the most appealing or exciting – instead of a seemingly more calculated image projection as discussed by the recruitment literature – these agencies are still communicating a message regarding what their organizational culture deems as appealing or exciting. However, to discern whether the recruiting literature cited is applicable to law enforcement recruiting practices, the logical next step would be to assess potential recruits’ judgements of which videos they find to be most appealing, and whether these videos align with the recruits’ value systems and ideologies. Results would not only inform the premise of the present study, but would
likewise be beneficial to individual law enforcement agencies seeking to attract applicants who hold to certain values – such as empathy, as suggested by Muir (1979), or those held by the policed of the agency’s location to be more representative of community value systems (Caldero & Crank, 2010).

**Recruiting Videos and Semiotics**

However, when assessing individuals’ perceptions of, and attraction to, police recruitment videos, it is important to briefly address the semiotics of visual imagery. While a discussion of semiotics may engender more questions and complexity to the subject of police organizational culture and recruitment advertising, recognition of this complexity can lead to more informed research and a richer understanding of perceptions of police recruiting media and the messages they contain.

In short, semiotics of visual imagery involves the interpretation of layers of meaning that are carried by images, objects, symbols, or other visuals in communication (van Leeuwen, 2001). Modern approaches to media analysis recognize that interpretation of a message is not constant, but varies based on the interpretation of the viewer (Macnamara, 2003; Morrison, 2016). While messages are often accompanied with cultural and even universal symbols or context to assist in communicating a certain message (see Macnamara [2005] for a discussion of cultural and international shared meanings attached to some facial expressions, road signs, mathematical symbols, and other more universal imagery that assists viewer interpretation), individuals may interpret visual messages differently based on a complex interplay of innate (such as race, ethnicity, gender, nationality, personality disposition, and social background) and experiential (such as occupation, education, family and social circles, religion, and current socioeconomic
status) factors that can affect a viewer’s sense of an image’s connotations (see Macnamara, 2003). Individual and cultural experiences of trauma and the aftermath of traumatic events can also affect viewers’ interpretations of the media (Kaplan, 2005).

Recall, for example, the scene of the African-American man with the baseball bat and the police officer with a long gun depicted in Figure 5.2. As it is difficult to determine even the objective record of events and context behind them, individual interpretations of this event may vary dramatically based on race and ethnicity, ideologies, and history of experiences with the police. Outgroup bias and its effect on threat perception, as well as beliefs that most police officers use justifiable, proportionate force may prime a viewer to interpret this scene drastically differently than a young Black viewer who has previously experienced unjust treatment by law enforcement, or a supporter of Black Lives Matter or similar social justice groups. Recall also the image comparison in Figure 5.1. Morrison (2016), in her assessment of the semiotics of police body-worn camera footage, observes that the first-person framing of body-worn camera footage places the viewer directly into the officer’s perspective. Particularly for viewers that regularly play first-person shooter video games, this type of framing directly places the viewer into a role often associated with the protagonist (which may bias a viewer to view the officer’s actions positively when viewing body-worn camera footage) (Morrison, 2016). Another example (Figure 5.4), taken from an older video still prominently found on the department’s website at the time of sample collection, demonstrates this same type of perspective filming, reminiscent of the U.S. Army’s recruiting video game series, America’s Army. Therefore even hobbies, such as gaming, appear to affect viewers’ diverse interpretations of visual media.
Even the present study, while designed to objectively measure concepts based whether they occurred and the duration of occurrence, demonstrates some variance in coder interpretation for the subjective measures of overall video tone ratings. While the present study’s consensus coding scheme did not allow for the calculation of true intercoder reliability statistics, the calculation of the researcher’s ratings of Overall Militarization Tone for the videos compared with those of the student coders (grouped as one entity, as the coders each coded a separate set of videos) generated a Cohen’s kappa of .48 (p < .001), indicating the lower end of moderate levels of agreement (Landis & Koch, 1977). Cohen’s kappa for Overall Community-Oriented Tone was likewise moderate. Possible reasons behind the variance between the researcher and the coders could potentially be attributed to the researcher’s familiarity with policing literature, occupation, and background, while to coders varied in their backgrounds as well, with one coder’s current
occupation being an intern with a local police department, and another having a military background.

Recognizing this variance in viewers’ backgrounds and interpretations of the same visual media should not only inform the addition of a diverse set of demographic control variables to the aforementioned future study of potential applicant’s attraction to police recruitment videos, but also leads to thoughtworthy points of future discussion. Consider the collection of images from several of the sampled videos below in Figures 5.4-5.6.

*Figure 5.5. Officers Training (Tucson Police Department, 2017)*
Figure 5.6. Officers in BDUs on Patrol (Pembroke Pines Police Department, 2016)

Figure 5.7. Officers Engaged in a SWAT Deployment (Clearwater Police Department, 2017)
These images show police officers depicted with a combination of several militaristic material indicators included in the present study. The officers in Figure 5.5 are wearing BDUs and tactical vests; there are no visible weapons and there is no visible uniform designation that these officers are police officers. Figure 5.6 features a group of officers wearing BDUs and tactical vests, holding their rifles in a patrol carry position, with one wearing a facemask. There are no visible designations on the fronts or sides of their uniforms that they are police officers. Figure 5.7 features several officers wearing tactical vests and BDUs, with their rifles drawn in a depressed muzzle position, with “POLICE” designated on their tactical vests. Are each of these images equally indicative of police militarization, or do some additional items (the BDUs, facemasks, or rifles), words (indicators that these officers are police officers), tactical positions, and contextual information (training depictions, music or narrative provided with these images) increase or decrease the viewer’s perception of militarization? Is the mere presence of one of these images (or another visible indicator of militarization used in the current study), regardless of its duration (or the duration of other measures) enough to give a viewer a high overall impression of the militaristic tone in a video? Or do the presence and duration of more community-oriented themes (indeed, all three of the above videos portray a balance of community-oriented themes as well) serve to mitigate these perceptions? While this may vary based on the viewer, this raises the question of whether even objective measures of occurrence and duration capture this potential weighting of indicators.

**Thematic Analysis and Qualitative Content Analysis**

These questions of semiotics, as well as the findings discussed earlier in the chapter, should compel future research to consider exploring themes and artifacts in police recruitment
videos using a qualitative approach, both to inform the refinement of the quantitative codebook, and to explore other themes that may arise as well.

Though semiotic approaches recognize variability at the individual level, qualitative content analysis of visual media informed by semiotics approaches are useful in discerning common techniques to communicate generally-accepted meaning or connotations, such as the use of distance to communicate relational closeness, both between persons in an image, and between the viewer and these persons though camera framing (Macnamara, 2005; van Leeuwen, 2001). Future qualitative research would do well to further explore the techniques used by law enforcement agencies to communicate meaning, both through filming techniques (such as positioning and framing) and through text analysis of transcriptions of the videos.

Indeed, certain words were frequently observed during the coding of the videos, such as the words “adrenaline” and “thrill” in some videos, and the words “counselor” (with the latter occurring with perceived frequency in videos that scored highly in both the COP statement and behavior scores). Specific values were also stated or displayed across the screen, such as “integrity” or “service.” Transcription of the sample would assist in uncovering further measures and potential statements, and would offer further opportunity for textual analysis, such as the examination of adjectives used when describing people, communities, or organizations, or other categories of emotional or aggressive language not included in the present study (Macnamara, 2005). These techniques may also be extended to include other forms of police recruiting media, such as flyers, billboards, posters, recruiting websites, and social media pages.

Qualitative content analysis of recruitment videos may be conducted either inductively or deductively. Using an inductive, thematic analysis and thematic network approach can be beneficial in uncovering themes, examining their groupings, and developing broader concepts
from these themes (Attride-Sterling, 2001). This approach may assist in uncovering other alternative categories of law enforcement organizational self-portrayal aside from the two discussed in the present study. Using a deductive qualitative content analysis approach (beginning with the broad concepts of militarization and community policing), however, can assist in systematically uncovering yet-unknown themes that fall into these broader categories, and can be used to develop the concepts of militarization and community policing (Macnamara, 2005; Mayring, 2000). For example, some common themes observed during the coding of the current sample were depictions of weightlifting, simulated K-9 attacks, depictions of armed civilians, and some common music genres. Deductive analysis can assist in the further development and refinement of the present study’s quantitative content analysis, which should be replicated and assessed with confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) to assist in establishing this novel method through which to examine police organizational variance in self-portrayals and themes.

**Limitations of the Present Study**

While the findings of the present study assist in demonstrating that quantitative content analysis can be a novel potential tool through which to examine police agencies’ organizational values and artifacts, there are several limitations that must be addressed. These include limitations of the construction and coding of the quantitative content analysis, limitations of the findings of Stage I, and limitations of the findings of Stage II. Awareness of these limitations, as well as the consideration of the previously discussed avenues of future research, will assist in strengthening further studies utilizing content analysis to examine police recruitment videos.
**Limitations of the Method**

Primary among these limitations – not only for the construction of the quantitative content analysis, but for the present study in sum – is the limited sample size. While this exploratory study examined the 200 largest municipal and county law enforcement agencies due to their increased likelihood to have the resources needed to create and maintain current recruitment videos, this figure only captures 1.4 to 5.3% of all local police departments in the United States (Bureau of Justice Statistics, 2015). Further research would do well to gather a more representative sample across agency sizes to examine whether smaller agencies generate videos that contain observable themes of militarization and community policing. While smaller agencies may not have the resources necessary to generate recruiting videos, including more agency types can provide insight into any differences in smaller agencies’ self-portrayal and artifacts compared to the largest agencies of the United States.

A second limitation is the possible existence of differences between the agencies within the sample that did not have recruitment videos, compared to the sampled agencies that had videos. No significant differences were found between these agencies in the sample, with the exception of whether or not these agencies have a full-time SWAT team. At this point, it is difficult to ascertain why there is a significant relationship between the status of an agency’s SWAT team and whether the agency has a current recruitment video; future research would therefore do well to examine this relationship further, as well as examine other potential differences in these agencies.

A third limitation to the quantitative content analysis is the lack of intercoder reliability during the coding process. As the present content analysis was constructed based on a consensus coding scheme, the coders of Level 1 coded the first instance of every measure occurrence, and
these data were automatically populated into the Level 2 Microsoft Access form. The coder of Level 2 (the researcher) confirmed these data or changed them as necessary, while also coding for repeated occurrences of measures. True intercoder reliability and agreement would have been generated only if additional coders had independently coded the entire sample using the Level 2 coding scheme, and these coders’ annotations had been compared with the researcher’s independent Level 2 annotations. Future research would do well to involve several trained coders in the Level 2 coding process, each of which would annotate the entire video sample, in order to generate reliability and agreement statistics.

As for the construction of the quantitative content analysis, the individual measures included in the codebook were largely informed by the literature of police militarization and community-oriented policing, as well as a pilot sample of recruitment videos to inform the operationalization of the literature-based measures. Several measures informed by the literature did not frequently occur, as seen by the results of the final sample, such as the assistance of vulnerable persons and the other measures discussed previously. Conversely, several words and behaviors were observed with some frequency during the coding process, as addressed in the above discussion of thematic analysis. Future research utilizing the quantitative content analysis would do well to refine and validate the codebook using a larger, more representative sample, a method to generate true intercoder reliability and agreement statistics, and the addition of relevant measures observed during the coding process and through qualitative content analysis.

**Limitations of the Findings of Stage I**

The findings of the quantitative content analysis, particularly the results of the PCA analyses, likewise involve several limitations. As demonstrated in the first PCA model, the factor
“Community-Oriented Behaviors,” though loading into a separate factor from the two militarization factors, contained one variable (Non-Motor Patrol) with a much lower commonality than the other two measures in the factor (Positive Juvenile Interaction and Positive Citizen Interaction). The Cronbach’s alpha statistic for this factor is likewise unacceptably low (.40), indicating that these measures together do not comprise a reliable scale for measuring community policing behaviors. Theoretically, however, this should not be a surprising finding: though literature agrees on the most basic community policing tactics and strategies, perhaps one of the most salient reasons behind community policing’s nebulous and vague definition and operationalization is its ability to be adapted in myriad ways and forms (Makin & Marenin, 2017). Additionally, the alpha level of the composite militarization score may be higher due to the more focused and limited definitions of militarization in the literature than of community-oriented policing. While the “Community-Oriented Statements” factor in the second PCA model had a Cronbach’s alpha level of .65, indicating a more reliable (though not quite at the generally accepted minimum alpha level of .70) scale, the “Community-Oriented Behaviors” factor requires further improvement. Future research would do well to assess further measures that capture common portrayals and adaptations of the community-oriented policing model and include them in future iterations of the quantitative content analysis. Future research should likewise collect more information regarding the types and contexts of the pre-existing measures. For example, Figures 5.8 and 5.9 portray screen-captures of positive interactions with juveniles. Figure 5.8 depicts a “shop with a cop” event, demonstrating that this police department is actively involved in a community outreach program. Figure 5.9 portrays high school student hugging a police officer after the officer spoke in a classroom. Compared to other common displays of positive interactions with juveniles, such as officers simply smiling at or high-fiving
children, these interactions provide more information about the department and its officers by showing specific programs in place (Figure 5.8) and a hug initiated by a juvenile (or adult citizen) may demonstrate a genuine connection between the police and the community.

Gathering additional measures and more information for the preexisting measures may strengthen the original factor, or may reveal additional, yet unexplored components in the PCA pattern matrix.

*Figure 5.8. An Officer Shops with Children During a “Shop with a Cop” Event (Portland Police Bureau, 2016)*
A second limitation of the PCA models is the cross-loading of Military Weapons in both the “Militaristic Behaviors” and “Militaristic Materials” components. This variable was still included in the final PCA models and the calculation of PCA score scales, as it was determined beneficial to still explore outcomes of the predictors of Stage II on all the codebook measures that occurred with sufficient frequency. Future iterations of the codebook may consider grouping Military Weapons with the other militaristic materials measures into one broader materials variable.

A third limitation is the inclusion of only two statement measures for militarization in the statement PCA model. Costello and Osborne (2005) assert that factors should be comprised of a minimum of three variables as a best practice for factor analysis. This factor was still included in the calculation of the Overall Militarization Score (PCA) as the PCA model divided clearly between the militarization and community-oriented statements, and it was deemed important to
still assess the statement measures’ relationships with the predictors in Stage II. While there was a third statement measure (**Exclusive Statements**) for militarization included in the content analysis codebook, this measure only occurred in 1.9% of the entire sample of 206 videos and was deemed to occur at too low a frequency to be included in the PCA model. The other two statement measures (**Danger Statements** and **Aggressive Statements**) occurred at a higher – though still overall low – frequency. This low frequency overall of statements that capture values of aggression, hypermasculinity, and martial metaphors may indicate that the widespread popularity of community-oriented policing rhetoric – whether as an active strategy and value orientation or as a technique to garner legitimacy – still largely dissuades law enforcement agencies from overt verbalization of more militarized rhetoric. Examining a more representative sample may assist in discerning whether this is a general trend, or if the largest – and therefore most visible – agencies are more careful to avoid direct articulation of values of aggression and hypermasculinity. Additionally, future research would do well to gather more possible statement or word measures through previously discussed methods, such as qualitative and thematic analysis of the videos.

A final limitation of the PCA models was the non-inclusion of the demographics and diversity measures. While some of these measures (specifically **Officer Speaks in Civilian’s Non-English Language** and **Statement of Value for Foreign Language Proficiency**) were excluded due to their very low frequency (<2.9%) of occurrence in the entire sample, others were excluded due to the problems of coding for demographics in recruiting media. There was a wide variety of filming and presentation styles throughout the sampled videos, with some being portrayed as if they were miniature episodes in a television show, others involving interviews and slower-paced portrayals of the daily job, some more like a slideshow of pictures played with music, others
being non-traditional, viral challenge videos, and many others having a unique style of their own. Many of the videos showed groups of officers together (as in a parade, or during a swearing in ceremony), with scenes changing within seconds. For the purposes of the present study, it was not feasible to code for the duration of portrayal of individual minority race/ethnicity officers, nor was it feasible to code for the duration of portrayal of individual female and male officers. Interviews were coded by gender as a substitute measure to ascertain whether female officers were given substantial speaking roles – as opposed to mere appearances – but this still cannot provide any background information on whether a woman was specifically selected as an interviewee as a form of tokenism. The variable Percent Women calculated for the PCA models (calculated by dividing female interview time by overall video time) also had to be excluded due to its creation of a fourth factor. Future research would do well to gather full demographic and duration information for officers portrayed in the videos to see if other demographic variables would load on the same factor as Percent Women, and scales created with these factor scores have a relationship with the LEMAS predictors of Percent Women, Percent Minorities, and Women in Supervisory Positions.

Several videos in the sample were clearly targeted towards recruiting women specifically. While some of these videos fell into a more balanced depiction of themes, one of these videos contained a number of aggressive statements, such as “I’ve always been drawn to more aggressive units,” and depictions of women lifting weights and training in SWAT team tactics. These portrayals evoked the findings of Dodge, Valcore, and Gomez (2011) and Rabe-Hemp (2008) that women in policing may feel pressured to embrace a stereotypically “masculine” or aggressive image in order to be accepted or promoted to more prestigious roles, such as SWAT teams. Another video focused more on the balance of mothering while being a female police
officer, and one interviewed officer stated that she believed women were essential for bringing a nurturing aspect to the department. While this may be the honest opinion of an individual officer, these generalized statements and portrayals likewise seemed to fall into the gendered stereotypes that are found in traditional police cultures (Miller, 1999; Rabe-Hemp, 2008; 2009). Using a larger sample of recruitment videos, future research may explore specific portrayals of women, particularly in videos that were designed to attract women to the occupation and specific law enforcement agency. As an interesting aside, the only other videos that entirely targeted a certain demographic were several that targeted military veterans. These few did not score highly on the subjective or objective militarization measures, and often focused on the benefits and stability of a policing career for veterans.

Lastly, as with full demographic information for officers, future iterations of the content analysis codebook (or a separate coding scheme entirely) would do well to capture demographic information for civilians portrayed in the videos as well. Future research would do well to examine several research questions using these data, such as whether the demographics of portrayed civilians match the demographics of the city or municipality. Even more compelling would be an examination of how certain demographics are portrayed. Do the dangerous civilians tend to be portrayed as young men of color, or the victims often portrayed as young white women? Conversely, what are the demographics of the civilians depicted as safely and positively interacting with officers? While real-world officer interactions with people of color and other demographics have long been a topic of discussion and study (see Holmes & Smith, 2008; Walker, Spohn, & DeLone, 2012), these avenues of future research may generate information on law enforcement agencies’ own biases through their choices of who they are portraying, what that civilian is doing, and with whom.
Limitations of the Findings of Stage II

Several limitations in Stage II must be noted as well. Though drug crime rates were found to be a significant predictor of high militarization video scores, it must be noted that the specific drug crime data used in the present study is somewhat problematic, and the variable was found to be highly correlated (−0.81) with *Department Size* in Model 1. As previously discussed, these data were obtained from the UCR, which operates according to a hierarchy rule of offenses. As is seen in the previous chapter’s Table 4.8, the minimum figure for 2013 drug crime rates was 4.46 (arrests per 100,000 population) and maximum was 408.89. Given that these are the rates of the 200 largest policing agencies, and therefore are the rates of generally higher population jurisdictions, these figures are extremely low and are likely affected by the UCR’s hierarchy rule. Additionally, drug arrest rate data were unavailable from the UCR for agencies in Florida, even in more recent years. Therefore drug arrest data were only available for 116 agencies in the current sample. Though accurate drug crime data are difficult to obtain, future research may consider exploring other drug crime indicators, such as drug incarceration levels per state, or drug data collected through the National Incident-Based Reporting System (NIBRS), which is not subject to the hierarchy rule (Federal Bureau of Investigation, n.d.).

A second limitation is the use of LEMAS data to obtain many of the present study’s predictors. Scholars have observed that the LEMAS is inconsistent in both the consistency of questions included in different iterations of the survey, and the consistency of its deployment (Matusiak, Campbell, & King, 2014). While future research would do well to replicate the present study using data from the upcoming LEMAS survey (2016 or 2017), this future LEMAS may not include measures identical to those used in the present study (for example, the community-oriented policing measures of the 2007 LEMAS are quite different from the 2013
As briefly alluded to in the above discussion of the difference between the measure for collaborative problem solving in officers’ evaluation criteria and the other LEMAS 2013 COP measures, there is likewise the problem of self-report and varying interpretations of what is indeed a vague concept that is applied quite differently across departments (Koslicki & Willits, forthcoming, Makin & Marenin, 2016).

Lastly, the present study’s small sample size was problematic for the ordinal logistic regression models. Separate models with limited variables were analyzed to increase statistical power, but this method is limited in its ability to demonstrate suppression and enhancement effects of the predictors combined into a single model. A larger sample size would benefit future research in enabling the analysis of more predictors in a single model, and may assist in exploring relationships with community-oriented policing video scores, as no significant relationships were found with these outcome variables in the present study (which may also indicate the need for more community policing measures, as addressed in the discussion of Stage I). A larger sample would likewise enable a comparison between county and municipal police departments (the present sample contained too few county agencies for meaningful comparisons), as Falcone and Wells (1995) argue that county-level agencies are historically and organizationally different from municipal police departments.

The sample was also limited due to the filtering process utilized to assign only one video per sampled agency (thus removing secondary and additional videos used by a number of agencies in the sample). While this filtering process was required to avoid violations of the independence assumption, future research would do well to assess all videos used by a larger sample of agencies using methods such as generalized estimating equations (GEE) modeling to
examine both between and within variance of recruitment videos used by law enforcement agencies.

**Conclusion**

The present study was conducted with the intent to explore a novel, empirical method through which to assess themes and artifacts of police militarization and community policing, and was successful in observing a variety of themes across sampled agencies’ videos, as well as several significant predictors of high militarization scores in videos. While the present study and its findings cannot provide definitive or generalizable answers to the questions of measurement of the broad concepts of police militarization or community policing, the questions of the origins or nature of militarization (such as the “iron fist/velvet glove” perspective), or the practical questions of recommendations to prevent the rise of militarization or reduce its level, it has established myriad new avenues of research that can begin to explore some of these questions through visual analysis.

The present study assisted in applying abstract indicators of militarization and community policing to objective, quantitative content analysis, and the PCA results assisted in revealing the patterns of how these measures group together, while also demonstrating where measures fell short in creating reliable scales. Current results demonstrate that the majority of sampled videos fall into the middle of these scales, though some extreme ends were found for both community-oriented policing and militarization scores. While much literature has examined military recruitment advertisements following the all-volunteer force era (Brockett et al., 2004; Brown, 2012; Padilla & Laner, 2002; Reichert et al., 2007), little is known regarding police recruiting advertisements, particularly those that fall into the extreme ends.
When refined and validated through the various methods as described throughout this chapter, the content analysis codebook and its resulting data can be used to not only replicate tests with predictors, but also use video scores to examine department outcomes. As Bieler (2016) asserts that many present indicators of militarization fall short due to the lack of empirical data on resulting behavior, this can assist in determining whether, for example, departments with videos with high militarization scores also use higher rates of force, or deploy their SWAT teams more frequently than those that do not. These methods can aid in the field’s exploration of measurement of these concepts. With future recruitment videos created in the coming years and a refined quantitative content analysis codebook validated through CFA, future research can also examine changes over time and potential effects from predictors and on outcomes.

Police practitioners should also follow future studies with interest to see which applicants are attracted to which types of themes in videos. Though some law enforcement agencies may be tempted to display themes and artifacts that they think will be exciting to potential applicants, law enforcement agencies should consider how its recruitment advertising may be attracting values and ideologies that may or may not be beneficial to growing a representative force that truly embraces an empathetic, service orientation.

As it stands, the present study presents an exciting starting point for new empirical examinations of the understudied concept of police militarization, the vague concept of community policing, and the possible relationships between these two value systems. The conclusion of the present study should therefore not be seen as the culmination of these research questions, but as the opening of a new – and much-needed in the post-Ferguson United States – approach to finding valid and applicable ways to assess police culture and recruitment.
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APPENDIX A

LEVEL 1 CODEBOOK

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Start Time of First Military Vehicle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Auto Populated Number</td>
<td>MM:SS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coded</th>
<th>End Time of First Military Vehicle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coder indicator</td>
<td>MM:SS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Video ID</th>
<th>Additional Display of Military Vehicle?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Copy the File Name</td>
<td>0 = No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Length of Video     | 1 = Yes                                 |
| MM:SS               |                                        |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender of Narrator</th>
<th>Display of Military Weapons in Video</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 = Male</td>
<td>(Examples include M-16s, M-14s, semi-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>automatic riot shotguns, 5.56 mm rifles)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 = Female</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>999 = NA (No narrator)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personal Interview</th>
<th>Start Time of First Military Weapon</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 = No</td>
<td>MM:SS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 = Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Start Time of First Personal Interview | End Time of First Military Weapon |
| MM:SS                                 | MM:SS                             |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Additional Personal Interview?</th>
<th>Additional Displays of Military Weapon?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 = No</td>
<td>0 = No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 = Yes</td>
<td>1 = Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Display of Military Vehicle in Video?</th>
<th>Display of Tactical Vests in Video</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 = No</td>
<td>0 = No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 = Yes</td>
<td>1 = Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Display of Military Vehicle in Video? | Start Time of First Tactical Vest Display |
|---------------------------------------| MM:SS                                      |

| Display of Tactical Vests in Video? | End Time of First Tactical Vest Display |
|-------------------------------------| MM:SS                                    |
Additional Displays of Tactical Vests?
0 = No
1 = Yes

Display of BDUs in Video?
0 = No
1 = Yes

Start Time of First BDU Display
MM:SS

End Time of First BDU Display
MM:SS

Additional Display of BDU?
0 = No
1 = Yes

Aggressive Statements made by Officer(s)?
(E.g. focus on promotion of toughness, coercion, and strength. “People sleep peacefully only because rough men are willing to do violence on their behalf”)
0 = No
1 = Yes

Time of First Officer Aggressive Statement
MM:SS

Additional Officer Aggressive Statements?
0 = No
1 = Yes

Exclusive Statements made by Officers
(E.g. statements that group the public as “they” or “the bad guys”; “They’re tough out there, we’ve got to be tougher”)
0 = No
1 = Yes

Time of First Officer Exclusive Statements
MM:SS

Additional Officer Exclusive Statements?
0 = No
1 = Yes

Statements made by Officers that Emphasize Danger
(E.g. statements that use martial metaphors or allude to aspects of the job being dangerous; “It’s a war out there”)
0 = No
1 = Yes

Time of First Officer Statement Emphasizing Danger
MM:SS

Additional Statements made by Officer Emphasizing Danger?
0 = No
1 = Yes

Active Pursuit
0 = No
1 = Yes

Start Time of 1st Active Pursuit
MM:SS

End Time of 1st Active Pursuit
MM:SS

Additional Instances of Active Pursuit?
0 = No
1 = Yes

Civilian Depicted in Handcuffs
0 = No
1 = Yes

Time of First Civilian Depicted in Handcuffs
MM:SS
End Time of First Civilian Depicted in Handcuffs
MM:SS
Additional Instances of Civilian Depicted in Handcuffs?
0 = No
1 = Yes

Firearms Drawn in Video
0 = No
1 = Yes
Start Time of First Firearms Drawn in Video
MM:SS
End Time of First Firearms Drawn in Video
MM:SS
Additional Firearms Drawn in Video?
0 = No
1 = Yes

Deployment of SWAT Activities in Video
0 = No
1 = Yes
Start Time of First Deployment of SWAT Activities
MM:SS
End Time of First Deployment of SWAT Activities
MM:SS
Additional Deployment of SWAT Activities?
0 = No
1 = Yes

Community Engagement Statements made by Officers
(E.g. statements that mention engagement with the community, such as earning trust or respect, being part of the community)
0 = No
1 = Yes
Time of First Officer Community Engagement Statement
MM:SS
Additional Officer Community Engagement Statement?
0 = No
1 = Yes
Officer Emotional Engagement/Attachment to the Community (E.g. statements emphasizing empathy, compassion, caring, and helping people)
0 = No
1 = Yes
Additional Officer Emotional Engagement/Attachment Statement?
0 = No
1 = Yes
Appearance of Male Officer in Video?
0 = No
1 = Yes
Start Time of First Male Officer Appearance
MM:SS
Appearance of Female Officer in Video?
0 = No
1 = Yes
Start Time of First Female Officer Appearance
MM:SS
Appearance of White Officers in Video
0 = No
1 = Yes
Start Time of First Appearance of White Officers in Video
MM:SS
Appearance of Black Officers in Video
0 = No
1 = Yes
Start Time of First Appearance of Black Officer in Video
MM:SS
Appearance of Hispanic/Latino Officer in Video
0 = No
1 = Yes
Start Time of First Appearance of Hispanic/Latino Officers in Video
MM:SS
Appearance of Asian Officers in Video
0 = No
1 = Yes
Start Time of First Appearance of Asian Officer in Video
MM:SS
Appearance of Other Minority Race/Ethnicity Officer in Video
0 = No
1 = Yes
Start Time of First Appearance of Other Minority Race/Ethnicity Officer in Video
MM:SS
Portrayal of Officers Engaging in Non-Motor Vehicle Patrol
(E.g. any patrol without use of a motor vehicle; foot, bicycle, equine, etc.)
0 = No
1 = Yes
Start Time of First Officer Portrayal Engaging in Non-Motor Vehicle Patrol
MM:SS
End Time of First Officer Portrayal Engaging in Non-Motor Vehicle Patrol
MM:SS
Additional Officer Portrayal Engaging in Non-Motor Vehicle Patrol?
0 = No
1 = Yes
Portrayal of positive Police Engagement with a Juvenile/Group of Juveniles
0 = No
1 = Yes
Start Time of First Positive Police Engagement with a Juvenile
MM:SS
End Time of First Positive Police Engagement with a Juvenile
MM:SS
Additional Positive Police Engagement with a Juvenile?
0 = No
1 = Yes
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Police Assistance of Vulnerable Person</strong> (E.g. assistance given to elderly, disabled, or homeless individual)</th>
<th><strong>Spoken/Written Statement of Importance of Foreign Language Proficiency in Video</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 = No</td>
<td>0 = No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 = Yes</td>
<td>1 = Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Start Time of First Police Assistance of</strong></td>
<td>999 = NA (No spoken or written words in video, other than department name and website)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vulnerable Person</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM:SS</td>
<td>Problem Solving Statements made by Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(E.g. Officer mentions problem solving as goal or use of problem solving methods)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>End Time of First Police Assistance of</strong></td>
<td>0 = No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vulnerable Person</td>
<td>1 = Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM:SS</td>
<td>Time of First Officer Problem Solving State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ment Statement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Police Assistance of Vulnerable Person?</td>
<td>MM:SS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 = No</td>
<td>Additional Officer Problem Solving Statemen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 = Yes</td>
<td>t?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Positive Verbal/Nonverbal Interaction with</strong></td>
<td>0 = No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civilian (Not counting juveniles)</td>
<td>1 = Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 = No</td>
<td>Time of First Officer Individual Efficacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 = Yes</td>
<td>Statement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Start Time of First Positive Verbal/Nonverbal</strong></td>
<td>MM:SS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction with Civilian</td>
<td>Additional Officer Individual Efficacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM:SS</td>
<td>Statements?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>End Time of First Positive Verbal/Nonverbal</strong></td>
<td>0 = No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction with Civilian</td>
<td>1 = Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM:SS</td>
<td>Time of Statement of Community Oriented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mission for Department/Officers (Written or Spoken)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Positive Verbal/Nonverbal Interaction</td>
<td>0 = No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with Civilian?</td>
<td>1 = Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 = No</td>
<td>Statement of Community Oriented Mission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 = Yes</td>
<td>for Department/Officers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officer Speaks in Citizen’s Language (if not</td>
<td>0 = No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English)</td>
<td>1 = Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 = No</td>
<td>Time of Statement of Community Oriented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 = Yes</td>
<td>Mission for Department/Officers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>999 = NA</td>
<td>MM:SS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Additional Statement of Community Oriented Mission for Department/Officers?
0 = No
1 = Yes

Humorous/Joking Tone to Video
0 = No
1 = Yes

Non-Traditional Video (e.g. Running Man or Mannequin Challenge with Recruiting Message)
0 = No
1 = Yes

Overall Militaristic Tone of Video (overall sense of aggressive, crime control, and hypermasculine feel of video)
1 = Not at all Militaristic
2 = Slightly Militaristic
3 = Moderately Militaristic
4 = Extremely Militaristic

Overall Community-Oriented Tone of Video (overall sense of community empathy/engagement, and positive citizen-focused feel of video)
1 = Not at all Community-Oriented
2 = Slightly Community-Oriented
3 = Moderately Community-Oriented
4 = Extremely Community-Oriented
APPENDIX B
LEVEL 2 CODEBOOK

*Repeat each additional variable start and end timepoints in Access sub-form when applicable

Search for Video ID in Search Box
ID
Auto Populated Number
Coded
Coder indicator
Gender of First Interviewee
0 = Male
1 = Female
Start Time of Additional Personal Interview*
MM:SS
End Time of Additional Personal Interview
MM:SS
Gender of Second Interviewee
0 = Male
1 = Female
Start Time of Second Display of Military*
Vehicle
MM:SS
End Time of Second Display of Military Vehicle
MM:SS
Start Time of Second Portrayal of Military Weapon*
MM:SS
End Time of Second Portrayal of Military Weapon
MM:SS
Start Time of Second Portrayal of Tactical Vest*
MM:SS
End Time of Second Portrayal of Tactical Vest
MM:SS
Start Time of Second Portrayal of BDU*
MM:SS
End Time of Second Portrayal of BDU
MM:SS
Time of Second Aggressive Statement*
MM:SS
Time of Second Exclusive Statement*
MM:SS
Time of Second Statement Emphasizing Danger*
MM:SS
Start Time of Second Instance of Civilian Depicted in Handcuffs*
MM:SS
End Time of Second Instance of Civilian Depicted as Dangerous
MM:SS
How is First Firearm Drawn?
0 = Training Context
1 = Non-Training Context
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event Description</th>
<th>Start Time (MM:SS)</th>
<th>End Time (MM:SS)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Start Time of Second Drawn Firearm in Video</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End Time of Second Drawn Firearm in Video</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How is Second Firearm Drawn?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 = Training Context</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 = Non-Training Context</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Start Time of Second SWAT Deployment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End Time of Second SWAT Deployment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time of Second Officer Community Engagement Statement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time of Second Officer Empathy/Emotional Attachment Statement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Start Time of Second Positive Police Interaction with a Juvenile</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End Time of Second Positive Police Interaction with a Juvenile</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Start Time of Second Police Assistance of Vulnerable Person</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End Time of Second Police Assistance of Vulnerable Person</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Start Time of Second Positive Interaction with Civilian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End Time of Second Positive Interaction with Civilian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time of Second Officer Problem Solving Statement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time of Second COP Mission Statement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Militaristic Tone of Video (overall sense of aggressive, crime control, and hypermasculine feel of video)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 = Not at all Militaristic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 = Slightly Militaristic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 = Moderately Militaristic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 = Extremely Militaristic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Community-Oriented Tone of Video (overall sense of community empathy/engagement, and positive citizen-focused feel of video)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 = Not at all Community-Oriented</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 = Slightly Community-Oriented</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 = Moderately Community-Oriented</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 = Extremely Community-Oriented</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>