Electronic Theses and Dissertations

Student Works

5-2013

Police Militarization: Attitudes Towards the Militarization of the American Police

Phillip T. Wyrick
East Tennessee State University

Follow this and additional works at: https://dc.etsu.edu/etd

Part of the Criminology Commons

Recommended Citation

Wyrick, Phillip T., "Police Militarization: Attitudes Towards the Militarization of the American Police" (2013). *Electronic Theses and Dissertations.* Paper 1161. https://dc.etsu.edu/etd/1161

Police Militarization: Attitudes Towards the Militarization of the American Police

_____

A thesis

presented to

the faculty of the Department of Criminal Justice and Criminology

East Tennessee State University

In partial fulfillment

for the requirements of the degree

Master of Arts in Criminal Justice and Criminology

_____

by

Phillip T. Wyrick

May 2013

_____

Dr. John Whitehead, Ph.D., Chair

Dr. Larry Miller, Ph.D.

Dr. Greg Rocheleau, Ph.D.

Keywords: Militarization, Police, Public Attitudes

ABSTRACT

Police Militarization: Attitudes Towards the Militarization of the American Police

by

Phillip T. Wyrick

Police militarization is a critical contemporary issue in the criminal justice field; however, only a minor amount of research exists on this issue. Almost no research exists on public attitudes toward police militarization, which is very important given the social context. A contextual literature review covers a brief history of American police with emphasis on key events leading to modern police militarization, such as the Munich Incident and Columbine. Also covered are research topics that help outline the need for research on public attitudes in this field, such as the amount and use of PPUs by Peter Kraska and the idea of role convergence. Google Docs was used to generate and disseminate an electronic survey to a random sample of ETSU students. Statistical findings show that, while militarization does play a significant role in public confidence in the police, positive public attitudes and fear of the police play a much more significant role.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

"Riot police officers tear-gassing protestors at the Occupy movement in Oakland,

California. The surprising nighttime invasion of Zuccotti Park in lower Manhattan,

carried out with D-Day like secrecy by officers employing klieg lights and a military

style sound machine. And campus police officers in helmets and face shields dousing

demonstrators at the University of California-Davis with pepper spray…Is this the

militarization of the American Police?" (Baker, 2011)

This question was asked by New York Times reporter Al Baker. The recent Occupy

movement across America has certainly shown us that our police forces can quickly turn into a

military like unit employing overwhelming force and tactics to crush opposition and threats to

public order and peace. However, it would be naïve to think that only the events of the past

decade have militarized the American Police. Militarization has a long history within the United

States and a series of critical events that forge the path that leads us to where we are today.

Before our discussion of militarization begins in earnest, a definitional groundwork

should be laid. One of the most renowned scholars of the militarization field, Peter Kraska, was

quoted in an article in *Social Justice* (2009) where he defined two important terms. Kraska states

that two concepts are important to this discussion: militarism and militarization. Militarism is

defined as "…in its most basic sense as an ideology…that stresses the use of force and threat of

violence as the most appropriate and efficacious means to solve problems." Militarization is the "implementation of that militarism ideology" (Hill & Beger, 2009). In a basic sense, militarism is the spirit of the military, the overwhelming and coercive use of force to solve problems, while militarization is the implementation of that spirit into legal action. This research would argue that we want our police to have aspects of the militarism ideology, to be ready to fight crime, to take a hard stance against those who harm us, and always be ready to make the ultimate sacrifice. However, militarization, the implementation of that warrior idelogy into mainstream police policy is not always a good idea.

Since the creation of the first true police force in 1829 by Sir Robert Peel in London, England, the police have always been a quasi-military force. Peel looked to the British military for inspiration and copied their top-down command model and uniforms. The newly emerging country of America later mirrored the London Police's model of law enforcement, with influences of Southern slave patrols and Northern night watchmen (Walker & Katz, 2008). During the Civil War it became apparent of the ease that the military could declare martial law and suspend local civil operations. In response to this, the Posse Comitatus Act of 1878 was passed, which bars the military from law enforcement activities within the United States except in times of extreme emergency (Matthews, 2006). A century later this law (imposed by Allies on the defeated Germany) played a critical role in the Munich incident, which forced untrained and inept local police into a crisis situation, ultimately leading to a massacre and the development of GSG-9, one of the first modern paramilitary police forces. Key events later also occurred to

influence our police militarization in America, such as the Waco incident, Ruby Ridge, the North Hollywood shootout, the school shooting at Columbine, and terrorists attacks of September 11, 2001, all leading up to the events of the Occupy Movement still fresh in our minds.

The militarization process has a long, rich history. Just as important, it has crucial implications upon society and the criminal justice system. Our police officers becoming militarized will no doubt have some effect on their interactions with suspects, citizens, and each other. Surprisingly, little research has been conducted on police militarization and significantly less on the impact of this militarization on the local community and citizen's attitudes. Police have been alienated from the public for many reasons over the decades: corruption, lack of training, excessive force, subcultures, and most currently the move to mobile patrol cars instead of foot patrol through the communities they serve. The next logical concern would be if this militarization effect, which has been accelerated in recent years will cause more alienation and further widen the divide between police officers and citizens.

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

Brief History of the American Police

No detailed discussion of American police is complete without a historical look back at where modern police originated and how they developed through the years. By looking at history, we can try to predict or at least have a better educated guess at where American policing will be in the future. The overall theme of the history of American policing is simple: police shape themselves according to contemporary events. They react to problems in society and change so they can confront and resolve them. In this context, the professionalization movement attempting to solve the overbearing problems of corruption and lack of training is of the same spirit as the militarization movement's response to modern society's problems such as gun control, the war on drugs, and global terrorism.

While most discussions on the history of police begin with aforementioned Sir Robert Peel and his "bobbies" in London, this first "modern" police force did not originate until 1829. This means America was already an independent country and the first settlers had arrived 200 years earlier. Thus, our discussion must begin far before the development of the London Metropolitan Police.

American development of police is ultimately a result of our "English Heritage." The settlers of colonies brought with them the justice system they lived under in England. The

earliest law enforcement officials were sheriffs (shire reeves) and their constables, who

undertook many duties such as tax collection and voting supervision, including local law

enforcement. Sheriffs were simply reactive policing force, investigating reports of crime and

disturbances within villages in their county, as their other duties allowed. As the local population

grew and villages and towns became larger and more complex, the watch system was employed

as added security. The watch was made up of adult males on a volunteer or rotation status who

simply "watched" for crime and raised an alarm if it occurred. Larger cities and villages had both

a night and day watch, while smaller areas had only a night watch. The watch usually only

consisted of a small group of individuals. The watch system was mainly employed in northern

colonies. The southern colonies had developed their own system of law enforcement, which has

been called distinctly American, the slave patrol. With the large spread of housing and plantation

areas in the south, a watch would not be effective, partly because to catch escaped slaves, the

guardians of the night needed to be mobile. Slave patrols were invented to both catch runaway

slaves and guard against slave uprisings. Their mobility, numerically large presence (Charleston

had over 100 members by the mid-1800s), and proactive mission made them more effective than

northern watches and arguably the first American police officers (Walker, 2008).

By the early to mid-1800s the shortcomings of the watch system and other law

enforcement systems were becoming painfully apparent. The development of modern police

forces in England and America were both spawned by large, racially driven city riots. Sir Robert

Peel, the English home secretary, developed the first modern police force, the London

Metropolitan Police, in 1829. The basic structure of the police was borrowed from the military: the uniforms, rank structure, etc. The most drastic change from the old watch system to the new policing force formatted by Peel is the addition of three aspects to policing: mission, strategy, and organizational structure. The police mission was to prevent crime, to be proactive instead of reactive like previous law enforcement; the police strategy to carry out this mission included foot patrols and the areas covered by police officers; and finally the organizational structure was the military model, a top-down bureaucracy with specific ranks, uniforms, titles, and chain of commands. America was moderately slow to adopt this new model of policing, with most major northern cities changing over to the new model in the range of 1838-1860. The south was still dominated by the sheriff and slave patrol system until the end of the civil war (Walker, 2008).

Important to mention at this point is a law that, while not directly affecting police and their development, would later prove instrumental in the militarization of modern police. This law was the Posse Comitatus Act of 1876. In the wake of the civil war, the nation had a collective moment in which to think about the dire consequences of war and the military. One obvious problem was the ease of the military to come into a town or city and declare martial law, effectively suspending the civil and constitutional law of an area, usually for an indefinite amount of time. This act generally barred the U.S. military from operating within the borders of the United States during normal conditions. Exceptions to this law were in times of war, rebellion, or natural disaster. The military could declare martial law and take over only until local civil governments and law enforcement were reestablished (Matthews, 2006). While this

act did not hugely effect developing law enforcement at the time, its effects would be dire a century later when a version of the act was forced upon a defeated Nazi Germany. This directly led to the Munich incident, the development of PPUs, and militarization of modern police (Kraska, 2001).

The period ranging from 1830-1900 is referred to as the political era of policing. The hiring, appointment, and funding of police were controlled by local politicians. Corruption, bribery, racism, and abuse of power were extremely widespread. Thus, the local police generally became a coercive force for local politicians to enforce their flavor of the law. The most famous example of this is Tammany Hall in New York, were police officers had set "fees" to be hired or promoted (Walker, 2008). This system obviously caused a great deal of mistrust in and hatred for the police. More obvious was the ineffectiveness and the failure of the goals of the police first set out by Robert Peel.

The next major period of American law enforcement is from 1900-1930, and is usually known as the Professionalization movement. Obviously, there were a great many flaws within the current corrupt, highly political status quo system. In the professionalization movement, leaders in law enforcement saw the need to have police chiefs and other administrators independent of local political control. There was also a great need for standardization of training, admissions standards, and a return to the original goals of policing. August Vollmer is typically seen as the "tip of the spear" of the professionalization movement. Vollmer was the police chief of Berkeley, California from 1905 to 1932. Under his administration, the police department

underwent radical changes from the political system to modern day policing. Vollmer was lauded for his role in advocating for college-educated officers and established the first criminal justice program at the nearby University of California. Vollmer later went on to consult police departments and administrators on his methods, even writing a scathing report of the LAPD for the Wickersham Commission in 1931. Many of Vollmer's former students went on to be police chiefs and helped further the professionalization movement (Walker, 2008).

Despite leaders such as Vollmer, many of the nation's police departments still resisted change and lagged behind the professionalization movement increasing standards for law enforcement. In the time period of 1930-1960, the country still battled to professionalize and modernize law enforcement. The report from the Wickersham Commission, a presidential commission ordered to study the status of American law enforcement in 1929, shocked many in government due to the proclivity of incidents of police brutality, political corruption, and lack of training. Two notable leaders of this era were O.W. Wilson and J. Edgar Hoover. Wilson was a police chief in Wichita, Kansas during the 1930s and later served as the Dean of the University of California. He is often referred to as Vollmer's protégé and did much to promote law enforcement education and professionalization. Hoover is most renowned for his work during his stint as the director of the FBI. Most notable is his creation of the FBI crime laboratory, to which any police department in the nation could send evidence to be scientifically studied, instead of using the ineffective and invalid measures of the past (Walker, 2008).

One major solution during this time period and into the 1960s was to return to the military for guidance. Peel had first mirrored the military in the creation of the first modern police force, and many felt that this could turn the police back into an effective force. The standardized uniforms, equipment, training, and admission standards used by the military were stringently put back into policing. Strict chain of commands and obeying of orders were emphasized. Solutions to public disorder and crime were overwhelming coercive force. Police authority was emphasized and threats to that authority were quickly dealt with. However, this created massive problems in the 1960s with the race equality movement and anti-war protests. The new, military-like police dealt with protestors and racial dissents using extreme force. The images of Martin Luther King's followers being fire-hosed in the streets, being attacked by police dogs, and being physically hauled out of sit-ins and beaten with batons are still vivid in many people's minds today. The result was a series of Supreme Court decisions such as Mapp v. Ohio and Miranda v Arizona that limited the police's power and discretion in how to handle searches and interrogations. The public appreciated the standardization and professionalization of the police, but the consequences of this movement were not in the best interest of the public (Siegel, 2009).

The period of 1970 to today has many names and many more areas of study than previous generations. The fallout of the professionalization and standardization movement was compensated by the increased hiring of minority and women officers. Also, the advent of community and problem oriented policing were spearheaded by the "research revolution" of

studies such as the Kansas City patrol experiment that empirically showed that legacy police

practices such as random patrol had no effect on crime rates. Racial tensions still ran high, but

programs such as citizen review boards helped communities think their police were still public

servants and their input mattered on a daily basis when making policy decisions (Siegel, 2009).

However, this period also set the stage for modern police militarization. Several incidents in this

era created the need for PPU's (paramilitary policing units) and a more militarized police force

to deal with emerging, modern problems.

Critical Contemporary Events

The history of the militarization of today's law enforcement agencies is as long and

detailed as the history of the police themselves. Fortunately, such a detailed discussion is not

within the parameters of this paper. For our purposes here, we will identify four key historical

events that each played a major role in the militarization of modern police: the Munich incident,

the Miami F.B.I. Shootout, the North Hollywood Shootout, and the Columbine High School

Shooting.

The Munich Incident (or Munich massacre) is the phrase often applied to the events of

the 1972 Olympics held in Munich, Germany. During the Olympics, members of the Palestinian

terror group Black September, broke into the Israeli athlete's quarters and took several athletes

and coaches hostage. What followed was a tense standoff, a botched rescue attempt by German

police, and the formation of one of the first paramilitary policing units.

One of the best visual and informational aids to understand this event is *National Geographic's Seconds From Disaster,* a documentary based show offering a minute-by-minute breakdown of crisis situations. According to the documentary, members of Black September seized the hostages in order to negotiate the release of over 200 Islamic hostages from an Israeli prison. They demanded that the prisoners be flown via airplane to Egypt and released. When Egypt refused to be part of a terrorist plot, the group became desperate and demanded to be transported via helicopter to the nearest airport and then be flown out of the country. It is at the point German authorities developed a rescue plan.

As mentioned several times previously, in the wake of WWII, Germany had severe restrictions placed on its military by the American-led Allies. One such restriction was a reiteration of the Posse Comitatus Act, which stated the German military could not operate within German borders during peacetime (Matthews, 2006). Thus, the rescue operation fell to the local police. The police planned to trap the terrorists in a three-pronged attack: a group of disguised police officers on board the plane would ambush some members when they came on board, five snipers overlooking the tarmac would then open fire, supported by police officers in a helicopter following the one carrying the terrorists. The plan failed miserably. Seeing the number of terrorists coming aboard the plane, the ambush team within the airplane fled without informing police command. The snipers overlooking the tarmac were poorly trained, and one had repositioned himself without telling the others, resulting in him being injured via friendly fire. The plan to quickly incapacitate the terrorists had fallen into a firefight. German backup in

APCs became stuck in traffic. By the time the firefight finally ended, all hostages had been

killed and one police officer lay dead in addition to many injured (National Geographic, 2006).

Less than 2 months later, the German Federal Police developed GSG-9 as a response to

the spectacular failure during the events at Munich. It was clear that the local German police

lacked the training, discipline, and equipment to deal with such events. GSG-9 was a division of

the police that had training, tactics, and weapons similar to the best trained military officers.

This group would influence the development of American SWAT and joint task force teams. The

Munich Incident and German development of GSG-9 would inspire President Reagan to loosen

the provisions of the Posse Comitatus Act of 1878. These dropped restrictions allowed for the

military training and tactics to be taught to police officers and for the development of specialized

PPUs (Kraska, 2001).

Almost 15 years later, the next major event towards the modern militarization of law

enforcement would take place in Miami, Florida. On April 11th, 1986, 8 F.B.I. agents ambushed

a pair of men who had been wanted in a 4-month string of armored car and bank robberies, and

were also wanted for several murders. While the F.B.I. had a distinct numerical advantage, they

didn't know that the two suspects were both former U.S. Marines with advanced training. One of

the men, Platt, wielded a Ruger Mini-14, a variant of the M-14 service rifle that was used by the

military, with an extended .223 20 round magazine. The other man, Matix, had a modified 12-

gauge shotgun with extended eight-round clips. When the firefight began, the bank robbers

merely had to switch clips to reload their weapons, while five out of the eight F.B.I. agents

struggled to reload their six-shot .38 caliber revolvers. After both sides had fired a combined 140

total rounds, the two gunmen lay dead, but seven agents were casualties. Two F.B.I agents were killed outright, three were permanently crippled, and two others severely wounded (Barrett, 2013).

Analysis of the firefight would show that the F.B.I. agents were simply "outgunned." One agent was wounded when a shotgun blast from Matix pierced his car door and struck him with pellets. Platt was able to flank one of the vehicles the agents were hiding behind and fired multiple times, fatally injuring one agent in the chest and another in the head. One agent, after being wounded in his hand by a rifle shell and having his revolver's chamber jammed with blood and gore, was shot through the neck and paralyzed as he reached for a shotgun in the backseat of an F.B.I. vehicle. The firefight ended when a wounded agent was able to get behind the two wounded gunmen and fired his weapon multiple times at point blank range. Although the F.B.I. agents had fired roughly 70 rounds and inflicted a distinct 18 bullet wounds on the gunmen, Matix and Platt were able to stay alive and firing for long enough to inflict a "terrible toll" (Anderson, 1996).

Later analysis would show one of the rounds that fatally wounded Matix was from one of the three 9mm semi-automatic pistols used in the fight (Anderson, 1996). One 9mm pistol was rendered inoperable after being struck with a rifle round fired by Platt. Another ran out of ammunition and the agent using it switched to his backup .38 revolver. This information, coupled with the obvious failure of the .38 revolvers used in the fight, led the F.B.I. to "lead the charge" to find a new standard law enforcement weapon. Local police departments in Florida and around the country took notice of the growing debate sparked by the incident in Florida. If the F.B.I. could be outgunned, what chance would a local police officer or sheriff's deputy have (Barrett, 2013)? This event would eventually lead to 9mm or .40 caliber pistols to be standard

issue to law enforcement around the country. However, our next incident will show that even that increase in firepower would not be enough for some situations.

Fast forward a decade later and we come to our next major even in militarization history: the North Hollywood Shootout. This incident was a firefight lasting 44 minutes between LAPD police and two heavily armed and armored gunmen attempting to rob a Bank of America Branch in California. The shootout showed the inability of the LAPD's weaponry to stop the suspects, and the need to better equip patrol officers with more lethal firearms equipment.

On February 28th, 1997, at approximately 9:30 am, two heavily armed gunmen entered a Bank of America branch in North Hollywood. The men were equipped with heavy, padded full body armor and carried a variety of weapons: illegally modified AR-15 assault rifles able to fire fully automatic with 100 round drum clips, AK-47 assault rifles equipped with drum magazines and standard magazines as backup, both submachine guns and handguns, and several hundred rounds of armor piercing ammunition. Upon exiting the bank, the gunmen found themselves surrounded by the LAPD, and a firefight ensued. After almost 20 minutes, SWAT officers started to arrive. The pair of gunmen escaped the bank and split up, one fleeing on foot, the other in an escape vehicle. The LAPD, armed with .38 pistols, 9mm handguns, and shotguns were unable to injure the gunmen due to their heavy body armor. A SWAT officer would later testify that the frangible police rounds fired by his M-16 failed to injure one gunman. In desperation, police raided local gun stores for assault rifles and ammunition. One gunman, out of ammunition and wounded, fatally shot himself in the head. The remaining gunman was pinned down behind

a vehicle and fatally wounded by SWAT officers armed with assault rifles; he would bleed to death before medical attention arrived (The History Channel, 2007).

Although no officers or citizens were killed, the events sparked a national response. Within 2 weeks, the U.S. Department of Defense had shipped 600 Army surplus M-16 assault rifles to the LAPD, enough for every patrol sergeant. Other cities such as Miami equipped all patrol officers with assault rifles. This event also lead to almost all police departments equipping their officers with more lethal and penetrating .45 caliber handguns rather than the .38 or 9mm pistols they had at the time of the shootout (The History Channel, 2007). Today, the majority of patrol officers (including our local police) carry assault rifles in their vehicles as a direct result of this incident.

The last major event in militarization is the Columbine High school shooting in 1999. This event drastically changed how police and SWAT teams confronted crisis situations. Before the Columbine incident, police would typically set up a perimeter and call in SWAT to deal with barricaded suspects. The shooters at Columbine were a new class of threats called "Active shooters" and the police had to find a way to solve the new threat.

Two Columbine high school students armed with handguns, shotguns, and homemade bombs entered Columbine High School on the morning of April 20, 1999. Their mission was simple: to kill as many students and teachers as possible. The shooting started shortly after 11 a.m. that morning. A lone sheriff's deputy arrived roughly 5 minutes after the shooting began

and opened fire on the gunmen until he ran out of ammunition and was forced to retreat. The

shooting went on for almost an hour before the two gunmen eventually committed suicide.

SWAT teams were out in force and surrounding the building roughly 15 to 20 minutes before the

shooting ended. It took SWAT teams an entire hour after both shooters were dead to enter the

building and discover the bodies (National Geographic, 2006).

The events at Columbine marked a point for drastic change for law enforcement and

SWAT tactics in the U.S. The police and SWAT enacted a standard control and wait response to

the incident. They expected the students to take hostages, make demands, and so forth according

to a number of other situations with shooters and barricaded suspects. However, these gunmen

were only interested in killing students and faculty, and nothing else. After this incident, police

around the country adopted "Active shooter" protocols. In an interview with Tom Wyrick, a 36-

year patrol veteran with the Kingsport Police Department, he detailed the change of tactics after

Columbine.

> "…We no longer waited around for the SWAT team to arrive. As soon as we [the police]
>
> had enough people, we go in. Four members to a team, a point man, two flanks, and a
>
> rear guard is typical. But if it's urgent enough you can drop the rear guard and go with
>
> three. We are trained to go towards gunfire…to find the shooter and neutralize them. If
>
> there is no gunfire, we search room by room." He went on to state: "This response
>
> doesn't just apply to school shootings, but to any situation where there is an active
>
> shooter or there is believed to be one" (Wyrick, personal communication, 2012).

This new tactic developed by law enforcement is facially more militaristic than the traditional response. Setting up a perimeter, calling in specialists, and trying to talk down the problem seem inherently like law enforcement should operate. However, this is not ideal for many situations, as Columbine showed. The new "active shooter" response is made military like due to its use of expedient and overwhelming force to bring a quick solution to a problem. This tactic is made possible by the North Hollywood Shootout, because many patrol officers have their own assault rifles and do not need SWAT to arrive, in addition to the special training every patrol officer has.

Looking back, we can see the importance of these three events on the militarization of the modern police. The Munich incident brought attention to the need of specially trained officers serving in PPUs with the tactics and weaponry to deal with extreme situations. The 1986 Miami shootout led law enforcement to upgrade from their .38 revolvers to 9mm or .40 caliber semi-automatic pistols with greater stopping power and ease of use. The North Hollywood shootout showed that American officers lacked the proper equipment to deal with scenarios where the suspects were better prepared and better equipped than responding officers. Finally, the Columbine shooting showed that police and event SWAT tactics did not prepare them for fast changing situations. The police needed to be able to employ targeted and high-speed force in dealing with certain situations.

The Amount and Use of PPUs

The field of research involving police militarization is lacking, at best, when one considers the importance and consequences of this topic. However, Peter Kraska, from the University of Eastern Kentucky, has devoted a significant portion of his career to the issues of police militarization and paramilitary policing. One of the most interesting and useful pieces of his work was his national survey research done in the 1980s and 1990s.

Kraska (2001) did two sets of national surveys, targeted at as many police departments as he could reach, one in the early 1980s which was compiled in 1985, and one in the early 1990s which was compiled in 1995. The survey asked questions of each department including whether they had a PPU (such as a SWAT team), how often it was deployed, and what it was used for. His findings were shocking. In 1995, over 77% of surveyed departments had a PPU, a 48% increase in number since his original survey in 1985. Furthermore, in 1995 PPUs in across all departments were deployed to the field roughly 30,000 times, an amazing 939% increase in deployments since 1980 (Kraska, 2001).

Kraska (2001) also discovered that the overwhelming majority of deployments for the PPUs were to execute no-knock warrants when searching a residence for drugs, weaponry, or those with outstanding arrest warrants. This indicates that PPUs are not being used for what they are designed for. SWAT teams, the direct descendants of GSG-9 in Germany, were designed to deal with crisis situations that regular officers did not have the training or equipment for (Kraska, 2001). This point was reinforced in the interview with police veteran Tom Wyrick. He

stated that "…[Sullivan County's] SWAT team is used almost completely for search warrants and drug raids." He would go on to say "…It is a good thing that the SWAT teams do these raids, since they have better equipment and training than patrol officers, and that officers don't need to taken off the line [patrol]…other than that, there isn't really a need for a SWAT team in Sullivan County" (Wyrick, personal communication, 2012). Kraska would go on to say that this misuse of PPUs is indicative of a shift in American towards a paramilitary policing model that would replace the current policing model.

Role Convergence and Paramilitary Policing

Two scholars, David and Kathleen Campbell (Campbell & Campbell, 2010), have done some interesting research in relation to police militarization. They call this phenomenon "role convergence." They describe in detail the formation and consequences of police militarization, which have been covered in detail thus far. However, they also introduce an interesting concept known as "military constablization." They state this is the result of modern military forces being able to finish fighting a ground war in a matter of weeks or days of direct combat, and then the next stage of the conflict is occupation, pacification, and nation building. This last section can last for up to a decade, as seen in Iraq and Afghanistan. This forces the occupying marines and army soldiers to mainly abandon the traditional duties of soldiers in favor of duties involving peace keeping, order maintenance, and law enforcement. All these duties are currently performed by police officers in the U.S. Campbell suggests that the military, in face of the new global war on terror, is turning soldiers into police officers. Combine this with the fact that civil

police in America are becoming more militarized, and you have their "role convergence."

Soldiers are turning into police, police are turning into civil soldiers, and both parties are

becoming an overall paramilitary force (Campbell, 2009). Hill and Berger (2009), in their article

mentioned at the beginning of this paper, would refer to this as the "global paramilitary policing

juggernaut." This is aggravated by the fact that many military veterans are drawn to law

enforcement careers due to the requirements, equipment, and ethos of the job. This allows

military mindsets to pervade civilian law enforcement departments, furthering the militarization

effect.

The implications of this "role convergence" are both unknown and somewhat obvious. A

paramilitary force would have dire implications for civil liberties and service rendered to

citizens. However, military crossover is not always a bad thing. Two studies showed positive

aspects to military veterans serving in civil law enforcement.

One study was designed to study the effect of military experience on stressful

occupational events that occurred to police officers. These stressful events were things such as

seeing a dead body, being involved in a shooting, etc. The researcher found that officers with

military experience reported significantly lower levels of stress when dealing with stressful

events. This would indicate military experience successfully prepares an officer for dealing with

the harsh realities of the police working environment, and thus would recommend that officers

have some military experience or that applicants with military experience be hired (Patterson,

2002).

In another study, two researchers looked at the correlation between police burnout and stress and military experience. Burnout refers to police officers becoming disillusioned and dissatisfied with their job, perhaps due to stress. The researchers found that officers with military experience experienced a significantly lower percentage of incidents of police burnout and stress. This effect was especially pronounced when looking at female officers. This, again, would indicate that military experience prepared officers for the harsh reality of policing, and police departments should prioritize them for recruitment and hiring for civil law enforcement jobs (Ivie & Garland, 2011).

Effects of Militarization

Two sets of research warn us about the effects of militarization: Kraska's (2001) work and Hill and Berger's (2009) combined work. Both sets include both immediate and long-term consequences of militarizing our police forces and relying incrementally more on paramilitary units to carry out law enforcement.

First, Kraska (2001) warns us of the immediate impact at home or in our communities. He uses what he calls one of the most "egregious examples" of paramilitary policing gone wrong; the case of Alberto Sepulveda. In September of 2000, a SWAT team raided the Sepulveda residence in the predawn hours in execution of a drug related search warrant. Eleven-year-old Alberto ended up with a SWAT officer wielding a shotgun standing over him, screaming for him to get on the ground with his arms outstretched. A few moments later Alberto was killed by a shotgun blast from the SWAT officer standing over him, by all indications an unintentional discharge. No drugs or other evidence were found within the home, and no one in

the household had an arrest record (Kraska, 2001). While this is obviously a tragic and emotional example, Kraska warns that this is by far not the only incident in which this has occurred. He states that raids performed by SWAT units and other PPUs in the U.S. have led to many other injuries and deaths both in situations involving drugs or evidence in the home and situations like Alberto's where the raid was misguided at best. Almost all of these raids are linked in some way with the war on drugs, and this sets a dangerous precedent for the future "wars" on crime and policing in general (Kraska, 2001).

Hill and Berger (2009), who coined the term "paramilitary police juggernaut" in their article, warn that militarization has far greater implications both here and abroad. Citing prior research on the matter, they state that modern, democratic policing is based on four principles: (1) Police give top operational priority to servicing the needs of individual citizens and private groups. (2) Police must be accountable to the law and not the will of the government. (3) Police should protect human rights, especially those rights involving political activity. (4) Police and their activities are transparent and accountable. Hill and Berger (2009) argue that current policing activities are accelerating more towards becoming a military model, which severely infringes on all of these principles. They say that the new militarized model encourages patrol officers and supervisors to react automatically in a quasi-military fashion, emphasizing only the use of coercive force to solve problems. Hill and Berger's (2009) vivid example to rival Kraska's (2001) Alberto story is the 1999 Seattle WTO riots. According to "500 incidents of eye witness testimony," the Seattle police handled the riots extremely poorly and in a very military like fashion. The police are accused of using massive amounts of tear gas to disperse nonviolent crowds, using rubber bullets against protestors engaged in passive resistance or fleeing, and using stringent force against all protestors or bystanders within their line of site instead of

making critical decisions on who to engage and who not to engage. The researchers warn that further militarization will increase incidents such as this and turn our democratic police force into an unthinking, reacting military unit (Hill & Berger, 2009).

There seems to be a distinct vacuum in exiting research when it comes to the public and militarization. Kraska (2001) and Hill and Berger (2009) hit close to home with their criticisms of the militarization movement but never approach the truly key issue. That is, how does the public feel about militarization? Police are distinctly public servants in countries with democratic policing models. Their actions and goals should mirror what the public expects and desires from the police. Thus, the actual thoughts, fears, and opinions of citizens on police militarization are highly important. Academic and legal scholars can debate and critique this issue, like any issue, for long periods of time, but without input from average citizens who could be affected by militarization on a daily basis, a key part of the debate is missing.

Contemporary Attitudes

Any study of police or the perspectives pertaining to them would not be complete without including some baseline research that already exists. Luckily, research involving public confidence and attitudes towards police occurs at a higher frequency than research involving police militarization. Although our variables of interest may not be specifically addressed, it does give us a general framework to think inside of. For this purpose, we will examine official Department of Justice statistics regarding citizen and police contacts, an international study interested in the determinants of police confidence, and a study focusing on direct and indirect experiences with police and their effects on positive or negative attitudes.

The idea that public attitudes towards police and their actions would come from first-hand experience and treatment by law enforcement would make logical sense. However, a D.O.J. report compiled by Eith and Durose (2011) shows that this may not be the case. Using data from a national-level, representative sample survey attached to the renowned National Crime Victimization Survey in 2008, the researchers compiled some intriguing results. According to their report, only 16.9% of U.S. residents age 16 and over had direct contact with the police, which was a decline from the same survey in 2002 (21%) and in 2005 (19.1%). The most common reason for contact with the police was being involved in a traffic stop, either as a driver or a passenger (47%). Another 12.2% of the total amount of contacts focused on being involved in a traffic accident. Only 5% of traffic stops led to a search of the driver or vehicle. In nontraffic related contacts, 20.9% involved a resident reporting a crime to the police, 6.3% involved a citizen being rendered aid or assistance, 5.6% involved police investigating a crime, 2.5% involved the police suspecting the respondent of a crime, and 5.5% involved other or unknown reasons for contact. Only 1.4% of the total contacts involved a use of force and 9 out of 10 respondents said that the police acted properly in the manner whichever manner they had contact (Eith & Durose, 2011).

From these results, we can extrapolate a few findings. First, the vast majority of police contacts either involve very minor offenses (primarily traffic infractions) or no criminal offenses at all (reporting a crime, being rendered aid). Furthermore, the overwhelming majority of citizens said the police had acted properly. This would show that citizens' dispositions regarding police confidence in fighting crime or handling crisis situations either come from nonserious crime related sources or from noncriminal matters. Also of note is the extremely small (1.4%) portion of the sample that had force used against them (i.e. an arrest) even when compared to the already

small number (16.9%) of total citizens who had any contact with the police. This shows that very few people have serious incidents that would prejudice their opinion of law enforcement. All of this may indicate that underlying independent variables may be the root of citizen attitudes towards police.

An article in Justice Quarterly in 2005 built upon the official D.O.J. statistic that four out of five people do not have contact with the police in a given year. Several researchers (Rosenbaum, Schuck, Costello, Hawkins, & Ring, 2005) sought to test if direct or vicarious experience had more of an impact on a citizen's opinion of law enforcement. Their study focused on citizen initiated police contacts (reporting a crime), police initiated contacts (investigations), baseline attitudes toward police, and causes of those baseline attitudes. They found that attitudes toward the police remained relatively stable despite citizen or police initiated contacts. Negative predispositions toward law enforcement predicted negative outcomes of both citizen and police initiated contacts; however, even positive predispositions towards law enforcement sometimes resulted in negative outcomes, primarily among whites (Rosenbaum, Schuck, Costello, Hawkins, & Ring, 2005).

The evidence that contact with the police predicted positive or negative attitudes towards the police was precarious at best. The researchers theorized that encounters with the police could be influenced by preexisting dispositions rather than the other way around. They found that whites had the highest expectations of police and seemed to get most of their information about the police from media outlets (televised news, newspaper). Minorities had lower expectations of police and received a significant portion of their news from the community or family. The researchers theorized that "bad news travels faster than good" and that the traditional history of police abuse to minorities could be the cause of negative predispositions towards law

enforcement. In any case, underlying societal values and attributes seemed to be the primary determination of attitudes towards police instead of actual face to face contact (Rosenbaum et al., 2005).

Several researchers at Sam Houston University and Missouri State University were interested in the possible underlying independent variables affecting public confidence in the police. Jang, Jihong, and Zhao (2010) designed an international study to look at a public confidence in the police across several demographic, economic, and political variables in several different nations, including the United States. They found that multiple variables had a significant impact on public confidence levels. First, they found a negative correlation between the national homicide rate and confidence in the police. As the homicide rate increased, the level in police confidence dropped (Jang et al., 2010). This makes logical sense, as having numerous murders and violent crime in your country (most of which may go unsolved due to the high volume) would lead you to believe the police were not being effective at fighting crime and maintaining order. Second, the researchers found that numerous demographic variables had a significant impact on police confidence: age, political affiliation, and education. Those of higher age had more confidence in the police, as did those of conservative political ideology. Education level had a negative relationship, indicating that those with advanced education had less confidence in the police. Finally, they found that those who were satisfied with their countries' democratic development had higher levels of confidence in the police. The final point led the researchers to claim that police should focus on protecting democratic values and freedoms in society (Jang et al., 2010).

This research is applicable to the current study in two major ways. First, it provides us with several independent variables of interest to look at it in our design as a possible predictor of

police confidence. These are age, political affiliation, and education. Second, it emphasizes the warning of Hill and Berger's research, which stated that militarizing the police would negatively impact democratic policing ideals and affect the public negatively. If it is true that the protection of individual liberties and positive progression of democratic ideals has a positive correlation with police confidence, it is possible that we will see a decrease in confidence for militarized policing tactics and equipment in our own study.

Conclusion

In conclusion, police militarization in America has a long and rich history rivaling the history of the police themselves. Through a study of the history of the police, we can see that it is truly a history of the police reacting to social problems and changing themselves to deal with new issues and improve themselves. The militarization movement is merely another reaction to a certain set of social phenomena. Some of the key events in this movement were things such as the Munich incident, the 1986 Miami F.B.I. shootout, the North Hollywood Shootout, and the Columbine shooting that each added something unique but critical to the overall development of militarized police. Some academic and legal scholars have been very vocal about the dangers of the road towards militarization or paramilitary policing yet not enough for such an important issue. This researcher would propose that a study of contemporary citizen attitudes towards police militarization would be highly important to this field of study as well as to the overall argument pertaining to the conflict between militarized and democratic policing.

CHAPTER 3

METHODS

Introduction

Our discussion about the history and development of police militarization in America has brought forth many issues and concerns. Specifically, some academic scholars have warned that the development of militarized police and paramilitary units will inevitably lead to an erosion of civil liberties and an end to traditional policing attitudes and practices. If this is the case, then citizens should be opposed to militarization and fearful of the legal and practical changes it would bring. However, it is also likely that the advanced tactics, superior equipment, and effectiveness of paramilitary or militarized police units could cause an increase in public confidence and decrease in public because the police would have the correct tools to "get the job done." This point can be reinforced by a general support for conservative/"tough on crime" policies that put emphasis more police power, funding, and staffing. Also, and perhaps more importantly, modern paramilitarism and militarized policing tactics are the result of shortcomings of traditional police in the past, especially when dealing with a crisis or extraordinary situation. It would not be a stretch to say that the general public supports change within law enforcement when inadequacies are shown and change or corrective measures are possible.

Research Hypothesis

Due to the available pertinent literature and other information available, it is the opinion of this researcher that the general public supports the militarization of the police. The following research hypothesis has been formed:

H_o: The presence of militarization will not have a significant effect on public confidence in the police.

H_a: The presence of militarization in certain situations (scenarios or vignettes for this research) will increase public confidence in the police.

To test this research hypothesis, the survey method was used. Each survey consists of three parts: basic demographic information (for independent variables), basic attitudes towards police (positive or negative), and a set of police scenarios (vignettes). There will be two forms: Form A, or the control form, will include vignettes outlining standard police practices. Form B, or the test form, will include vignettes outlining militarized policing practices. All other questions between the forms will be the same. The survey was created, disseminated, and collected via Google Docs and delivered via ETSU school e-mail. Answered surveys were automatically logged to a spreadsheet on the Google Docs server.

Sampling

For research purposes, the population being studied will be considered the entire current student population of ETSU, approximately 13,600 students. The Registrar's Office at ETSU was contacted and provided a master list of all currently enrolled ETSU student names and school e-mails. From this list, several sets of student e-mails were randomly selected to receive the survey. In order to control for random and sampling error as much as possible, the survey was disseminated as randomly as possible. The randomization process was achieved through a random number sort function using Microsoft Excel. Once emails were sent, a 1-week collection period was allocated before transferring the data collected on output spreadsheets into SPSS for coding and statistical testing. A response rate of 20%-30% was anticipated with using 1,000 randomized emails, an approximate yield of roughly 200-300 surveys usable for data entry and analysis. However, the two survey forms were each sent to 2,000 student emails, 1,000 emails

per form (A and B). After the 1-week collection period, only 103 usable responses were recorded to output spreadsheets. Form A had 53 responses and Form B had 50 responses. Overall response rate was 5%.

This low response rate may be indicative of problems with the sampling frame and/or sampling method. Generally, the lower the response rate, the less likely a researcher can find generalizability from the sample to the population being studied, let alone the overall or general population. Also, the amount of variability in such a small and limited sample may heavily influence the significance levels of several independent variables. A more detailed analysis is included in the "Limitations and Applicability" section.

Measurements

Independent Variables

Our primary independent variable is the presence or nonpresence of militarization in the survey (whether respondents received survey A or survey B). The response is coded in SPSS as a "dummy variable" from 0 to 1, where 0 is the nonpresence and 1 is the presence of militarization. Militarization is, of course, a very broad topic and can be conceptualized in several different ways. Some would say that militarization is simply the implementation of the "military mindset" into actual policing practice (Kraska, 2001). Other researchers claim that militarization is the use and/or overuse of paramilitary units (such as GSG-9 or S.W.A.T. teams), typically for purposes they were not originally designed for, specifically executing search warrants (Balko, 2006). Thus, it is best to capture the essence of police militarization in the aggregate. The working definition of police militarization for the purposes of this research is threefold: (1) Police are equipped with advanced lethal equipment (i.e. assault rifles vs. side

arms) and/or advanced gear (body armor, helmets, etc.). (2) Police use advanced military like tactics, with emphasis on small, coordinated groups and the use of overwhelming speed and force to solve problems. (3) Patrol officers, not specialized paramilitary units, are expected to respond to crisis situations.

This variable is captured in the aggregate by slight but important differences between the vignettes (otherwise referred to as scenarios). For example, in scenario 1, form A (our control or nonmilitarized example) states that:

"Your local police department receives 100 surplus military M-16 assault rifles. The local police chief states that patrol officers will not have assault rifles installed in their vehicles. The weapons will be stored in the police station's armory and used only in extreme emergency situations.

While form B (our test or militarized example) states:

"Your local police department receives 100 surplus military M-16 assault rifles. The local police chief states that the assault rifles will be installed in every patrol car. Patrol officers are trained and certified with the weapons. The assault rifle may be used in any situation involving deadly force, exactly like the officer's sidearm."

From this, you can see the obvious change. In form B, the police fit both rules 1 and 3 of our working definition, namely the use of advanced weaponry and the migration of specialization to patrol officers instead of paramilitary units. The other four scenarios operate in similar fashion. Scenario 4 focuses on an execution of a search warrant, where form A has uniformed officers conducting a search in broad daylight, while form B has a S.W.A.T. unit execute the same warrant with the same results, only at 3:00 a.m. and with overwhelming force. Scenarios 3 and 5

explore police reaction to possible active shooter scenarios, one at a private residence and the other in a public building. In both controls, the police take a slow, methodical approach involving SWAT teams similar to pre-Columbine standard tactics, while the militarized forms involve patrol officers reacting to "active shooter scenarios" aligned with post-Columbine style tactics.

While militarization (dichotomously coded as 0 – not present, 1 – present) is our primary independent variable of interest, multiple demographic level variables were also collected. These included sex (coded 1 – male, 2- female), race (coded nominally), political views (coded from 1 – Extremely Liberal to 7 – Extremely Conservative), level of religiosity (coded 1 – Not religious at all to 7 – Extremely religious), academic class standing (coded ordinally, ranking from Freshman to Graduate), and several socioeconomic status measures including mother and father education levels (coded from 1 – Less than high school to 7 – Graduate, Ph.D. level) and personal and family income level (coded ordinally from low to high). Three variables were created to measure a possible predisposition to a particular attitudes toward police, these were: personally work in criminal justice field (coded 1 – yes, 2 – no), know someone who works in the criminal justice or related field (coded 1 – yes, 2 – no), and had negative experience with law enforcement that influenced opinion (coded from 1 – Strongly disagree to 7 – Strongly agree). All data were recorded at either the nominal (sex, race) or ordinal level with the exception of age, which was recorded at the interval-ratio level. These variables were collected both for sampling frame purposes and for possible in-depth analysis if our primary independent and dependent variables are significant. For more information on the coding and scales of variables, please refer to Appendices A and B for individual survey questions and available responses.

Dependent Variables

Our primary dependent variables were the level of fear of the police and level of confidence in the police that are asked for each scenario. Respondents are asked to rate their level of fear of the police and level of confidence in them using the information provided in each scenario. This variable is measured on a Likert scale ranging from 1 to 7, where 1 is no fear/no confidence and 7 is extremely fearful/extremely confident. There is one measurement per variable per scenario, so there are a total of five confidence measures and five fear measures. These variables are computed using SPSS into an "average" variable, which adds each fear or confidence measure together and divides by the total (for example, F1 + F2 + F3 + F4 + F5 / 5 = Average Fear). This is done both for ease of computation and analysis and to match the aggregate data collection style exhibited by the militarization presence variable.

While confidence in the police is our primary focus, it is important to mention the reason for the inclusion of the fear of the police variable. Police confidence is generally a positive term, most people in the general population (and our sample) have a great deal of confidence in the police. It is important to balance this positive variable out with a variable that can record generally negative attitudes. Fear of the police was chosen for this study because it seemed most pertinent to the subject of law enforcement and militarization. Arguably, confidence in the police and fear of the police are not polar opposites or two sides of the same coin. There are other "negative" variables that could have been used in lieu of fear of police, such as mistrust or dislike of the police in each scenario. However, the fear variable is believed to be the best conceptualization of a negative term to compliment the measure of police confidence in this study.

The other dependent variables were focused on positive or negative police attitudes collected in the mid-section of the survey. There are 12 statements, six negative (even numbers) and six positive (odd numbers) that were designed to measure baseline citizen attitudes towards police. These questions are all measured on a Likert scale of 1 to 7, where 1 is the most disagreeable with the statement and 7 is the most agreeable. Statements that measure positive police attitudes include ideas that are generally associated with someone liking the police or being supportive of them. For example, statement 3 reads "Police officers are brave for doing their jobs", statement 7 reads "Police officer safety is important to me", and statement 11 reads "Police officers are not paid enough for what they do." It is highly likely that those who have a positive attitude towards police will find these statements agreeable. In comparison, the negative police attitudes are measured the same way. For example, statement 4 reads "Police officers do not respect citizen's rights", statement 8 reads "The Police have too much power", and question 10 reads "The police are not to be trusted." It is highly likely that respondents with negative attitudes toward police will find these statements agreeable. In similar fashion to the Fear and Confidence variables, the positive and negative police attitudes are both computed into singular composite variables. This is done for both ease of computation and interpretation and to keep the data similar to the militarization, confidence, and fear variable measurements.

To confirm that the underlying variables were all being reliably measured for the aggregate or composite score, Cronbach's alpha statistic was inspected. For positive attitudes, Cronbach's alpha was .798, for negative attitudes the reported statistic was .795, for citizen fear of the police the reported statistic was .784, and for citizen confidence in the police the reported statistic was .882. All measures of Cronbach's alpha for the aggregate variables are within acceptable operating parameters. (See Table 1)

Descriptive Statistics

Variable	N	Mean	Median	Mode
Militarization	103	.49	.00	0
Sex	103	1.67	2.00	2
Age	103	29.07	24.00	19
Academic Standing	103	3.67	4.00	5
Mother's Highest Level of Education	103	4.14	4.00	6
Father's Highest Level of Education	103	3.77	3.00	2
Ethnic Identity	102	1.09	1.00	1
Total Personal Income for Last Year	89	3.06	3.00	1
Total Family Income for Last Year	82	3.51	4.00	5
Political Identification	103	3.84	4.00	4
Level of Religion/Spirituality	103	4.17	4.00	4
Personally Work in CJ field or related	103	1.94	2.00	2
Know someone close who works in CJ field	103	1.59	2.00	2
Negative Experience with Police	103	2.85	2.00	1

Results

The survey was answered by 34 males (33%) and 69 females (67%). The mean age of the

sample was just over 29; however, there were several graduate students of advanced age

(including one 64 year old and nine respondents in the 50s) that may skew the data. Thus,

interpreting the median age of 24 may be more applicable. Academic standing was measured from freshman to graduate level, and the response breakdown is as follows: 13 freshmen, 5 sophomores, 21 juniors, 28 seniors, and 36 graduate students. Given the randomization of the survey process, higher academic classes seem overrepresented in the sample. The average education level of the respondent's mother was slightly above the associate's degree level while the education level of the father was slightly below. The sample was overwhelmingly white, with 96 White respondents, 4 Black, 1 Hispanic, 1 Asian, and 1 coded other. (See Table 1 for detail)

All aggregate (averaged) dependent variable scores were measured on a Likert scale of 1 to 7. The positive attitude towards police aggregate score had a mean of 5.5; while the negative attitude score had a mean of 3.16. The aggregate confidence in police score from the scenarios had a mean of 5.12, while the aggregate fear score from the scenarios had a mean of 2.66. Overall, our sample showed evidence of having high positive and low negative attitudes towards police while having high confidence levels and low levels of fear towards police in the scenarios. (See Table 2)

Table 2.

Aggregate Variables

Variable	N	Mean	Median	Mode
Positive Policing Attitudes	103	5.5032	5.6667	6.5000
Negative Policing Attitudes	103	3.1602	3.0000	2.6000
Fear of Police	103	2.6117	2.6000	1.0000
Confidence in Police	103	5.1223	5.6000	6.0000

Linear, multivariate regression analysis was chosen to interpret the obtained results. The goal of this research is to find if a significant relationship exists between the presence of militarization and levels of fear and/or confidence in the police. Regression analysis was employed to try to find the variable that most significantly influences fear and confidence levels towards the police. Ideally, this will be the presence of militarization. The predictive formula y= a +b(x) was used to find the increase in dependent variable for a certain measure of the independent variables. (See Table 3)

Table 3.

Linear Regression Analysis

R	R^2	Adjusted R^2	ANOVA (Model Sig Lvl)	Constant	Militarization Beta-weight	Confidence Beta-weight	Fear Beta-weight
.768	.590	.578	.000	4.145	.509	.413	-.590

The first test to be implemented was a simple regression model where the aggregate variable for police confidence across the scenario was regressed upon the independent variable Militarization (our measure of which version of the scenarios the respondent received). The overall model was significant at the alpha = .004 level of significance. Pearson's r showed a statistic of .284, denoting a weak to moderate relationship. The r^2 statistic was .081, denoting that around 8% of the variance in our dependent variable was explained by the presence of

militarization. The regression model was significant and the predictive formula could be used. Militarization carried a beta-weight of .819 with a constant of 4.725.

Several series of tests were then implemented to see if any other independent variables had a significant impact on the citizen confidence in police: sex, age, personal income, family income, political views, religiosity, and whether respondents reported having a negative contact with police that influenced their opinion of them. No other independent variables were significant. Personal income showed signs of being significant but this later fell away as more relevant variables were added to the model. Our originally dependent variables, fear of police and positive police attitudes, were chosen to be treated as independent variables for two reasons: first, they explain a majority of the variability within the model (almost 60%), second, the lack of any significant demographic level independent variables. The research hypothesis states that we are interested in seeing the impact of militarization on public's confidence in police, and we have seen that. However, it was also stated that everything subsequent to this test was of secondary importance. It is pleasing to see that variables within our study explain so much of the variability in our dependent variables, although those variables were originally not designed for that. It was highly unlikely that any major independent variable other than militarization would be significant due to a small, flawed, and homogenous sample. The pursuit of significant demographic level independent variables is ultimately outside the scope and limits of this research.

A second major linear regression was run using confidence in the police as the dependent variable and Militarization as the primary independent variable. Positive police attitudes and fear of the police were then added as independent variables. The overall model was significant at the alpha = .000 level of significance. Pearson's r showed a statistic of .768, denoting a very strong

relationship. The r^2 statistic was .59, meaning that almost 60% of the variation in our dependent variable was being explained by the three independent variables present. The regression model and all three independent variables present were all significant. Militarization carried a beta-weight of .509, positive attitudes carried a beta-weight of .413, and fear of police carried a beta-weight of -.590.

If we employ our predictive formula to write out our equation, we can obtain some interesting results. Remember, our dependent variable is measured on a Likert scale of 1 to 7 where 1 is having no confidence in the police and 7 extremely high confidences. Using the extreme values of our positive attitude variable and fear level, we can obtain a range of y= 0.937 (low positive attitude, high fear) to 6.955 (high positive attitude, low fear) with militarization present. Without militarization present, we receive a range of y= 0.428 (low positive attitude, high fear) to 6.446 (high positive attitude, low fear). However, these results are only for extreme values. We can get a better picture of the true effect of militarization by using the mean values of our variables, which are 5.5 for positive police attitudes and 2.6 for fear of the police. When we plug this into our predictive regression formula, we receive a range of y= 4.8825 (no militarization) to 5.3915 (militarization).

CHAPTER 4

DISCUSSION

Our research has yielded some interesting results despite numerous limitations. From our original regression model that only used the average police confidence and the presence of militarization, we can reject the null hypothesis of our research, that the presence of militarization has no effect on citizen confidence in police, in favor of the research hypothesis, which states that the presence of militarization would increase public confidence in police. Although the Militarization variable is significant, by itself it has a weak to moderate r, very low r^2, and small beta-weight in the regression formula. The true change can be seen when the measures for positive police attitudes and fear of police are added in. The overall r for the model inflates to .748, which is an extremely strong, positive correlation. The r^2 also inflates to .59, which means the regression model explains the majority of the variation in our dependent variable.

These results show that while the presence of militarization is a significant factor in determining citizen confidence in police actions, militarization's influence is overshadowed by a citizen's positive attitude and fear of police. This result makes logical sense. If a citizen is highly fearful of the police or has an inherently negative attitude towards the police, he or she is unlikely to have a high confidence level in police action whether they are militarized in their actions and equipment or not. Likewise, if a citizen has very little fear of the police and an inherently positive attitude, he or she is likely to support the police operating in an official capacity regardless of tactics or gear. The mean statistics of the sample shows that the average

person has a fairly positive attitude towards police and relatively little fear, while having a fairly high level of confidence.

Although there is a statistically significant difference in whether police militarization is present or not, there is not much substantive significance. Carrying a beta-weight of only .509 in the final model, this equates to only a half point difference on a Likert scale of 1 to 7. Using the "average person" predictive equation, it changes the response from 4.9 to 5.4. Both scores still denote a moderately high level of confidence in the police. This research ultimately fails to show that police militarization is a highly statistically and substantively significant or a primary factor in determining a citizen's confidence in the police. However, given the lack of pertinent research in this area, this introduces a worthy starting point for future research into both police militarization and public confidence in the police.

Limitations and Applicability

Numerous threats to validity and reliability exist, mainly due to the conceptualization process of some variables (which is inherently subjective) and the traits of the sample. The sample was selected randomly, albeit on a small scale population (currently enrolled students at ETSU). This randomization process helps cut down on several negative factors such as a lack of variability in the sample or experimenter or selection bias. Yet, with an abysmal response rate of 5%, our sample suffers considerably from a lack of generalizability, even from within a fairly small population of roughly 13,600 students. Several variables are overrepresented in the sample, such as students of older age, graduate level students, and females. Also, our sample is highly homogeneous, being overwhelmingly white, having moderate religious and political values, and having typically low personal income while having moderate to high family income. It is entirely

plausible that not enough variability exists, especially in such as small sample, to derive any meaningful results. Although Cronbach's alpha gives us a good result on internal reliability, the extremely low response rate harms our overall reliability.

A major threat to validity in the current study was the conceptualization and operationalization process for our major independent and dependent variables. Militarization is loosely defined by three broad terms and replicated in five generated scenarios. Validity was attempted to be controlled for by keeping the results the same for both versions of a scenario while changing only the methods. For example, in scenario 3, a hostage is taken, police arrived, and later the aggressor is arrested while the hostage is unharmed. The only difference is the presence of militarization (police rushing into the home and holding aggressor at gunpoint (militarized) vs. slow methodical approach involving SWAT and a hostage negotiator (nonmilitarized). In scenario 5, shots are heard inside of an office building, no civilians or police are harmed, and the shooter is found dead. Again the only difference is militarization, specifically, the tactics the police use (post-Columbine "active shooter" tactics vs. pre-Columbine SWAT tactics). Although the differences are controlled for as much as possible, it is still plausible that the militarization variables are too subjectively defined to be applicable.

Positive and negative police attitudes are measured by a series of questions and then compiled for an aggregate score. Some questions may not measure precisely what is expected. For example, question 5 states "Police officers are regular people like you and me." This is considered a positive attitude towards police because respondents are expected to think that officers are human beings and fellow citizens who do an important job. However, it is possible that respondents could find this statement disagreeable if they think that police officers are better than regular people or are a special population (i.e. heroes) and don't deserve to be lumped into a

category with the rest of the general population. Related to this is question 6 "Police officers should be treated differently than you or me." This is considered a negative attitude indicator because those who have positive attitudes would, again, think that police are fellow humans and citizens who deserve the same level of respect and scrutiny as anyone else. However, it is also plausible that those who think that police are superhuman or heroes deserve to be treated better (differently) than the rest of the population and would interpret the question in the opposite way. All statistical based research is inherently subjective and it is of the opinion of this researcher that these threats are controlled for as best as possible given the circumstances.

Future Research and Conclusion

The ability to show significance for several variables of interest with such a small and flawed sample is very promising. The primary goal of establishing the presence of police militarization as a significant factor in citizen confidence in police was accomplished statistically, but the substantive effect is debatable. The research was unable to replicate other studies and find any demographic level variables such as age, political affiliation, or race that had a significant effect on citizens' attitudes towards the police. However, this is most likely due to the problems revolving around a small, homogenous sample. It would be interesting to see the same or a similar study produced on a larger scale with a greater sample size and more representative results. Nevertheless, this research could be a starting point for further investigation into the effects of militarization on citizen fear and confidence in the police.

An interesting conclusion, although not directly related to militarization, is the link between citizen fear of police and positive attitudes towards police. If the research at hand can be applied to a more general population, then it would be possible to increase citizen confidence in

police by reducing fear and improving positive attitudes. There are sure to be specific

independent variables that will affect this relationship specifically, and hopefully future research

can discover these.

REFERENCES

Anderson, W. F. (1996). *Forensic analysis of the April 11, 1986, FBI Firefight.* Quanitico: F.B.I.

    Academy.

Balko, R. (2006). *Overkill: The rise of paramilitary raids in the U.S.* Washington DC: Cato

    Institute.

Barrett, P. M. (2013). *Glock: The rise of America's gun.* New York: Broadway.

Campbell, D., & Campbell, K. (2010). Soldiers as police officers/police officers as Soldiers:

    Role Evolution and Revolution in the United States. *Armed Forces and Society, 36* 327-

    350.

Eith, C., & Durose, M. (2011). *Contacts between police and the public, 2008.* Washington DC:

    U.S. Department of Justice.

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

Ivie, D., & Garland, B. (2011). Stress and burnout in policing: Does military experience matter?

    Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies and Management, 1(34), 49-66.

Jang, H., Joo, H.-J., & Zhao, J. (2010). Determinants of public confidence in police: An

    international perspective. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 38(1) 57-68.

Kraska, P. (2001). *Militarizing the American criminal justice system.* Richmond, VA:

    Northeastern University Press.

Lutterbeck, D. (2004). Between police and military: The new security agenda and the rise of

    gendarmeries. *Cooperation and Conflict, 39*(1), 45-68.

Matthews, M. (2006). *The Posse Comitatus Act and the United States Army: A historical perspective.* Ft. Leavenworth, TX: Combat Studies Institute Press.

Patterson, G. (2002). Predicting the effects of military server experience on stressful occupational events in police officers. *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies and Management, 25*, 602-618.

Rosenbaum, D., Schuck, A., Costello, S., Hawkins, D., & Ring, M. (2005). Attitudes toward the police: The effects of direct and vicarious experience. *Police Quarterly, 8*(3), 343-365.

Siegel, L. (2009). *Essentials of criminal justice* (6th ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Cengage Learning.

Talvi, S. (2003). Shoot first, ask questions later: The Militarization of Law Enforcement. *Prison Legal News, 14*(9), 10-11.

Walker, S., & Katz, C. (2008). *The police in America: An introduction.* New York: McGraw-Hill.

Appendix A

Form A – Standard Survey

ETSU Student Police Militarization Attitudes Survey

Dear ETSU Student,

My name is Phillip Wyrick, and I am a graduate student at East Tennessee State University. I am working on my Master's Degree in Criminal Justice and Criminology. In order to satisfy the requirements for my M.A., I am required to do a thesis and corresponding research. The name of my research study is Police Militarization: Attitudes towards the Militarization of the American Police. By completing the attached survey, you will provide me with raw data to analyze and statistically test. Thank you for your time and consideration.

Please note a few things before starting: This study has been determined to be human research by the ETSU Institutional Review Board (IRB). By choosing to complete this survey, you are considered a research participant. Under applicable state and federal law, you have certain rights and protections as a voluntary participant. If you have questions about this research or your role as a research participant, you may contact me or the ETSU IRB at the contact information provided below.

The purpose of this study is to research attitudes and feelings towards the police becoming militarized. It should only take about 5 to 10 minutes to complete. Your ETSU student e-mail was randomly selected from a master list of all currently enrolled students. If you choose to complete the survey, your answers will be saved to a spreadsheet on a Google Docs server. This method is completely anonymous and confidential. Only a timestamp will be recorded when you submit your answers, in other words, no personal identifiable information will exist to link your answers to you once you complete the survey.

Participation in this survey is completely voluntary. You may refuse to participate. You can quit at any time. Unanswered surveys will not be included in the research data. There are no consequences to refusing to participate in this research.

If you have any research-related questions or problems, you may contact me at (423) 439-6453 or (423) 863-0066. You may contact the ETSU IRB at (423) 439-6053.

Thank you again for your time and consideration. I look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,

Phillip Wyrick

Demographic Information

Sex

- ○ Male

- ○ Female

Age
(in years)

[   ]

College Class Standing (Academic Level)

- ○ Freshman
- ○ Sophmore
- ○ Junior
- ○ Senior
- ○ Graduate
- ○ Other: [   ]

Please list your current major or program of study

[   ]

Highest education level achieved by Mother

- ○ Less than High School
- ○ High School Diploma
- ○ Some Junior College (2 year) or Vocational Training
- ○ Associate's Degree / other Vocational Degree
- ○ Some University or 4 year college
- ○ Bachelor's Degree or related 4 year program
- ○ Graduate Degree - Master's or J.D. level
- ○ Graduate Degree - Ph.D level

Highest education level achieved by Father

- ○ Less than High School
- ○ High School Diploma
- ○ Some Junior College (2 year) or Vocational Training
- ○ Associate's Degree / other Vocational Degree
- ○ Some University or 4 year college
- ○ Bachelor's Degree or related 4 year program
- ○ Graduate Degree - Master's or J.D. level
- ○ Graduate Degree - Ph.D level

Ethnic Identity

- ○ White
- ○ Black
- ○ Hispanic
- ○ Asian
- ○ Other: [_____]

Your total income for last year

- ○ 0 - $3,000
- ○ $3,001 - $6,000
- ○ $6,001 - $10,000
- ○ $10,001 - $20,000
- ○ $20,001 - $35,000
- ○ $35,001 - $50,000
- ○ Over $50,000
- ○ Don't know / prefer not to answer

Your total family income for last year
(this includes all members of your household)

- ○ 0 - $10,000
- ○ $10,001 - $30,000
- ○ $30,001 - $50,000
- ○ $50,001 - $70,000
- ○ $70,001 - $100,000
- ○ Above $100,000
- ○ Don't know / prefer not to answer

Political Views
1 - Extremely Liberal, 2 - Liberal, 3 - Leaning Liberal, 4 - Moderate, 5 - Leaning Conservative, 6 - Conservative, 7 - Extremely Conservative

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Extremely Liberal	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	Extremely Conservative

How religious/spiritual do you consider yourself to be?

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Not Religious/Spiritual at all	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	Very Religious/Spiritual

Are you involved with or work in the criminal justice field or related fields?

- ○ Yes
- ○ No

Do you have a family member or close friend that works in the criminal justice field or related fields?

- ○ Yes
- ○ No

Attitudes Towards Police

Instructions: Your answers will evaluated on a standard Likert scale ranging from 1 to 7. 1 will represent the most disagreeable or negative answer pertaining to a statement. 4 will represent a neutral position on the question. 7 will represent the most agreeable or positive answer pertaining to a statement.

1. Generally, I respect the Police and their authority.

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Strongly Disagree	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	Strongly Agree

2. The Police have too much lethal equipment.

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Strongly Disagree	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	Strongly Agree

3. Police officers are brave for doing their jobs.

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Strongly Disagree	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	Strongly Agree

4. Police officers do not respect citizen's rights.

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Strongly Disagree	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	Strongly Agree

5. Police officers are regular people, like you or me.

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Strongly Disagree	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	Strongly Agree

6. Police officers should be treated differently than regular citizens

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Strongly Disagree ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ Strongly Agree

7. Police officer safety is important to me.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Strongly Disagree ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ Strongly Agree

8. The Police have too much power.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Strongly Disagree ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ Strongly Agree

9. The Police should be better equipped and better funded.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Strongly Disagree ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ Strongly Agree

10. The police are not to be trusted.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Strongly Disagree ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ Strongly Agree

11. Police officers are not paid enough for what they do.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Strongly Disagree ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ Strongly Agree

12. Personally, I do not like the police.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Strongly Disagree ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ Strongly Agree

13. I have had a negative experience with the police that influenced my opinion of them.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Strongly Disagree ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ Strongly Agree

Police Scenarios

Instructions: Given the following mock scenarios, act as if you are an eyewitness to such events or witnessed such events on the local news or other similar medium. Your answers will be rated on the previously mentioned Likert scale of 1 to 7, with 1 being the most disagreeable or negative answer, while 7 would be the most agreeable or positive answer.

Scenario 1

Your local police department recieves 100 surplus military M-16 assault rifles. The local police chief states that patrol officers will not have assault rifles installed in their vehicles. The weapons will be stored in the police station's armory and used only in extreme emergency situations.

1F. Given the above information, what is your level of fear of the police?

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Not Fearful at all	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	Extremely Fearful

1C. Given the above information, what is your level of confidence in the police?

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Not Confident at all	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	Extremely Confident

Scenario 2

You hear on the local news that a dangerous convict has escaped from the prison is loose in your neighborhood. That evening, you answer a knock at your door. A uniformed police officer informs you that the convict is being actively searched for and recommends for you to stay inside with the doors locked.

2F. Given the above information, what is your level of fear of the police?

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Not Fearful at all	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	Extremely Fearful

2C. Given the above information, what is your level of confidence in the police?

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Not Confident at all	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	Extremely Confident

Scenario 3

Using a knife, a man takes his girlfriend hostage inside their home. Local police arrive within minutes of recieving the call and surround the home. A hostage negotiator is brought in to speak to the suspect. 3 hours later, the suspect exits the home and surrenders. The suspect is arrested by uniformed officers and transported to jail. The hostage is unharmed.

3F. Given the above information, what is your level of fear of the police?

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Not Fearful at all	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	Extremely Fearful

3C. Given the above information, what is your level of confidence in the police?

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Not Confident at all	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	Extremely Confident

Scenario 4

Local police obtain and execute a search warrant at a local home. At noon, two uniformed officers knock on the front door and announce their police presence. The inhabitant who opens the door is detained by one officer, and the other officer searches the home for drugs and weapons. 5 pounds of cocaine and several assault rifles are seized . The indiviual who answered the door is arrested and transported to jail.

4F. Given the above information, what is your level of fear of the police?

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Not Fearful at all	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	Extremely Fearful

4C. Given the above information, what is your level of confidence in the police?

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Not Confident at all	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	Extremely Confident

Scenario 5

Gunshots are heard inside a local office building. Four patrol officers arrive within minutes and begin to help evacuate civillians and seal off the building and surrounding area. 20 minutes after the initial gunshot, a police S.W.A.T. unit arrives on scene and prepares to enter the building. After 10 minutes of preparation, the S.W.A.T. unit enters the building and begins a room by room search and clear. 45 minutes after the initial gunshot, the police find an adult male dead from a self-inflicted gunshot wound in a bathroom. No police or civillians are harmed in the incident.

5F. Given the above information, what is your level of fear of the police?

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Not Fearful at all	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	Extremely Fearful

5C. Given the above information, what is your level of confidence in the police?

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Not Confident at all	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	Extremely Confident

Submit

Never submit passwords through Google Forms.

Powered by Google Drive

Form B – Militarized Survey

ETSU Student Police Militarization Attitudes Survey

Dear ETSU Student,

My name is Phillip Wyrick, and I am a graduate student at East Tennessee State University. I am working on my Master's Degree in Criminal Justice and Criminology. In order to satisfy the requirements for my M.A., I am required to do a thesis and corresponding research. The name of my research study is Police Militarization: Attitudes towards the Militarization of the American Police. By completing the attached survey, you will provide me with raw data to analyze and statistically test. Thank you for your time and consideration.

Please note a few things before starting: You must be 18 years of age or older to participate. This study has been determined to be human research by the ETSU Institutional Review Board (IRB). By choosing to complete this survey, you are considered a research participant. Under applicable state and federal law, you have certain rights and protections as a voluntary participant. If you have questions about this research or your role as a research participant, you may contact me or the ETSU IRB at the contact information provided below.

The purpose of this study is to research attitudes and feelings towards the police becoming militarized. It should only take about 5 to 10 minutes to complete. Your ETSU student e-mail was randomly selected from a master list of all currently enrolled students. If you choose to complete the survey, your answers will be saved to a spreadsheet on a Google Docs server. This method is completely anonymous and confidential. Only a timestamp will be recorded when you submit your answers, in other words, no personal identifiable information will exist to link your answers to you once you complete the survey.

Participation in this survey is completely voluntary. You may refuse to participate. You can quit at any time. Unanswered surveys will not be included in the research data. There are no consequences to refusing to participate in this research.

If you have any research-related questions or problems, you may contact me at (423) 439-6453 or (423) 863-0066. You may contact the ETSU IRB at (423) 439-6053.

Thank you again for your time and consideration. I look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,

Phillip Wyrick

Demographic Information

Sex
- ○ Male
- ○ Female

Age

(in years)

[ ]

College Class Standing (Academic Level)

- ○ Freshman
- ○ Sophmore
- ○ Junior
- ○ Senior
- ○ Graduate
- ○ Other: [ ]

Please list your current major or program of study

[ ]

Highest education level achieved by Mother

- ○ Less than High School
- ○ High School Diploma
- ○ Some Junior College (2 year) or Vocational Training
- ○ Associate's Degree / other Vocational Degree
- ○ Some University or 4 year college
- ○ Bachelor's Degree or related 4 year program
- ○ Graduate Degree - Master's or J.D. level
- ○ Graduate Degree - Ph.D level

Highest education level achieved by Father

- ○ Less than High School
- ○ High School Diploma
- ○ Some Junior College (2 year) or Vocational Training
- ○ Associate's Degree / other Vocational Degree
- ○ Some University or 4 year college
- ○ Bachelor's Degree or related 4 year program
- ○ Graduate Degree - Master's or J.D. level
- ○ Graduate Degree - Ph.D level

Ethnic Identity

- ○ White
- ○ Black

- ○ Hispanic
- ○ Asian
- ○ Other: [   ]

Your total income for last year

- ○ 0 - $3,000
- ○ $3,001 - $6,000
- ○ $6,001 - $10,000
- ○ $10,001 - $20,000
- ○ $20,001 - $35,000
- ○ $35,001 - $50,000
- ○ Over $50,000
- ○ Don't know / prefer not to answer

Your total family income for last year
(this includes all members of your household)

- ○ 0 - $10,000
- ○ $10,001 - $30,000
- ○ $30,001 - $50,000
- ○ $50,001 - $70,000
- ○ $70,001 - $100,000
- ○ Above $100,000
- ○ Don't know / prefer not to answer

Political Views
1 - Extremely Liberal, 2 - Liberal, 3 - Leaning Liberal, 4 - Moderate, 5 - Leaning Conservative, 6 - Conservative, 7 - Extremely Conservative

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Extremely Liberal	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	Extremely Conservative

How religious/spiritual do you consider yourself to be?

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Not Religious/Spiritual at all	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	Very Religious/Spiritual

Are you involved with or work in the criminal justice field or related fields?

- ○ Yes

- ○ No

Do you have a family member or close friend that works in the criminal justice field or related fields?

- ○ Yes
- ○ No

Attitudes Towards Police

Instructions: Your answers will evaluated on a standard Likert scale ranging from 1 to 7. 1 will represent the most disagreeable or negative answer pertaining to a statement. 4 will represent a neutral position on the question. 7 will represent the most agreeable or positive answer pertaining to a statement.

1. Generally, I respect the Police and their authority.

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Strongly Disagree	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	Strongly Agree

2. The Police have too much lethal equipment.

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Strongly Disagree	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	Strongly Agree

3. Police officers are brave for doing their jobs.

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Strongly Disagree	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	Strongly Agree

4. Police officers do not respect citizen's rights.

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Strongly Disagree	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	Strongly Agree

5. Police officers are regular people, like you or me.

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Strongly Disagree	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	Strongly Agree

6. Police officers should be treated differently than regular citizens

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Strongly Disagree	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	Strongly Agree

7. Police officer safety is important to me.

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Strongly Disagree	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	Strongly Agree

8. The Police have too much power.

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Strongly Disagree	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	Strongly Agree

9. The Police should be better equipped and better funded.

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Strongly Disagree	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	Strongly Agree

10. The police are not to be trusted.

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Strongly Disagree	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	Strongly Agree

11. Police officers are not paid enough for what they do.

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Strongly Disagree	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	Strongly Agree

12. Personally, I do not like the police.

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Strongly Disagree	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	Strongly Agree

13. I have had a negative experience with the police that influenced my opinion of them.

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Strongly Disagree	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	Strongly Agree

Police Scenarios

Instructions: Given the following mock scenarios, act as if you are an eyewitness to such events or witnessed such events on the local news or other similar medium. Your answers will be rated on the previously mentioned Likert scale of 1 to 7, with 1 being the most disagreeable or negative answer, while 7 would be the most agreeable or positive answer.

Scenario 1

Your local police department receives 100 surplus military M-16 assault rifles. The local police chief states that the assault rifles will be installed in every patrol car. Patrol officers are trained and certified with the weapons. The assault rifle may be used in any situation involving deadly force, exactly like the officer's sidearm.

1F. Given the above information, what is your level of fear of the police?

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Not Fearful at all	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	Extremely Fearful

1C. Given the above information, what is your level of confidence in the police?

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Not Confident at all	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	Extremely Confident

Scenario 2

You hear on the local news that a dangerous escaped convict has escaped from prison and is loose in your neighborhood. You answer a knock at your door. Three police officers wearing riot gear (heavily padded full body armor including helmets) holding AR-15 assault rifles inform you that the suspect is still at large in your neighborhood but the police are actively searching for him. The officers recommend you stay inside and lock all doors and windows.

2F. Given the above information, what is your level of fear of the police?

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Not Fearful at all	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	Extremely Fearful

2C. Given the above information, what is your level of confidence in the police?

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Not Confident at all	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	Extremely Confident

Scenario 3

Using a knife, a man takes his girlfriend hostage inside their home. Within moments, three patrol officers arrive on scene, and they immediately force their way into the home. The officers hold the suspect at gunpoint until he surrenders. The suspect is arrested and transported to jail. The victim is unharmed.

3F. Using the above information, what is your level of fear of the police?

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Not Fearful at all	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	Extremely Fearful

3C. Using the above information, what is your level of confidence in the police?

Scenario 4

Local police receive a search warrant to be served at a local home. A police S.W.A.T. team is called to execute the warrant. Officers wear full body armor and carry AR-15 assault rifles. They arrive at the home at 3:00 in the morning. The S.W.A.T. team breaks down the front door, rushes in, and hold a lone inhabitant at gunpoint on the floor. After a search of the house, 5 pounds of cocaine and several assault rifles are seized. The lone inhabitant is arrested and transported to jail.

4F. Given the above information, what is your level of fear of the police?

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Not Fearful at all	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	Extremely Fearful

4C. Given the above information, what is your level of confidence in the police?

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Not Confident at all	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	Extremely Confident

Scenario 5

Gunshots are heard inside a local office building. Four patrol officers arrive within minutes. The officers immediately enter the building, moving in formation towards the last reported location of the gunshots. 5 minutes after entering the building, the police find an adult male dead from a self-inflicted gunshot wound in a bathroom. No police or civillians are harmed in the incident.

5F. Given the above information, what is your level of fear of the police?

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Not Fearful at all	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	Extremely Fearful

5C. Given the above information, what is your level of confidence in the police?

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Not Confident at all	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	Extremely Confident

Submit

Never submit passwords through Google Forms.

Powered by Google Drive

VITA

PHILLIP T. WYRICK

Personal Data: Date of Birth: August 13, 1989

                            Place of Birth: Kingsport, TN

                            Marital Status: Single

Education: Public Schools, Kingsport, TN

                            A.S. Criminal Justice, Northeast State Community College,

                            Blountville, TN, 2009

                            B.S. Criminal Justice and Criminology, East Tennessee State

                            University, Johnson City, TN, 2011

                            M.A. Criminal Justice and Criminology, East Tennessee State

                            University, Johnson City, TN, 2013

Professional Experience: Deputy Clerk, Sullivan County Circuit Court Clerk, Blountville,

                            TN 2008-2013

                            Graduate Assistant, ETSU Department of Criminal Justice,

                            Johnson City, TN 2011-2013

Honors and Awards   Dean's List, Undergraduate 2007-2011

                            Outstanding Undergraduate Criminal Justice Student, 2011