

Development of police procedures as
portrayed in the reality television series
Cops

Case study from Florida

Tero Tihveräinen
University of Tampere
School of Social Sciences and Humanities
Sociology
Master's Thesis
September 2013

University of Tampere
School of Social Sciences and Humanities
Sociology

Tero Tihveräinen: Development of police procedures as portrayed in the reality television series Cops – Case study from Florida

Master's Thesis, 76 pages, 1 appendix

September 2013

This is a case study which explores whether the reality television series Cops portrays a procedural change in the way officers work in Florida. This change is being studied in two different settings: 1) Change in procedures in the way police officers use force which includes a comparison between two drug sting operations. In addition, this thesis explores whether officers have become more aggressive and cautious in different scenes. 2) This thesis also explores how officers communicate with suspects and other citizens and officers' background and reflective talk.

The analysis was done by watching a total of 18 episodes which included 30 scenes from the reality television series Cops. The episodes were all from the state of Florida. The chosen episodes were from the years 1995–1997 and 2009–2011. From the 30 scenes two drug sting scenes were specially chosen for a comparison of police procedures.

The results revealed the change in how officers saw their work. In the 1995–1997 scenes officers saw themselves as crime fighters and felt that their job was extremely dangerous. In the 2009–2011 episodes officers portrayed their job as being protectors of the community and presented positive aspects of their job. The results were quite the opposite when examining how officers used force in the episodes. In the 1995–1997 episodes officers were more relaxed in scenes and presented less physical force against suspects. This was especially the case when officers handcuffed suspects. In the 2009–2011 scenes officers were more cautious when entering the scenes and more often handcuffed the suspects even for petty offences. In addition, officers used more physical force towards suspects. Some of these changes give evidence that strategies from the ideology of community policing has been implemented in the work of police. The analysis also suggests that the actions of officers in the 2009–2011 scenes were in accordance with the Tampa Police department's standard operating procedures manual.

Table of contents

1. Introduction.....	1
2. Police and media research	5
2.1 Media Research	5
2.2 Police Research	10
3. Theoretical Background	16
4. Research data and methods.....	20
4.1 Research material	20
4.2 Research problems.....	23
4.3 Method	25
5. Use of force.....	28
5.1 Approaching the incident area.....	28
5.2 Use of handcuffs	33
5.3 Lethal and non-lethal instruments	35
5.4 Case: Special operations unit	38
5.5 Conclusions	43
6. Community policing.....	50
6.1 Background talk from police officers	50
6.2 Interaction between the officers and others	54
6.3 Reflecting talk	62
6.4 Conclusions	64
7. Discussion.....	69
References	72
Appendix 1: List of chosen Cops episodes for analysis.....	77

Abbreviations:

	Meaning
VM	Male victim
VF	Female victim
WM	Male witness
WF	Female witness
SM	Male suspect
SF	Female suspect
OM	Male officer
OF	Female officer
Number ^x	2 nd , 3 rd etc. officer, victim etc.
Sxx	Season number
Exx	Episode number

1. Introduction

There is a lot of research about the different methods of policing and the way reality television series is being portrayed. However, there does not seem to be a lot of research about the possible relation between reality television series and reality. Cameras always affect the way individuals work but then again so does every type of observation. By watching the reality television series Cops, I became interested in the change in police procedures that the series presents. I started to wonder whether a real live change can be connected to the portrayed reality of the television series Cops. Thus, my research questions are as follows: *Can there be portrayed a procedural changed in the reality television series cops?* If the answer is yes, then my interest is in *what kind of changes does the reality television series cops portray?* I am also interested in *whether there is evidence that the portrayed changes in the television series are real police procedural changes?*

In the accumulated policing research, there was one particular method of policing that seemed to rise from the theoretical discussion: Community policing. In different countries community policing has different meanings, but in all research I studied one particular characteristic of the method seems to connect all of the theories: the co-operation between the community and the police. (e.g. Fielding 2006.) In the narrowest theories community policing includes only the aforementioned co-operation but in the wider perspectives, community policing includes wide police reforms (e.g. the establishment of new units, changes in police standard operating procedures etc.).

In this thesis, I studied the reality television series Cops in two different timelines, 1995–1997 and 2009–2011, and made a comparison between episodes in the two timelines. The analysis was guided by the theoretical background of community policing. The main idea of community policing is to enhance the co-operation between members of the community and the police (ibid.) Different countries take up different types of strategic planning to achieve this relationship. In the United States, community policing is pursued by actively engaging police officers to communicate with various members of the community. In addition, members of the communities are being implemented in the decision making process of the police. The reason is that the community is seen as best information source for problems relating to crime (e.g. Silk 2012).

Due to the fact that the work of officers is strictly controlled and closely followed by the different public sectors (e.g. citizens, the media, etc.), I could observe whether some procedural changes had occurred in the series. Since community policing seems to be an important factor in the police reform in the 21st century, I hypothesized that this would be portrayed in the series (Crank 2003; Fullbright-Anderson et al. 2006; Silk 2012).

I use Fielding's (2006) three broad meanings for community policing and move towards more specific strategic policing changes. Fielding's meanings emphasize 1) the alternative method for rapid response policing, 2) a process where members of the community are included in police decision making and 3) the importance of positive communication between the community and police officers. Fullbright-Anderson et al. (2006) presented four dimensions for community policing: 1) *the philosophical level*, 2) *the strategic level*, 3) *the tactical level* and 4) *the organizational level*. With the help of these dimensions, I analyze whether the television series Cops portrayed procedural policing changes towards community policing.

In chapter two, I present previous research done in the field of media research and in the field of policing research. A particular observation was that the television Series Cops was used in various media type research (e.g. Geiser-Getz 1995.) Most of the research presented the portrayal of the television series or the experience of the viewers. None of the research weighed the authenticity of the portrayal in the television series Cops. By studying previous research done in the field of policing, I observed that most of the research consists of issues closely related to police reform. In addition, some research was done on the methods of policing (e.g. Newburn 2011). After studying the wide variety of policing research, I focused more in what kind of research was done in the field of community policing (e.g. Brown 2007).

In the third chapter of my thesis, I present the theoretical background of my study. I start by presenting when community policing was implemented and what method of policing it replaced. Crank (2006) suggested that community policing replaced professional policing due to the growing dissatisfaction of the community. However, in order to understand what is community policing I studied the definitions for community policing and present the ones I use in my analysis. I start by presenting Fielding's (2006) three broad views for community policing, in order to present what was generally thought about it. However, Fullbright-Anderson (2006) specified the four dimensions for community policing. These dimensions are the main definitions I use throughout my thesis.

In chapter four, I present the method of my analysis. I use qualitative content-analysis as a method. I categorized the actions of the police to aggressive and non-aggressive behavior and used these two categories as indicators of whether some or all of the four dimensions in community policing could be portrayed in the television series cops. In my analysis, I hypothesized that the indicators would be present in the 2009–2011 episodes and would not be present in the 1995–1997 episodes. In addition, I categorized the talk of the officers to positive and negative images of the community and the work they are doing and again studied whether there were indicators for the four dimensions of community policing as presented by Fullbright-Anderson (2006). At the end of the chapter, I conclude that this thesis does not involve ethical issues due to the fact that the material is public, commercial and has already been presented in Finnish television. However, I refrain from using any names or other identifiable characteristics of the characters presented in the series.

Chapters five and six present my analysis and the conclusions I made from my analysis. In chapter five, I present the change in the use of force and as a case study I compare the actions and gears officers use in two drug sting scenes. I start by categorizing the actions to aggressive and non-aggressive behavior and present what type of differences does the television series portray when comparing the episodes from 1995–1997 and 2009–2011. In the conclusion part, I study the changes with the help of the four dimensions of community policing as presented by Fullbright-Anderson (2006). In addition, I use Fielding's (2006) meanings for community policing. The whole analysis aims at concluding whether or not the television series Cops portrays a change towards community policing.

In chapter six I analyze the background and reflective talk of officers. In addition, I took note of how officers interacted with others in the television series. At first, I categorized the talk and the interaction to positive and negative images of the community and/or the work of officers. In addition, I presented the changes in the talk and interaction that officers had by comparing the 1995–1997 and the 2009–2011 episodes. In the conclusions sections, I again study the changes with the help of the four dimensions presented by Fullbright-Anderson (2006) and Fielding's (2006) meanings for community policing.

In the last section, I discuss the findings I made in my thesis and consider the relevance of my thesis. In addition, I suggest additional research that could be done in the field of policing research and media research and how my research could be developed. Moreover, I discuss the problems I

had in making my thesis: one of the main problem was using a commercial material to present actual information of a real life phenomena.

Other research has been done on whether a reality television series portrays realistic events (e.g. Morris & McInterney 2010). However, this is the first study that connects the portrayed behavioral change to an actual real live change. This is done by showing that at least some of the procedures portrayed in the reality television series Cops are according to official police guidelines. The relevance of the study is in bringing up discussion of whether reality television could be used more often as a source of information in topics other than ones related to human experience.

2. Police and media research

2.1 Media Research

There is a wide range of research in the field of media research. Today media research is a growing and important field of research because media influences everybody around the globe. According to the University of Turku webpage, media research includes movie- and television research, research in popular culture, media philosophy, feministic media research, research in digital media and the research in rhetoric (University of Turku 2013).

Juha Herkman (2008) has mapped the current trends in media research and has found three distinct media research interest areas: 1) the relation in social and political issues and the media (e.g. how does the media give out information from a tragic event), 2) cultural aspects of media and communication and 3) media and communication technology. In addition, Herkman found that especially in Finland, media research is focused in popular culture and political issues. (Herkman 2008, 153–154.)

My research is a part of the Finnish popular media research field focusing on popular culture. Research done on television series is seen as a part of popular culture or cultural studies in the field of Finnish media research. In the next section I will describe the field of television research.

Television research – reality television

The field of television research includes research done on television programs. Mostly television research consists of interest in what the different programs portray. In this section I will introduce the field of television research, focusing specifically in research done on reality television.

Reality television programs have received more and more popularity and there is a wide variety of different types of reality television programs. According to the Assistant Executive Director of Writers Guild of America, West (WGAW), Charles B. Slocum, the earliest reality television series was Candid Camera, which aired for the first time in 1948. Alan Funt, the director of Candid Camera, started out with the same concept as Candid Camera on television, but his version was only

broadcasted in the radio. After Candid camera, the first reality television shows aired were game shows such as “Who am I”. There were a lot of reality based television shows that were filmed in a studio in the 1950’s such as “Tell the truth”, although as Slocum states these kinds of television shows do not meet modern definition and standards of reality television. (WGAW website.)

In 1973 the first true reality television series entered the television set. “An American Family” on PBS was a reality television show that showed the sensational secrets as well as decisions about a family named Louds. According to Slocum, Sociologist Margaret Mead commented to “TV Guide” that this show does not fit the category of documentary but that it needs a new category. This would be defined as reality television. (Ibid.)

In 1976 a breakthrough in reality television was made when a portable video camera was invented and made affordable to all TV-stations. However, it was not until 1984 when Sony upgraded its technology that the modern reality television programs such as “Americas Most Wanted (1988)”, “Rescue 9-1-1 (1989)” and “Cops (1989)” emerged. The camera made it possible to follow the work of police officers and rescue workers for a longer period of time. (Ibid.)

Today, there is a wide variety of different reality television programs that differ extensively from the concept of police reality television. We have game show types of reality television programs, which are embedded with romance and the idea of finding your true love (e.g. The Bachelor). We have reality television programs that follow either a celebrity figure’s everyday life (e.g. The Osbournes) or that follow the everyday life of a group of random people (e.g. Jersey Shore). Another major reality television type is the documentary based reality television such as Air Crash Investigations. The documentary based reality television programs can be about historical events or from current events.

An example of a research about the portrayal of a television program was done by Theresa Morris and Katherine McInterney (2010), who noticed that a large group of pregnant women watched different types of reality based pregnancy/birth television programs in order to learn from them. The authors were interested in how the programs portrayed reproduction. In their conclusions they argued that the birth programs were not realistic. Not at least about how women in the United States experience birth. (Morris & McInterney 2010.)

In some additional reality television based research, the researchers are interested in how people react to the information received from programs and whether they find it realistic or not. Research has been done on the influence of consuming reality television on behavioral patterns in social media. It seems that young adolescents who watch a lot of reality television programs spend more time in the social media networks and have more friends through social media networks. (Stefanone et al. 2010.)

A lot of research has also been done in what reality television programs portray and how they affect the viewers. In addition, some studies have been made on what reality programs portray about the culture (e.g. Price 2010). However, there is not much research on whether the reality programs actually give out realistic information about something concrete. For example, in the case of Air Crash Investigations, a research could be done on whether this particular program simulates true methods used in real air crash investigations. As an example, a thematically similar study to the one that I conducted was provided by Kosovoski & Smith (2011). The authors compared the information gotten from a reality television show called “Intervention’s” to empirical studies of intervention programs to determine whether the reality show had any realism in it. The authors concluded that the information from the television program did not match the findings from the empirical studies. It was evident that what the program portrayed was too optimistic results of the various treatments with the addition that the program made it seem like everyone could get into different intervention treatments. Actually, according to empirical studies, the intervention treatments are rather expensive making them accessible only to those who can afford them. The actual success rates of the treatments were way worse than the reality television program portrayed them to be. (Kosovoski & Smith 2011.)

Research done on Cops reality show

There are some previous studies from the series Cops and most of these studies examine how the series portray the work of police officers as well as what opinions viewers have of the program. I found no studies that would evaluate whether Cops portrays the real work of police officers in the United States.

Anette Hill (book review 2006), the professor of Media in the University of Westminster, London, tries to answer two questions in her study: 1) who watches reality television series and 2) why do people watch them. The audience of reality television is comprised of a variety of people regardless

of their age, sex or gender. She even divides reality television series into two types: 1) infotainment that are reality shows that follow someone's everyday life, and 2) docu-soap shows such as the Wheel of Fortune or Jersey Shore. According to Hill, the first reality television series emerged in the 1980's and they were tabloid news programs such as "America's most wanted". (2006, 227.)

For the second question she surveyed 9000 people in the UK. From the 9000 she selected regular television watchers and performed family interviews. Even though her results show that viewers question the authenticity of the shows the viewer's still seem to find information from the television shows. In addition, the reality television shows usually work as "emotional magnets" with danger and thrill making them as entertaining as regular television series. (Ibid.)

Hill searched for the meaning and audience for reality television series, but more specific studies have been made of reality television series. For example, an interesting study by Philip Chon Ho Shon and Bruce A. Arrigo (2005) has been made of how the reality television series Cops shows how mental illness is being punished in the series. The researchers chose 20 episodes where mental illness occurred from the television series Cops and analyzed how mental illness is being presented in the police-citizen encounter.

The authors conclude that the danger produced by officers and the crazy answers (answers that were seen irrational) people give in the episodes, enables the labeling of mental illness. According to the authors, the series makes the scenes funny by showing the officers laughing at the mentally ill persons at the end of the scenes. The officer's comments and everything the television show emphasizes turns mental illness as a disease into a joke. In addition, the authors find that fear plays a role in the television series because the scenes start with a dangerous act, such as a mentally ill person driving recklessly. The mentally ill are seen as dangerous and humorously illogical at the same time. This is the way the researchers see the television series Cops as "punishing" the mentally ill. (Ibid, 73.)

In another study Glenn C. Geiser-Getz (1995) asked what kinds of criteria viewers have for the episodes of "Cops" and "Unsolved Mysteries". He examined this particularly focusing on entertainment and humor. In addition, he was interested in how viewers reacted to the television programs. According to the study it seemed that the subjects enjoyed the fact that the events were from real life and not just a fictional story. Most of the viewers seemed to agree that the shows are to certain extent truly realistic but there were some doubts as well. Some felt the situations as being

realistic and others felt for example that the politeness of officers in the show does not reflect realistic events at all. In addition, according to the viewer's responses, reality shows are not "fun" to watch, since they in a way portray the real life in a pessimistic manner. (Ibid.)

In Geiser-Getz's second study (1995), he showed undergraduate students an episode of Cops and this time he only had a post-viewing discussion. It seemed that laughter played a big role when watching the episode. The subjects enjoyed the fact that criminals ended up in embarrassing situations and laughed especially hard when the suspects denied the crime that they were accused of. However, there were subjects that did not find any humor and expressed frustration to the show. They were especially frustrated with the fact that the show presented crimes that mostly are due to social causes, such as bad education and poor living standards. (Ibid.)

Another example of how reality television programs such as Cops are studied comes from an article by Theodore Prosis and Ann Johnson (2004), both PhD's of communications, titled "Law enforcement and Crime on Cops and World's Wildest Police Videos: Anecdotal Form and Justifications of Racial Profiling". The authors study how these programs justify controversial actions by police and how they justify racial profiling through these reality television programs. These authors also talk about the portrayal of the reality based television programs (ibid, 72). The authors chose 6 hours of video material (six 30 min episodes from Cops and 3 one-hour episodes from Worlds Wildest Police Videos) between 2000 and 2001. They paid close attention to the narrators in the programs, to the ethnicity of the police and the citizens and to the justifications of the authorities for the traffic stops and the questioning of suspects. (ibid, 79.)

The authors had similar findings as Chon Hon Son et al. had: The officers both in Cops and WWPV portrayed their job as dangerous and that their job is to get the bad guys out of the streets. In addition, Chon Hon Son et al. found a negative labeling of mentally ill in Cops, just as Prosis and Johnson found that Cops and WWPV portray the criminals as if they have no meaning in their actions. According to Prosis and Johnson the criminals are described purely mad and evil and they get no chance to justify their actions in these series (ibid, 81.)

Police aggression is also shown in the analysis of the article. According to the authors, the officers in Cops as well as in WWPV present extreme aggression with the addition that in some cases the officers do not explain to the suspects why they are arresting them. Moreover, the officers justify their actions by stating that their actions reflect standard police procedures. (Ibid, 81-82.) The

authors do not mention anything about whether the actions are truly standard procedures. They only analyze how the series portray the actions.

As a conclusion the authors want to state that these reality television programs give the viewers a biased sense of police officers, police work and criminals. In addition, the authors fear that these reality programs give illegitimate justification to police aggression since they found that most citizens find their information about the work of police and criminals from these reality based television programs. (Ibid 87–88.) However, the authors did not provide any specific examples of what constitutes as police aggression, nor did they compare the actions of the officers in the series to police standard operating procedures.

2.2 Police Research

The field of Police Research is enormous. It ranges from examining police operations to the studying of experiences by officers (e.g. experienced work satisfaction). The field of police research consists of studies examining co-operation between different officials as well as between officials and the public. In addition, police research includes studies done on the influence of media towards police work (e.g. how social media is used by police agencies). Moreover, one significant area of police research is studying the work of police officers (e.g. what do they do, what kind of crimes do police officers come across). Police research is important in understanding what kind of criminal activity can be seen as a major problem in the community. In addition, police research is used to address these problems properly. In short, the main purpose for the existence of police research is that it helps to focus police resources more efficiently.

Police research is an important part of my study due to the fact that when comparing a television series to real events in the field of policing, I need information about how policing is currently done and how the policing has changed. Community policing can be seen as a large part of police research as well as policing research can be seen as a subfield of police research. One of my main focuses is how the officers police in the reality television series *Cops* and in order to understand why the officers police the way they police, I need information from police research studies that help to explain why the officers act as they do.

One key interest areas in the field of police research in the United States has always been the use of force. There are numerous reports on excessive use of force and this has made researchers to study

whether the use of force is an actual problem. In an example, Pinizzotto et al. (2012) surveyed 295 officers across the United States asking them whether they have had to use deadly force. According to the authors 70% of the officers responded that they have been in a situation where they could have legally used their sidearm but they chose not to use it. In addition, the authors found out that in 93% of the cases where the officers could have used their firearm, they decided not to use it. (Pinizzotto et al. 2012.)

Some studies consider racial issues. For example, Robert Staples (2011) studies whether the U.S police discriminates African Americans, relating the discrimination in a historical context. The debate is highly political and the crime statistics do in fact indicate that African Americans are most likely to be arrested and convicted in the United States. (Staples, 2011.) In additional research done in police misconduct, which is a problem in the United States, there are reviews of court cases where officers have been prosecuted for excessive use of force. (e.g. Harvard Law Review 2012, ref 13.6.2013.) The court reviews in the United States are used in the field of police research in order to analyze for example the amount of misconduct done by the police towards minorities. Ethnicity plays a large role in the field of police research in the United States.

Policing research

Policing research and police research are two different lines of research. Whereas police research indicates that the research focuses on the police as an organization, policing research is interested in how the police fight crime, what kind of methods and strategies are involved and what kind of procedures officers have in the field. In addition, policing research applies to other agencies than the police since policing can be seen as a process which prevents criminal activity. Thus civilians reporting crime can be seen as policing. However, the term policing is used when the preventive actions are strategically planned or when there is a true organization or an association behind the actions of policing. (Mawby in Newburn 2011, 17.)

The field of policing research is another wide area of research. Policing research can be the research of large theoretical models such as the community policing model (e.g. Fielding 2006), problem-oriented policing (e.g. Newburn 2011) and knowledge-based policing (e.g. Williamson 2008). These are just some large scale theoretical models of policing that have been used today in the strategic planning of policing at least in the U.S and the UK.

There are more specific studies done in policing, such as describing the relationship between gender and policing, ethnicity and policing and rank and policing (e.g. Scheb et. al 2009.) One major area of policing studies is the co-operation between police agencies and other law enforcement or other crime preventive agencies or associations. The research follows how the co-operation works and what strategic plans are made through the co-operation of different agencies. In addition, evaluative research has been done on the efficiency of the co-operation. (e.g. Liliokanaio 2009; Alpert et al. 2011.) With the research of co-operation, private policing agencies have also been a topic of discussion, since the use of private security agencies has increased in the United States (e.g. Stafford 2012).

The above mentioned researches are only a small part of the field of policing research and the fields vary when comparing different countries. In my study, I am mostly interested in the field of community policing which will be presented next.

Community Policing

I start by presenting a study that clearly shows that community policing was in effect during the 21st century, although the 9/11 attacks in New York had devastating effects on community policing. Eventually as suggested by Dan Silk (2012), community policing was found to be an important inhibitor for terroristic attacks.

A study about the effects of the 9/11 terrorist attacks on policing shows that there was a fast and extreme reform in policing. The study was presented by Ben Brown (2007), who looked at what happened in the method of policing after the 9/11 attacks.

According to Brown, right after the 9/11 attacks happened, an extreme fight against terrorism emerged. Airports were shut down, border security was increased and police were aggressively searching for clues and people related to the terrorist attacks. For example, the Patriot Act (Public Law 115 Stat. 272., ref. 5.8.2013) was introduced, passed and signed in to law as quickly as possible. This act gave the police overwhelming powers, for example for roving wiretaps. A roving wiretap means that when officers get approval of wiretaps they can change methods of surveillance, even though the followed subject would throw away his phone and buy a new one. Before this, officers had to file for a new permit to continue surveillance on the subject's new phone. In addition, new agencies were formed, such as the Homeland security and the transportation security administration.

Old agencies got more funding, such as the FBI and DEA (note that the DEA controls the movement and selling of illegal drugs and has nothing to do with terrorist attacks). (Ibid, 240.)

Officers were also empowered to do home searches based on mere reasonable doubt of a crime being evident. Suspects could be arrested and detained for long periods of time without filing charges and without admitting the suspect to call for legal counseling. Things were even more difficult for those without American citizenship status. Police were permitted to arrest all non-citizens for any reason, this including arresting immigrants for violation of federal immigrant laws (e.g. entering the United States without a proper Visa). (Ibid, 241).

As funds for more aggressive police work were added, at the same time funds were reduced for community-oriented-policing. This made the public afraid of an aggressive police force, which has neither ties nor accountability for the community. However, the authors note that there is no evidence that the aggressive way of policing had an effect on community policing. (Ibid, 242).

Dan Silk (2012) emphasizes the importance of community policing as an important factor against violent extremism. He analyzes a White House document that studies possible ways of fighting against violent extremism.

The document relates to the project Prevent, which is the name of the strategy that was used in the UK in their fight against terrorism. Silk finds evidence from the project Prevent that community policing is successful for the fight against terroristic attacks. Silk suggests that community policing should be used to build trustworthy relations with Muslim communities to prevent them from contacting terroristic groups such as Al Qaida. The preventive factor is that through building trustful relationships with ethnic parties and the law enforcement, the ethnic groups would prefer to be loyal towards the United States than the radical Muslim groups in the Middle East. (Ibid.)

Another research conducted by Curtis Clarke (2006) studies the Edmonton police trying achieve better efficiency and effectiveness in problem solving through community based policing. The authors analyze proactive policing that is based on community policing. Proactive policing is explained by Clarke as:

Making use of data to establish the existence and extent of a problem, to analyze its nature and source, to plan intervention measures to reduce it, and to monitor and evaluate the effectiveness of the selected responses. (Ibid, 4.)

Clarke describes how Edmonton emergency services were hit by budget cuts that put pressure in the way policing was done. At the same time there was an increasing need for emergency services. Proactive policing and intelligence based policing were seen as a solution to the problem. The idea of the two is that proactive policing would take initiative action in trend problems and that in intelligence based police resources were more efficiently focused on certain problem areas. (Ibid, 8–9.)

Edmonton police needs to address the problem of declining resources and increasing demand in efficiency. It was suggested that there should be established specialized intelligence units that each would address only a certain problem. The information of trend problems come from line officers from the field that make suggestions to specialized community officers. The community officers look into the information received from the line officer and if a trend has been found, the community officer sends all the necessary information about the problem to an intelligence officer who will try to develop a solution to the problem. This setting enables line officers to allocate more time to emergency calls and be excluded from problem solution. (Ibid, 10–13.)

At the same time emergency calls would be divided in to two sections: Primary response officers and ownership officers. Primary response officers would address all emergency and service calls and ownership officers would address emergency and service calls in their designated ownership area (e.g. a certain part of the city). All other calls would be directed for the community officers or other non-emergency officers. (Ibid, 10.)

As a conclusion the author notes that community policing is still a basis for new models of policing. New models build upon the general idea that policing cannot be done without the help of citizens. The key for good policing is in the co-operation of police officers, citizens and other agencies. (Ibid, 15.)

It is important to bring up how officers feel about community policing in order to see whether it is truly influential for the officers as well. Helen Rosenberg, Robert T. Sigler and Scott Lewis (2008) studied how officers in different ranks felt about the importance of community policing. The study

was done in the city of Racine. The authors had a 40 item survey that was done in two different times in a 19 month time scale. The first set of surveys were done in February 1997 and the second in September 1998. (Ibid, 295.)

The main finding of the study is that, the officers did not change attitudes concerning community policing. From the first survey the authors concluded that officers were slightly positive about community policing concepts and the community policing program. However, officers had negative opinions about flattened organizational structure and good relationship between supervisors and subordinates. In addition, officers disliked the idea of a community policing unit. The authors found that community policing programs in Racine did affect the attitudes of the officers positively. (Ibid, 297–300.) It is clear that officers appreciate the co-operation between the community and police officers. However, community policing associations, such as the neighborhood watch, were not seen necessary by police officers.

The above mentioned studies indicate that community policing has been a major issue in the field of policing. Even though the 9/11 attacks almost destroyed the basis for community policing, nowadays community policing is seen as a sufficient way of preventing terroristic acts such as the 9/11 attack (Silk2012). Thus it can be concluded that community policing is still in use in the United States.

3. Theoretical Background

There was some evidence that what the television series *Cops* portrays is the actual change from an professional way of policing to community policing (sometimes also called community-oriented-policing), or at least that police departments wanted to emphasize the co-operation between the officers and the community, even in the television series *Cops*. I used the theoretical model of community policing and the concept of community-police relations to explain the portrayed shift of procedural change in *Cops*.

The timeline I have chosen for distinguishing procedural change (1995–2011) is the same timeline as some research shows for the police reform towards community policing. Community policing is seen as a continuing part of the American police reform (Fullbright-Anderson et al. 2006, 104.)

As can be seen from the researches I have presented in chapter 2, Community policing (CP) is a method that is used in the United States today. There are various agendas for using CP, whether it is to prevent violent extremism (e.g. Silk 2012) or just to adapt an efficient method of policing where members of the community are encouraged to engage in active crime fighting (e.g. by actively approaching citizens and keeping them aware that officers are there to protect them). (Crank 2003).

Even though one can debate whether the reality television show *Cops* portrays a true procedural change, the portrayed change can to some extent be explained by a true procedural change. Since community policing is about the building of a positive relationship between the police and the community, one way of giving a positive image of community-police relationships is through the help of the reality television programs, although more evidence for this argument is needed. (Gallagher et al., 2001, ref. 05.08.2013)

Community policing

Community policing emerged in the 1970s when distrust in the professional way of policing emerged. In the professional model of policing, police rely on a few professionals that give either recommendations or sanctions to the police. Community policing as a term means that the police officers as well as police organizations move their focus towards the needs of the community. Instead of receiving recommendations solely from professionals, the police gather information from members of the community (Crank 2003, 192). Maguire et al. (2003, 252) argue that it was the pressure from constituencies that demanded community policing. However, at the same time Gianakis and Davis (1998) findings suggest that the organizational impacts of community policing has been minimal. In fact they had a study from Florida which suggested that community policing was taught only to line officers instead of police organizations. (Ibid, 496.) The main idea is that by bringing police work and the community closer together is a more efficient way of policing (e.g Skogan 2007).

Before community policing there was the professional model of policing where the policing procedures came from a professional at a higher rank to the police stations (Crank & Langoworthy 1992). The community did not need to be heard, but a single person could influence where police resources were focused at. Police organizations must please these sovereigns, since the well-being of the organizations rely on them (ibid, 187). Sovereigns are organizations such as the House of Representatives, the Senate and different courts. However sovereigns can also be individuals who take part in the planning of police procedures.

There are several similar definitions for community policing. The differences in what people perceive as community policing is well defined by Nigel Fielding. Fielding (2005, 460–461) found three different meanings for community policing. 1) Community policing in some cases mean that it is an alternative method for rapid response units. In this sense the police officers are assigned their own area of the city to watch, thus making the police closer to the community, 2) A process in which the community is included in active crime fighting through various organizations, such as the Neighborhood watch and 3) It is a method of policing where the communication between officers and the community is an important factor. In a broader view Fielding argues that community policing is an ideological method of policing which emphasizes the co-operation between the police and the community and where preventive policing is pursued according to the wishes of the community. (Fielding 2005, 460–461) The similarities in the definitions are the co-operation

between the community and the police officers. Some studies include the change in organizational structure and strategic planning in the definition of CP. (e.g. Vejnovic et al., 2005.)

Even though Fielding defined the meaning of community policing quite extensively, he did not address the specific strategy changes that community policing includes. Fielding's definitions for community policing can be connected with the talk that officers gave in my analysis, however it does not explain actual change. Fullbright-Anderson et al. (2006, 104–105) introduced the strategy changes that were implemented in community policing. According to them, at least four different dimensions of community policing can be found. The four dimensions are 1) Philosophical level, 2) strategic level, 3) tactical level and 4) organizational level. The *philosophical* level of community policing emphasizes the importance of citizens input in police decision making. The citizens input can be taken into account through joint meetings between community associations and the police, surveys and advisory boards. The purpose for the philosophical level of community policing is to make the neighborhood a better place to live.

At the *strategic level* of community policing, the way officers work is changed so that the front-line officers would have more community-police interaction. The strategic level of community policing includes officers visiting more often different people's homes, more face to face interaction with members of the community and more police-community meetings where problems are addressed. The idea is to increase police-community trust through increased interactions with the police and the community. The other operational meaning of the strategic level is to have permanent assignments in smaller scale geographical areas. This increases the police-community familiarity and trust but the downside is that without proper supervision this increases the possibility for police corruption. Familiarity might make officers more prone to disregard some offences. The strategic level of community policing also emphasizes the importance of the prevention of crime in the neighborhoods. The idea is to work in co-operation with the problematic neighborhood and exercise problem solving with the community to prevent further crimes. (Ibid, 104–105.)

The third level of community policing is the tactical level. In this level the authors mention smart policing, where police departments understand that they cannot provide public safety alone. The police departments build links to other law enforcement agencies and community associations such as small church communities. (Ibid, 105–16.) The idea is basically to divide the responsibility for keeping the community safe and to have multiple organizations work together in finding ways to do preventive crime fighting.

The fourth level for community policing is the *organizational level*. This means that certain organizational changes are implemented. The changes include changes in the organizational structure such as decentralizing, flattening, creating teams and civilianizing (transforming parts of police work to civilian work, e.g. permit handling), changes in management such as new policing values, strategic planning, supervisory coaching and mentoring, and empowering of officers and changes in information management, which consists of the introduction of new information technology. (Ibid, 106) The similarity in Fieldings definitions and Fullbright-Anderson et als. levels of community policing is the co-operation between police officers and members of the community.

I use community policing in its broadest sense: community policing is a method of policing which emphasizes the importance of co-operation between the police and the community. In addition to this, community policing emphasizes the importance of positive community-police relationships.

4. Research data and methods

4.1 Research material

My research material consists of 18 episodes of Cops; five from the eight (1995) and ninth (1995–1997) season and thirteen from the 22nd, 23rd and 24th seasons (20–2011). The 1995–1997 episodes were transformed from VHS to a digital form and the 2009–2011 episodes have been recorded from the television and bought from the internet from various places such as Ebay and Amazon.com. The five episodes from the eighth and ninth seasons consist of 15 scenes from Florida and the later episodes from the 22nd to the 24th seasons consist of 15 scenes from Florida. One episode lasts approximately 22 minutes. The total length of the material I chose to be analyzed is approximately three hours. I chose episodes that are from the same state since the state laws vary a lot within the United States. I have chosen Florida for the reason that I have often been to Florida and I am more familiar with the local laws there. The eighth and ninth season episodes consist of different scenes in the same city (one episode, one city) but in the later seasons, episodes consist of scenes from different cities. One episode consists of three to five different scenes. One scene usually lasts for approximately 5 to 7 minutes.

Editing and censorship

This series is easier to analyze due to the minimum amount of special effects. There is no background music (except the startup theme) and there are no special effects (explosions, sound effects etc.). In addition, the scenes are, in most cases, presented from the beginning of a situation. However, a police officer may have to be in a situation for hours and the whole situation cannot be covered in 5 to 7 minutes. Nevertheless, I find the scenes covering important parts of a situation: the call for the incident, the chase and the outcome of the situation.

The censorship is also kept to a minimum. This means that wounds and accidents (such as a car hitting a pedestrian) are shown in the series without any part being censored. The only censorship in the series involves nudity cursing, and censoring individuals' faces that are not involved in the situation in any way. Moreover, full addresses, social security numbers and surnames are censored with a beep sound or using mute.

As in all commercial programs the situations are chosen for the episodes according to a certain method. One portrayed criteria for choosing these particular scenes might be that almost every scene ends up in an arrest. One of the reasons for this might be that the show would be more interesting for the audience. In a narrative sense, the arrest serves an ending and a resolution for the story which is what might be expected by some viewers. However, the producers of Cops do not explain how the scenes were chosen for the series.

Description of episodes

An episode usually starts with one officer talking about how he/she became a police officer. The officer also tells about the background of the neighborhood and usually legitimizes why the officers are in the neighborhood.

After the background talk, a situation occurs where police assistance is needed. The officer tells where he/she is going and what additional information has central given to the officer. The officer explains the codes used and starts to concentrate on the driving and talking with the dispatcher. Once the officer is in the scene he will start talking with the participants. In other times, officers start chasing a suspect. In the end, an offender is arrested and then the suspect is given a chance to explain his actions. The officer also tells to the camera or to his supervisor what has happened and what resulted in the arrest.

During the whole time only one officer is in the spotlight of the camera crew. Most times, the officer in the spotlight will make the arrest, even though another officer has caught the perpetrator. The other officers involved in the action tell the camera crew (or the officer in the spotlight) how the chase or the chain of events started and their involvement in it. An interesting point is that the officers act as they are fully aware of the camera crew and talk directly to the camera when the suspects act as there are no cameras involved. This is best observed in domestic disturbance calls: the officers knock and enter with the camera crew and the occupants are not even slightly surprised of the camera crew. Many times in reality shows such as Poliisit (Finnish reality television show) the suspects or the persons involved try to show off to the camera and bystanders might wave or jump in front of the camera. So sometimes it seems that the people involved are informed of the cameras beforehand. When chases occur, it should not be possible to inform the suspect about the camera beforehand. One of the reasons is that the suspect running from the police would not

probably want to be tased (shot with a tasergun and shocked) twice. Even though no shock would be administered the second time, the taserguns' spikes do penetrate the skin.

The camera crews also participate in foot chases and they assist the officers when needed, for example when a gun needs to be kicked away from the suspect. This might be due to the fact that the officers usually work alone in a squad car. There are some cars that have two officers, but mostly the officers' patrol alone.

After the chase and the arrest the officers will give the suspect a chance to explain his actions. At the same time the suspects are mirandized (Miranda rights, ref 12.8.2013). This means that the suspects are informed of their rights, for example the right to be silent and the right to be questioned with their lawyer present. In addition, the suspects are informed of the charges they will face. Most of the times, the explanation given to the officers does not affect anything in the series. The explanations do not drop the charges but instead the officers mostly replied that the suspect has a change to explain things in court and that the judge will decide whether the explanation is legitimate or not. The interesting part here is that the officers in the series will not further investigate claims that suspects give about an address involved or when the suspect informs about some paperwork that would justify the suspect's actions, is in the suspect's home.

After giving the suspects a chance to explain themselves, they are transported away and the episode will move on to the next scene. Only a few scenes present how suspects are processed in the police stations. However, no additional information is given whether the person in the series has been convicted for the crime or not. The suspects might be held in jail for months until they are able to settle things in court (e.g *Millan*, 4 F.3d at 1044; Criminal Resource Manual 26).

People involved and crime types

The people involved in the series are ordinary line police officers or officers in higher ranks. The other people involved are the suspects, the victims, the witnesses and informants. Most of the officers are born in the U.S but there are some officers from the U.K and Australia as well. Most of the officers are male however there are female officers shown quite frequently. According to a Police Employment website (Police Employment, ref. 10.6.2013, ref. 10.6.2013) 12%, of all the officers in the United States are women. The television series shows about one third of the scenes

with a women officer. About one third of the officers shown are African American and in rare cases the officer is Asian. All the rest are Caucasian male or female officers.

In the suspects case three forth of the suspects are male and over half of the scenes the suspect is African American. A non-US-citizen citizen suspect has not been shown in the episodes chosen for my analysis.

Environment

Mainly, the incidents happen in suburbs but there are no clear indicators of whether the areas are poor or rich areas. Some of the incidents do happen in areas where the houses are in bad shape and the neighborhoods residents mostly consist of African American or Hispanics. There are no incidents taking place in clearly wealthy parts of the city. The scenes have been criticized for portraying crime that presents itself in the poor neighborhoods and that white-collar-crimes are being ignored (Absolute astronomy). In this research the environment does not affect the observed procedural change due to the fact that scenes presented are in similar neighborhoods.

4.2 Research problems

The portrayed change in police procedures is the main focus of my research. I addressed the issue by analyzing episodes of the reality television series Cops. I analyzed episodes from the years 1995–1997 and 2009–2011. Reality television series have been studied before and there has been research done on the television series Cops. However there is no research whether Cops portrays a procedural change that has happened in the United States. I also analyzed the use of force by watching how officers behave in a scene and whether they used any aggression towards the suspects. I also included two special operation drug sting scenes and compared more thoroughly how officers behaved in a similar setting in a different time. In addition, I analyzed the way the officers present themselves and their work, how the officers co-operate with other members of the community and how officers conclude what just happened in the end of the scenes. My research questions are as follows:

- 1) *Can there be portrayed a procedural changed in the reality television series cops?*
- 2) *What kind of changes does the television series Cops portray?*

In addition, I am also interested in *whether there is evidence that the portrayed changes in the television series are real police procedural changes?* My hypothesis is that community policing affects these portrayed procedural changes.

I analyzed the use of force and the talk of the officers and determined whether community policing had been applied and whether the change towards community policing can be portrayed from the television series *Cops*.

In the section where I have analyzed the use of force, I differentiated aggressive behavior and non-aggressive behavior. I counted the times when officers used physical aggression towards the suspects, when officers were cautious when entering the scenes and had their hand on their weapon, when officers waited for backup before entering a scene, how officers talked to the suspects, victims and other bystanders and how many times officers used handcuffs when they arrested a person and when a person was detained. By aggressive behavior I mean behavior that I see to be clearly out of proportion when compared to the actions of others (e.g. suspects and others). Aggressive behavior can be, for example, when officers use handcuffs even though the handcuffed person does not show any sign of threat. Aggressive behavior does not need to be physical. Aggressive behavior is also body language, such as being overly cautious (e.g. the touching of the gun in an uncertain situation). In addition, it can be violent language and disrespectful behavior towards the suspect. In all of the above mentioned, the aggressive behavior is behavior that is clearly unjust when taking into account the situation.

In addition to analyzing the behavior of officers, I try to determine whether officers have changed the way they talk about the community. I have differentiated how officers talk about the community they work in, whether officers have small talk with eyewitnesses and victims or whether they behave strictly professional towards other people, only asking questions about the case. I predict that the four dimensions in community policing (Fullbright-Anderson 2006) would change the way officers act towards the suspects as well. The suspects are also members of the community and thus my hypothesis is that officers would co-operate with the suspects and resolve the situations through communication. The extent and systematic use of excessive (does not relate to illegal) force would lead to assume that either the procedural guidelines are in fact in contradiction with the strategic dimension of community policing or that the suspects are not seen as members of the community.

As a more thorough study done on the use of force, I analyzed two drug sting scenes and compared how officers worked. I watched how many units there were, how the units were placed in the scene, how they did the arrest (did they throw the suspects on the ground) and what gear officers carried. The two special operations scenes are pre-planned and give more clear indicators of whether a portrayed procedural change has occurred in the television series.

I studied whether the officers had positive or negative images of their work, of suspects and of other members of community, by observing how officers present themselves, their work and whether they talk about the community or about the dangers of the job. I also analyzed how they co-operate with members of the community (e.g. how they use eyewitnesses or do they) and how they conclude the scene (does the scene just end or do they reflect of what has happened). I analyzed whether the officers have changed their attitudes towards their work and studied whether communication between officers and other members of the community had changed. In addition, I studied how the communication between officers and suspects has changed in the series.

In addition, I analyzed how the officers explained their actions (e.g. whether they got a bad guy off the street or made the neighborhood a safer place). I studied how officers appreciated members of the community helping the police in any way. In the end I concluded whether my observations were in line with the four dimension of community policing (philosophical, strategical, tactical and organizational). I also assessed whether my findings concurred with Fielding's (2005, 460–461) definition of community policing.

4.3 Method

I have chosen qualitative content analysis as my method of analysis. Content analysis is an analysis method that is used in qualitative research. Content-analysis seems to be somewhat debated. For example, Klaus Krippendorff (1985, 21) sees content analysis as a quantitative method whereas, Sietamaa-Hakkarainen (2000, 4) argues that context analysis nowadays is mostly used in qualitative research. Nevertheless he continues that content analysis can be used as a qualitative or quantitative method.

Content analysis in qualitative research is a method for analyzing textual data. From the text the researcher is interested in the context and the themes. Even a single finding in a certain theme is meaningful for the analysis. Theoretical categories will be used when analyzing textual data and

these categories will be compared. In the most radical cases content analysis follows the rules of grounded theory, where the idea is that the research will not rely on existing theories or studies but it makes its own new theory. (Sietamaa-Hakkarainen 2000, 3–4.)

I analyzed my research data by dividing the way officers use force to aggressive and non-aggressive methods. At the end of the use of force chapter I concluded my findings and connected the findings with the theoretical dimensions of community policing (philosophical, strategical, tactical and organizational) (Fullbright-Anderson 2006.) In addition, I studied whether my observations were in accordance with Fielding's definitions for community policing (Fieldings 2005, 460–461.)

I am also interested whether officers gears have changed and how the officers used their gear. I categorized the gear in the protective gear (e.g. bullet proof vests), lethal instruments (e.g. sidearm) and non-lethal instruments (e.g. taser). I compared the actions of the police to the instruments they were carrying and also considered whether the officers' actions could be deemed aggressive or non-aggressive. The use of non-lethal instruments does not automatically deem the actions of the officers non-aggressive if, for example, the threshold for the use of the non-lethal instrument had notably declined. I find, that the use of protective gear is a police procedure which is why I am interested in whether officers are wearing them or not. I only looked at protective gear in the cases of the drug sting scenes due to the fact that only in these two scenes a full comparison of gears could be made.

In the section where I analyzed the way officers describe their work and how they interact with members of the community, I categorized officers' attitudes to positive and negative images of work and members of the community. Through this categorization, I compared whether my observations would fit the four dimensions of community policing as well as with Fieldings (2005) descriptions of community policing. If officers found members of the community important and useful, there was evidence for the favor of community policing even though all positive images cannot be related to community policing.

4.4 Ethical issues

As with all research, I studied whether my research involves ethical issues. Since the material I have is public and available to everyone without restriction, I concluded that my research does not involve any ethical dilemmas. However, due to the fact that the show provides detailed information

of the persons involved, I have not included names or any other recognizable data of the people involved in the scenes. I have in some cases mentioned the episode I have used in my analysis. Thus, some recognizable features can be found from the episodes. However I find no ethical dilemma in this, since the material is public, commercial and has been broadcasted in Finland.

5. Use of force

In this section I analyze how officers use force in arrest situations. I use the term “use of force” broadly ranging from the way the suspect is handcuffed (if at all) to the way officers use their own weapons in situations. I compared thirteen incidents that happened in 1995–1997 to thirteen incidents that happened in 2009–2011. My focus state was Florida.

I started by analyzing how officers approach the suspect. I paid special attention to how officers use their voice and how they use their sidearm. I also looked at how officers react to individuals carrying weapons. According to the U.S Department of Justice’s research (2011, 5–7) different states started using the taser gun in different time periods. For example Seattle approved taser guns for police use in the year 2000 and 60% of officers in Miami-Dade police department carried a taser gun in 2006. From this data, I make a cautious assumption that the taser gun was not in use in Florida police departments in 1995–1997.

After looking at how officers approach suspects and how they use their sidearm I looked at how and when officers handcuff their suspects. At this point I also analyzed how and when officers have to use physical force when arresting a suspect.

In the last part I paid special attention to how officers use non-lethal and/or lethal instruments during an arrest. The idea is to pay attention to the instruments the officers carry and analyze what has changed in the use of instruments as well as what instruments have changed entirely from 1995 to 2011.

All of the above has been analyzed by categorizing the actions of officers to aggressive and non-aggressive behavior. In the end of this chapter, I conclude my findings and compare them to the dimensions of community policing (Chapter 2, 14–17).

5.1 Approaching the incident area

In a 1995 episode an officer is called to a house where a burglary is in progress. The 911-operator gave information that the male resident has the suspect on the ground and is pointing a gun at him.

The officer approaches the house and sees a man pointing a gun at another man on the ground. The officer never commands the house owner to put down his gun even after he was waving it around in front of the officer. The officer approached the scene alone, and without any caution walked to the suspect, handcuffed him and took him in to the cruiser. In the end of the scene the officer made a comment which clearly reflects the attitude towards weapons at least in Florida and during that time period:

Example 1

“Just about everybody in Florida has got a gun so.. these guys that try to break in to houses and cars and stuff need to be aware of that, they could pay the penalty if they get caught”.

(OM, S08E06)

A comparison can be made from an incident that happened in 2011. Even though the situations differ from each other, the way an officer approaches a scene can be noticed. In this situation a female officers is called to assist in a regular traffic stop. When the female officer approaches the scene there is a male officer already present.

The female police officer walks up to the car and asks the driver for his driver’s license. At this point the male officer is beside the female officer. There are two people in the car and when the other person moves the male officer immediately grabs his weapon (does not draw it) and tells the passenger to stop moving around. The male officer is extremely cautious at this point. The driver is told to come out of the car. When the driver steps out of the car he moves his hand downwards (possibly reaches for his pocket) in a very conspicuous way, the female officer grabs his hand with the male officer grabbing the suspects other hand. The female officer tells the driver not to reach for anything. Now, both of the officers are extremely agitated. The male officer puts the suspect against the car and cuffs the driver. In addition, the male officer keeps being verbally aggressive towards the two suspects. However, the female officer is calm and polite in the situation. Even in the situation where the officers find a weapon hidden in the trunk, the more agitated male officer commands his colleagues to back off from the weapon since the muzzle of the weapon is pointed towards them. When interviewing the suspect the male officer keeps being hostile towards the suspect and by shouting tries to get answers from the suspect.

The next example is from the scene when the female police officer and the camera crew approach the suspect vehicle:

Example 2

OF: You got your umm... your license on you?

SM: I gave him my license

OF: Huh?

OM: Hey man (showing the door)

SM: I just gave him my license

OM: Come here. (SM reaches for his belt to get out and the officers put's his other hand on his gun) Don't be moving around man. Come out. (OF open the door)

*OM: I'm gonna ask you one time just before you come out of here man, you moving around awful lot. When I went to stop you... (The suspect put's his hand in his pocket and the officers take his hand)
(S24E01)*

Some interesting remarks can be made from the two different situations. First of all in the 1995 scene the officers judge the situation non-threatening by disregarding the man with the gun. In the 2011 scene the officers seem cautious from the very beginning of the incident. What is similar about these two scenes is that with both of the scenes there is no information about the people involved. The first scene could be seen as more suspicious and life threatening when a weapon is involved, especially when the officer has no information about who is the actual house owner. In the United States officers might be used to firearms being present as example 1 shows. This might be an explanation of why the officer does not worry about the gun. However, the house owner waves it around carelessly, sometimes pointing at the officer and the officer does not react to it at all.

In the 1995 scene the officer is relaxed even when there is a weapon present. The officer is non-aggressive in his behavior by not reacting to the weapon and by only applying handcuffs peacefully to the alleged suspect. However, in the 2011 scene the male officer can be deemed aggressive. He is suspicious of the people in the car even though no law has yet been broken.

The quote (29) I presented earlier shows how the officer felt about firearms. The officers were used to weapons in Florida and did not see it as a threat. In the 2011 scene the officers emphasize that they have to be prepared for anything. Other scenes also concur with this. Officers are more cautious in the 2011 episodes compared to the episodes in 1995–1997. For instance in the 1995–1997 scenes including the scene about the home owner with the gun, officers enter these types of situations alone. They do this regardless of the fact that there was no information about a weapon being present which should affect how officers enter the scene. The officer never called for backup when seeing the weapon. This may be because of the presence of the cameraman, however the cameramen are not equipped to protect themselves. In addition, the backup arrived after the suspect was handcuffed and questioned. In the 2011 scenes, especially in burglaries, the officers seldomly enter the situations alone. The officers go in pairs or in a group and the officers almost every time call for assistance at the very beginning even though there is no need for assistance. In the 2011 traffic stop the officer was called to assist even though there was no evident threat. The assistance call came because there were two occupants in the car and the first officer wanted someone to back him up. This suggests that a procedural change has happened: safety and caution is more important to the officers than before.

I categorize officers entering situations alone without backup as aggressive behavior. I suggest that the officers emphasize more the importance of capturing a criminal than the importance of being safe. Although, I do accept that a lot of different variables might influence the way officers work in the United States. It might be the case that there are not enough resources for officers to get back up. However, by allowing officers to enter threatening situations, it gives an image of the police force that the main task for officers is to arrest criminals even when the criminals might possess a life threatening risk for the officers. The *DeShaney vs. Winnebago County* department of social services court ruling (Legal information institute, 10.6.2013) freed officers from the responsibility from protecting civilians when there are not enough resources to do it. This suggests that officers should have themselves protected and not to engage in life threatening situations at least when there is no backup present. Although it must be noted, that in some areas in the United States there are only a few officers available at all times (e.g. Alaska). In the cases where officers try to arrest a fleeing suspect alone, the officers have to use greater force to apprehend the suspect. In some cases the officers have to rely on their sidearm which in some situations can be seen as an out of proportion action. The use of a sidearm could be avoided by the help of other police officers. In addition, drawing and firing a sidearm against a suspect with a knife might be avoided by outnumbering the suspect. In a one-on-one situation the weapon is the officers' only backup.

Even though physical force cannot be seen as out of proportion in one-on-one situation (excluding the use of the sidearm), the situation could possibly be resolved more peacefully when more officers are involved. In hostile situations backup helps officers to reduce the level of violence by giving the officers an advantage by outnumbering the suspects. The suspects are more co-operative when seeing that they are outnumbered and the officers might not have to use as much force. However, as shown in the 2011 traffic stop scene this is not the case. Although, the 2011 scenes officers seldom enter situations alone and mostly they call for backup (Table 1), the officers express more aggressive behavior than before. The aggressive behavior is expressed by the handcuffing and detaining of suspicious persons before they are being arrested. In addition, aggressive behavior is being expressed vocally by aggressively commanding the suspicious persons. Moreover, the vocal aggressive behavior is expressed by making a mockery out of the suspect. The suspect is not being heard nor is his information seen as reliable.

Table 1. Number of scenes where officers waited for backup before entering the scene. Excluded two special operation stings, one emergency call and one animal call.

Excluded 4 scene	Scenes from 1995–1997	Scenes from 2009–2011
Officers wait for backup x/x times	3/13	8/13

The use of physical force has also increased when comparing the 1995–1997 scenes to the 2009–2011 scenes. (Table 2) In the traffic stop scene a male suspect is being pulled out of the car aggressively, when the male officer claims that the suspect is reaching for his pocket. The camera is pointed at the suspect at all times and by browsing through the scene multiple times, I found no evidence of the suspect trying to reach for anything. I argue that the officer, being as agitated as he was, overreacted to a normal movement of the hand and by being extremely cautious, the officer interpreted the situation as hostile. The aggressive behavior was out of proportion and the situation might have been resolved by commanding the people to exit to vehicle for a search. The female officer was not aggressive but did not question the male officer’s behavior.

Table 2. The number of times officers used physical force even though the suspect did not possess a threat (e.g. slamming a suspect on the ground even when the suspect did not express any threatening behavior). Excluded two special operation stings, one emergency call and one animal call.

Excluded 4 scenes	Scenes from 1995–1997	Scenes from 2009–2011
Officers use physical force x/x times	0/13	4/13

5.2 Use of handcuffs

There is a difference in how officers have used handcuffs on suspects but before coming to this I explain the difference between being arrested and being detained. When a person is detained it means that the person is temporarily restrained from his freedom due to a search or an uncertain situation where the officers feel unsecure. A detained person is a person who is not seen broken any laws yet. However, when a person is arrested she/he has been seen broken some law where an arrest has to be made (e.g. in the case of vehicle theft). After being arrested the person is transported to jail where this person will await for prosecution and court ruling.

In all the earlier 1995–1997 episodes when a person has been detained he/she has never been handcuffed (Table 3). The handcuffing has only been done after a person is being arrested. The television series Cops portrayed that in some cases the officers did not even carry handcuffs with them like in an example of a 1997 episode where the suspect was arrested for DUI (driving while under the influence) an officer told another officer to put the suspect in to a caged car, since he did not have a set of handcuffs with him. The reason for the officer not carrying handcuffs was never explained. The case might be explained if for example the handcuffs were broken and the officer did not have time to get a new set of handcuffs. Since no explanation was given, it raises the question of whether all officers carry handcuffs.

Table 3. The amount of times officers detain and handcuff people and the amount of time officers detain without handcuffing. Excluded two special operation stings, one emergency call and one animal call.

Excluded 4 scenes	Scenes from 1995–1997	Scenes from 2009–2011
Officers detain and handcuff x/x times	0/13	5/13
Officers detain w/o handcuffing	8/13	0/13
Officers do not detain at all	5/13	8/13

In addition, there is an episode from 1995 where officers were called to a trespassing incident. After finding the suspect and looking into his background the officers found out that the suspect also had a warrant for a probation violation and thus needs to be arrested and transported to jail. The arresting officer acted kindly and comforted the suspect. When the suspect was put in to the police car he was never handcuffed and was transported to jail without any restraints. According to Tampa police standard operation procedures a suspect must be always handcuffed unless the suspect is under the age of 13 or in a medical condition which limits the use of handcuffs. In addition, the Florida statues state how the handcuffs should be used and that they should always be double locked so that the suspect does not get his hands out of them. (TPDSOP 351.1, 1)

A change has occurred when observing the 2011 episodes. This time all arrested suspects are handcuffed straight away. In most cases, the officers also handcuff people who are being detained. The officers in the series advise detained people that they are being detained for the officers as well as the detainees' safety and the officers cuffing the detainees explain that they are not being arrested yet. However, usually a minor panic hits the detainee as they sometimes feel their freedom being threatened. The officers in the television series explain to the camera that the handcuffing of the detainees' is important. The officers can search for example the detainee's car for evidence without worrying about the suspect running from the scene. It can be assumed that there have been attempts to flee the scene when the suspects have not been cuffed although there have been attempts to flee even with the handcuffs on. These attempted fleeing episodes are from another state, but it indicates that fleeing has occurred with and without the handcuffs.

Handcuffing detained persons and handcuffing all arrested persons as a standard operating procedure (TPDSOP 351.1, 1–4) is an indicator of some different type of policing where officers

have to use more safety measures. In the earlier episodes officers were more relaxed and arrested suspects only if they were deemed aggressive or they had done a serious offence, usually an offence involving some type of assault. In the 2009–2011 episodes the officers clearly show a systematic change towards aggressive type policing thus treating even suspicious people, who have not been charged of any crime, as they were as dangerous as convicted criminals. The problem is that now a suspicious person, who might be an innocent member of the community, is being treated as a non-community member, but as an offender which is against the ideology of community policing.

5.3 Lethal and non-lethal instruments

Officers use their lethal and/or non-lethal instruments during arrests. First, I present what these instruments are, how they have changed from the 1995–1997 episodes to the 2009–2011 episodes. I have presented some of the changes of using a sidearm earlier but now the perspective is on the instruments specifically.

Officers carry a weapon or a sidearm which is considered to be a lethal instrument. However, since technology has developed these weapons can be equipped with non-lethal bullets such as rubber bullets or pellets. The main sidearm that an officer carries is almost always equipped with live ammunition but some squad cars also carry a shotgun which can be equipped with rubber bullets. The rubber bullets are mostly used in riots since the idea is to control the situation and avoid serious injuries. The reason why rubber bullets are not normally used in situations where there is a single suspect is that the rubber bullets can inflict deadly damage if for example the bullets strike the head. In addition, shotguns spray the rubber bullets in a wide area and they are meant to incapacitate a large group of people. Using rubber bullets on a single person can result in a serious injury. According to Florida statues 776.06:

A law enforcement officer or a correctional officer is not liable in any civil or criminal action arising out of the use of any less-lethal ammunition in good faith during and within the scope of his or her official duties.

Since the Standard operating procedures do not have specific guidelines for the use of rubber bullets, it can be assumed that the use of rubber bullets is always in the discretion of a single police officer. Moreover, there are other non-lethal instruments that can be easily carried with and that do

less damage to a single person than rubber bullets and thus rubber bullets are less used in everyday policing.

The rubber bullets have not been used in the earlier episodes and in the later episodes they have only been used in special operations such as drug stings. However, I have not seen a shotgun with rubber bullets been used in the selected episodes. I do know that rubber bullets have been around for a while since in another state's 1995 episode an officer called for an officer with a rubber bullet shotgun.

A taser is a weapon that fires metal pins that penetrate the skin. There are electric wires connected to the metal pins and a shock can be administered by pulling the trigger of the gun. The good thing about this is that it is effective but the downside of it is that due to the wiring the range of this weapon is quite limited. Even though this is a non-lethal instrument, it becomes extremely lethal when the shock is administered to a person with heart problems, or with a pacemaker. This type of weapon can be used only once since, after the first shot the weapon must be reloaded with new pins. Most of the 2011 episodes prove that officers carry tasers next to their sidearm on the waist, since it's small and easy to carry. It is quite easily distinguishable due to its unique yellow and black color.

The officers in the series still rely on their firearm when approaching an uncertain situation, however the taser is drawn and used when a suspect is seen fleeing. I portrayed the use of a taser as a help when trying to stop a fleeing suspect or when trying to get the suspect to comply. In many cases the taser seems to remove ethical problems in situations where suspect is attacking an officer with a knife. As earlier mentioned about the problem with single officers facing single suspects who have knives the problem is more easily solved with the help of a taser. The taser stops the attack and keeps the suspect alive. The taser is being broadly used all over the United States. It is easy to make the assumption that the taser has only been used in the 2011 episodes since it was not in use in 1995–1997, even though it was already invented in the 1970s (Cronin & Ederheimer 2006, 3.)

An interesting non-lethal instrument is the pepper spray. Although it is very common for a security officer and most police officers also carry it, I have not seen the pepper spray used in the episodes I chose for my analysis. Although there are no explanations for this from the series, Tampa standard operating procedures might have an explanation for this. First of all, I argue that pepper sprays are not shown in the series due to the fact that officers might not carry them. According to the TPDSP

officers are not required to carry pepper spray if they already have an expandable baton and a taser (TPDSP 521, 4.) In addition, TPDSP have strict restriction of when officers are allowed to use pepper spray as well as a harsh punishment for sustained complaints of illicit use of pepper spray. The officer has to make sure that pepper spray is only used when no other officers or innocent bystanders are in risk of getting affected by the spray. This most likely also applies with the camera crew being present. Furthermore, officers are only allowed to use pepper spray when being a minimum of 3 inches and a maximum of 10 inches from the aggressor. Moreover, officers must be certain that pepper spray is used only when there is no risk of the wind blowing the spray back to the using officer. The punishment for unnecessary use of pepper spray includes an additional training for the officers, which includes a personal experience of the effects of pepper spray as well as an additional appropriate disciplinary action against the officer. The standard operating procedures regard the use of pepper spray as being a serious matter. (TPDSP 521, 1–4). As a conclusion, the evidence suggests that officers in the 2009–2011 episodes do not carry pepper sprays and even if they do, they rarely use it.

The last instrument I want to present is the flashbang. The flashbang is a grenade which sparks a bright flash that induces temporary blindness. (Global Security, ref. 10.6.2013) The idea of the flashbang is to make it possible to enter to a room of hostiles without anybody getting hurt. Flashbangs are only carried by Special Forces such as the SWAT team and never by normal police officers. The flashbang is being used in the series in the earlier 1995–1997 episodes as in the 2009–2011 episodes. I have not noticed a difference in the use of flashbangs. Flashbangs were only used during drug stings when entering a drug house. Flashbangs inflict minimum damage and usually the damage occurs if the flashbang explodes right next to a person.

What has aggressive behavior to do with the development of instruments? As one may conclude from the implementation of new instruments, the ideology has been to develop more effective but less lethal instruments. The development of non-lethal instruments serves to protect even aggressive suspects by reducing the risk of getting killed by a police officer. However, at the same time it makes it easier for officers to use aggressive behavior against offenders. Shooting a running suspect who stole a purse might not be deemed ethical. Instead, tasing the same suspect seems to be non-disputed choice of method. This also decreases the threshold for using aggressive behavior towards suspicious people. In the 2009–2011 episodes the taser is being used frequently, and in many cases the taser was used in situations where the offender is already in the ground but passively resisting the arrest. The non-lethal instruments might free officers from ethical dilemmas in situations where

the arrested person cannot be detained but where the suspect does not pose as a threat. According to the Community oriented policing services (COPS website, ref. 05.08.1987) there is no clear definitions for how much force can officers use when apprehending suspects. However, as was portrayed in Cops, using a taser is an often used method in breaking passive resistance.

5.4 Case: Special operations unit

Special Operations Units are task forces for the police departments that are used in special circumstances. The first idea of the units were to help in hostage situations where you needed a unit that was specially trained for entering buildings silently and securing hostages. (Tampa PD, ref. 10.6.2013). A good example of this would be the S.W.A.T team.

According to Katz (2001) the special operations units derived from the communities' needs for solving problems. Hence, because of this need, multiple different special operations units were founded such as the S.W.A.T team and the DEA.

In the next section I present how officers in the drug sting scenes work and how have their methods of operating changed. In addition, I present how the officers explain why they do what they do and take into account how many times a special operations unit has been shown in the 1995–1997 episodes compared to the 2009–2011 episodes.

The work of special operations units in COPS

I found only two special operations unit scenes from the state Florida in the television series Cops; one from 1995 and one from 2010. I have made my analysis from these two scenes.

I did not go through all of the episodes in the series since my main interest is only on the chosen episodes. However, some comparison was made from episodes unrelated to Florida but from the same timeline that I made my main analysis from. In general, regarding cops, I argue that special operations scenes were shown more often in the 2009–2011 episodes than in the 1995–1997 episodes. In addition, the type of special operations varied more in the 2009–2011 (e.g. prostitution stings, drug stings, auto theft stings etc.)

The 1995–1997 episodes mostly showed drug busts where drug houses were raided or prostitutions stings where prostitutes were met by undercover officers who pretended to be clients. The newer episodes had special operations where officers pretend to be buyers or sellers. According to Katri Sieberg (2005, 82) sometimes it is better and more effective to arrest buyers instead of the sellers. When buyers are arrested for purchasing drugs, the prices of the drugs must decline in order to attract more buyers. However, when drug sellers are arrested, there is always someone to take the arrested seller's place. The newer episodes show prostitutions stings where officers pretend to be buyers of sex or they pretend to be the actual prostitutes. In the older episodes possible prostitutes were stopped and the officers had a conversation with them due to the fact that in most cases the officers knew the prostitutes beforehand. Seldom had the officers actually arrested a prostitute. In addition, the 2009–2011 episodes had various type of bicycle theft, auto theft etc. operations where for example a bicycle was left unlocked in front of a store, and police officers were hiding and watching the bicycle. When the bicycle was taken, the offender was arrested. These types of special operations were not seen until in the episodes from the 21st century.

Even though within state comparisons cannot be made from most of the special operations, I argue that the variety of special operations shown in the series shows that special operations units are more in use (e.g. United States department of justice, ref. 14.9.2013) and the amount of different special operations units has grown. A counterargument may be that there has been a demand for variety to the actual television series Cops. By showing special operations the producers pursue to portray the work of police officers as exciting. However, for a unit to be called a task force a real task force unit must be established. There is also the possibility that the task force name showed in the television series Cops is fictional.

Drug sting scenes

I start by introducing what happens in the two different drug stings. I observed the drug sting scenes thoroughly in order to show what differences in the way officers work can be noticed. The two scenes show major differences in the way a drug sting force operates. The first episode is from 1995 where officers pretend to be sellers and arrest buyers and in the 2010 episode the officers pretend to be buyers and arrest sellers. The special operations units have always arrested sellers, even though for example Katri Sieberg (lecture, ref. 20.4.2012) stated that New York police organizations were more interested in arresting the buyers instead of sellers. Sieberg argued that it is more effective to arrest buyers since they are more afraid of getting caught than drug sellers are.

In 1995 the scene starts with a short briefing, where the officers plan the drug sting. In this scene officers arrest drug buyers. They also go through how many bags of marijuana the officers have in the drug sting. There are two African American officers dressed up as gangsters, standing on the side of the road waiting for cars to pull over and buy drugs from the undercover officers. The arresting officers are in civilian cars, in police uniform, waiting for a signal from the undercover officers to indicate the arresting officers that a transaction has been made. The arresting officers are hiding but so that line of sight to the undercover officers remains. The signal from the undercover officers is raising their cap. Once the signal is shown, the arresting officers move in, trying to park their cars in front and behind the suspect in order to stop the suspect from fleeing. Two incidents are shown and in both of the incidents the suspect could not be stopped straight away. When the suspects try to escape, multiple police units nearby enter the scene and try to stop the suspects.

In the first incident the suspect is stopped shortly after he tried to flee. The officers surround the suspect's car and pull him out of the car. None of the officers have their gun drawn. After the suspect is out of the car the suspect is cuffed and the drugs recovered from inside the car. When questioned, the suspect denies buying drugs even after the arresting officer tells the suspect that the sellers were actually undercover police officers. The suspect is put into a police car and driven off. The suspect's car is confiscated.

In the second incident the suspect also flees and a high speed chase starts. This suspect gets to flee the scene since according to the officer this is only a crime against government property and a high speed chase would endanger innocent bystanders and this is why they are not allowed to pursue the suspect after a certain point. However, the officer continues that the tags of the car were seen and there is no trouble to find the suspect later or at least the owner of the car. In the end all of the officers are pleased about the arrests.

The 2010 episode also starts off with a short briefing. In the briefing the officers plan the drug sting and this time they will try to arrest buyers. In the scene only one incident is shown. The scene starts with a phone call between an undercover officer and the seller where meeting is arranged in a supermarket's parking lot. An undercover officer, dressed in civilian clothes, is waiting in a civilian car. The arresting officers are hiding a bit further from the undercover officer in actual police cars in police uniforms. The seller arrives in the parking lot in a car. There are two individuals in the car. A woman gets out of the car from the passenger side and approaches the undercover officer. The

woman explains that the transaction will go as followed: the woman takes the money from the undercover officer and takes it to a third person who will get the drugs from somewhere and delivers them to the woman. The undercover officer is unsatisfied since he fears that they will just take his money. The woman offers to go sit with the undercover officer and wait till the driver of the car takes the money to the third man and gets the drugs from him. The officer accepts and gives the money to the woman who takes it to the driver of the car. While waiting in the car the officer and the seller engage in casual conversation. After a while the woman's phone rings and she is told that the third person has not returned with the drugs but has actually taken the money and ran. After a while the driver returns and the woman tells that she will give some of her own drugs to the undercover officer. The woman gets the drugs from the car and gives them to the officer. Since there is a camera and microphone in the undercover officer's car the arresting officers see that the transaction is made and move in. Multiple officers surround the suspects and get out of their cars and draw their weapons. Both the undercover officer and the seller raise their hands. The woman is pulled out of the car, handcuffed and arrested, as is the driver of the suspect's car (this is not shown). The woman is questioned and she does not deny having the drugs but tries to argue that the drugs are for her own use and for a friend. The officers tell the camera that all participants were arrested and transported to jail in different patrol cars. In the end all of the officers express their satisfaction due to the successful operation.

Gear and action comparison between the drug stings

In this section I compare the gear the officers in the drug sting units wore in the 1995 and 2010 episodes. After this I compare the actions of the drug sting officers, how they use their weapons, how they pursue the suspect, the amount of officers in the scene etc.

In the 1995 episode the arresting officers use civilian cars. They have their sidearm with them, normally a pistol, pepper spray and handcuffs. The officers do not seem to be wearing any protective gear. The undercover officers are in plain civilian clothes without any protective gear or sidearm. In the 2010 episode the gear of the drug sting officers change dramatically. The officers are in full protective gear, with armor piercing vests on. They drive big police SUV's and they are carrying a pistol as a sidearm and a shotgun or a submachine gun. In addition, they are carrying telescopic nightsticks and tasers. Two of the officers are identifiable (the ones that talk to the camera). The rest of the drug sting unit are wearing masks to prevent others from identifying them.

From the protective gear it is quite clear that the safety of the officers has increased from the earlier episode to the later episode. Armor piercing gear was available in 1995 as well as shotguns and sub machine guns but according to the series they were implemented in drug stings later than 1995. In addition, it seems that it is important for the drug sting officer to not be recognized. However, this recognition might be because of the cameras (the officer wishes not to be recognized) or because of the possible threat officers might face, if recognized by the suspects. In addition, if the drug sting officers are not recognized, they can work as undercover agents in a different drug sting operation. This is only speculation since the officers in the series do not explain the reason for wearing masks.

Looking at the gear that officers in the drug sting scenes have and comparing it to the development of non-lethal equipment, I argue that safety for everyone involved is a major issue nowadays. When comparing the two drug sting scenes, even though the setting differs from each other, a clear difference can be seen in the gears officers use.

When comparing the actions of the officers in the drug sting scenes, it is evident that in the 2010 episode officers are more effective, more strategically placed and in addition the number of officers involved is a lot higher. The officers heavily rely on their weapon and make a swift arrest. The officers do not present unreasonable amount of force. With the large amount of police officers with their weapons drawn, the officers resolve the situation quickly and without any unnecessary use of force.

In the 1995 episode it seems that officers are not as strategically placed, especially when all of the suspects get to flee the scene. If the officers would have been strategically placed, as in the 2010 episode, there would have been units in all directions from the scene. The units entering the scene do not place themselves in a way that would trap the suspect's car, thus allowing the suspect to escape. The issue here might be because of insufficient police resources. In addition, the officers run towards the suspects' cars without their weapon drawn as if they would disregard the fact that the suspects might have weapons with them inside their car. However, when catching the suspect they use additional force to pull the suspect out of the car. In this case the officers do act extremely aggressively towards suspects even though the officers could have resolved the situations more peacefully through strategic planning. Instead, since the suspects fled the scene, the officers use additional force after the offender has been caught.

The instrument comparison suggests that the officers in the 2010 scene are more heavily equipped to use aggressive behavior. Despite the heavy equipment, through strategic planning and vocal commanding the officers resolve the situation peacefully. In the 1995 scene the officers are more relaxed when entering the situation and they end up using physical force to apprehend the suspects. When comparing the drug stings to the scenes of normal police officers my findings suggest the opposite. Normal officers use more aggressive methods when apprehending suspects in the 2009–2011 episodes than in the 1995–1997 episodes.

5.5 Conclusions

As a conclusion I argue that the officers in the series *Cops* engage in aggressive behavior more often in the 2009–2011 episodes than in the 1995–1997 episodes. The exceptions are the drug sting scenes, where I observed that officers in the 2010 scene are more equipped to use aggressive behavior. Through strategic planning and vocal commandment the officers resolve the situation in a non-aggressive way.

The officers in the 2009–2011 scenes use handcuffs more often even in situations where an arrest has not yet been made. The officers grab their weapons when feeling uncertain and always call for backup. In the episodes where briefings are being presented, the officers are being taught about being secure and protecting each other. The briefings were shown only a couple of times in the start of an episode but in the 2011 series talk about danger and being cautious is more highlighted in the briefings. Even though calling for backup should ease the uncertain situations, the actions of the officers actually appear to be more aggressive than when they are facing the suspect alone. Even the attitudes towards suspects are more negative when compared to the 1995–1997 episodes.

Organizational level of community policing might explain the change of police behavior. It includes value changes in policing as well as giving more power to single police officers (Fullbright-Anderson et. al. 2006, 104–105). First of all, the safety of police officers can be seen as part of value changes. Value changes can include for example changes in the way officers protect themselves or how they communicate with suspects and other members of the community. When value changes are applied by police officers it might induce a change in how officers act towards suspects. The officers make sure that the situations are as safe as possible by treating every suspicious person as an evident threat. At the same time, being overly suspicious of every person contradicts with one of the main ideas of community policing. That is that officers are supposed to

build up positive relations with members of the community (ibid). If suspects are seen as members of the community, there is supposed to be more positive interaction between the suspects and the police officers. This should ensure that the situations where officers deal with suspects can be resolved through positive communication and without physical contradictions. However, the officers might not see suspects as members of the community. Maguire et al. (2003, 252) state that community policing was actually adapted by the officers instead of the actual police organizations. In this case, the officers might have excluded suspects from being members of the community and thus would not act according to the ideology of community policing when dealing with suspects. In addition, as mentioned by Brown (2007) in the case of 9/11 terrorist attacks, procedures against suspects were harshened after the attacks, even though the strategic planning of community policing was never interrupted because of the attacks. On the other hand, Dan Silk (2012) notes in an FBI bulletin that co-operation through community policing is the way to decrease terrorism (Silk 2012, 3). Thus co-operation with a risk group (e.g. as muslims are seen by the U.S. police) would be beneficial in the fight against crime and terrorism.

In Finland, there exists a similar type of series to Cops, called Poliisit. The idea of the series is the same: follow what police officers do in the line of duty. One major difference in these series is that in the Finnish reality television show Poliisit, suspects are very rarely handcuffed. However, in Cops almost every suspect, despite the severity of their crime is being handcuffed. The officers in Cops explained this as being cautious and that as an officer, you never know what the suspect might do. Tampa Police Department's standard operating procedures are in accordance with the way officers behave in the 2011 episodes of Cops. The guidebook states that officers must always handcuff a transported person except when his under the age of 13 or a medical condition prevents the handcuffing (TPDSOP 371.1, 1). Unfortunately there is no older version of the standard operating procedures so I cannot study whether an actual procedural change has occurred. However, the actions of the officers suggest that a procedural change has happened. At least the actions of the officers have clearly changed in the television series Cops.

The way officers use handcuffs might give out a symbolic meaning that the ones who are handcuffed are dangerous and that they must be controlled. Even though safety procedures are supposed to ensure safety in any line of work, this particular safety procedure might be against the ideology of community policing. As mentioned earlier some people react in a panic-like-way when being handcuffed even though the officers mention that they have not been arrested but detained. The method "handcuff all suspicious persons" seems to be an aggressive policing method.

Handcuffed people who are actually innocent might feel insulted by the handcuffing and might build up negative images of police officers. In this scenario the officers are the ones in control and not the co-operative type. This method gives more evidence to what Ritti and Mastrofski (Crank 2003, 192) called the professional model of policing, where the police organization was seen as a more military-like-institute with an objective to arrest people that commit crimes. Professional policing had no room for community-police relations. However, the handcuffing of all suspicious people as a method might not be in contradiction with community policing. The organizational level of community policing also states that the idea is to empower single officers so that they can make decisions more independently (Fullbright-Anderson et al. 2006, 106). When comparing the increased training in safe methods and the emphasis on work safety to the aggressive policing methods, it might be the case that officers interpret suspicious situations as a threat towards their safety. Through their increased decision making power, they decide to handcuff every suspicious person. Safety might become more important than the idea of community policing, especially if the suspicious people are not seen as members of the community but instead as enemies.

At the same time as safety and cautiousness have become more important, another theme has occurred: the safety of the suspects. The taser has been one of the most important devices the officers have received. It is clear that officers emphasize the safety of the suspects as well; they talk about not wanting to kill the suspects but at the same time the officers need to protect themselves. In a 1995 episode an officer who is ordering a suspect to get down while pointing a gun at the suspect, tells the suspect after arresting him that he should not struggle because the officer could have shot him and then things would have been really bad. For the reason that the taser was not yet actively used by the police in 1995, the officers did not have any alternative than to shoot at a dangerous suspect if necessary. For some reason, even though the officers had pepper spray they did not use it in close combat situations. One of the reasons might be that the officer using the pepper spray might get himself hurt as well as the suspect. The officers do carry a nightstick with them in the 2009–2011 episodes and a wooden baton in the 1995–1997 episodes, however I did not observe it being used in any of the chosen episodes.

When comparing the gear of the officers, I argue that in threatening situations in 1995–1997 the officers had no choice but to shoot at the offender. This is regarded as aggressive behavior, even though the sidearm might be the only instrument to protect the officer. However, I do emphasize the existence of the wooden baton and the rare occasions that it was used. The wooden baton could have served as a non-lethal instrument in situations where the offender would have a knife. For

some reason officers rarely relied in the use of the wooden baton. The emergence of the taser was a solution for dealing with the aforementioned situations. Although the series portrays that the taser dropped the threshold for using aggressive behavior, I argue that officers, at least in *Cops*, use the taser with a very low threshold, thus making their behavior aggressive in non-threatening situations.

The issue is whether non-lethal instruments are in accordance with community policing. When considering the *Organizational level* of community policing, non-lethal instruments do apply to the new policing values. The new policing value in this case is to ensure security for the offenders as well. This suggests that the offenders are seen as members of the community. The problem is that the non-lethal instruments, at least in the television series *Cops*, seem to increase the aggressive behavior of police officers. My analysis suggests that non-lethal instruments lowers the threshold of using physical aggression (e.g. using a taser) to resolve an uncertain but not yet dangerous situations. Thus the real question is whether the instruments were created to insure the safety of the suspects or for more efficient capturing of criminals. In any case, the change in gears does portray new policing values in the organizational level of community policing.

I argue that *Cops* portrays officers to be more violent and disrespectful towards suspects in the 2009–2011 episodes. However, the gear officers carry in the 2009–2011 episodes are more suspect friendly. Thus I argue that the official procedures have changed and that the new procedures reflect more the ideology of community policing. However, as portrayed in *Cops*, the officers have in fact worked against the ideology of community policing, at least in the case of using force against suspects.

Special operations

My findings on the television series *Cops* indicates that there are more special operations units that existed in 2009–2011 than compared to 1995–1997. Although, one simple reason for this might be that the special operations scenes are a way to add something new and exciting into the series. The question however would be that why is it done now and not earlier, since the program has been broadcasted for such a long time. Katz's (2001) findings on special gang units concur with my findings on the existence of special operations units. Even though the chosen episodes from the State of Florida do not suggest this, the series as a whole does.

Another finding suggests that there is more emphasis on special operations units. In the 1995 episode the drug sting operation consisted of normal police officers when in the 2010 episode the unit was actually a separate unit which is specialized in drug related operations. The unit had a unified and distinguishable uniform and the members of the unit had official badges that stated that they were part of a drug sting unit.

At the *tactical level* of community policing, building links between other law enforcement agencies is important. In addition, in the *organizational level* of community policing decentralizing and creating teams is an important factor. (Fullbright-Anderson 2006, 105–106.) Decentralizing in community policing is the same phenomena as specializing. Big organizations are broken apart in order to establish different departments (e.g. sales, marketing etc.). In the case of law enforcement, specialized units are established. The difference between decentralizing and creating teams is that in decentralizing the single units are placed in different geographical locations and in creating teams, new units are established from the old organization. The comparison between the 2010 drug sting scene and the 1995 drug sting scene suggests that decentralizing and creating teams has occurred in the police organizations. However, more studies are needed in order to understand the full extent of decentralizing and creating teams.

My findings on special operations units suggest that the work of special operations units have moved towards being more safe and efficient. I found that the amount of units in drug stings has increased when comparing the scene from 1995 to the scene from 2010. In the 2010 scene there were around fifteen special task force officers shown in the scene while in the 1995 scene there were only five officers in the scene. In addition, I found that the officers have more protective gear and more firepower than before. Moreover, the placement of the officers and the actions of the officers are more strategic than before, making it almost impossible for the suspects to escape from the scene. My argument is based on the fact that in the 1995 scene all of the suspects had to be chased by police officers and usually there were only two arresting units compared to the five arresting units in the 2010 scene. In addition, when comparing the use of weapons between the 1995 and the 2010 scenes, in the 2010 scene officers had more powerful weapons pointed at the suspects during the arrest. However, in the 1995 scene officers had no weapon drawn at the suspects at any point.

Regardless of the fact that officers had more protective gear in the 2010 scene, the officers in the 1995 scene were more aggressive towards the suspects. In the 2010 episode officers pointed

weapons towards the suspects and commanded the suspects to exit the vehicle and to back up towards the officers. In the 1995 scene, officers chased the suspects without any weapons drawn and forcefully pulled the suspects out of the car. It is clear that in the 1995 scene officers used aggressive behavior towards the suspects when again in the 2010 scene the officers used a decent amount of force, making their behavior non-aggressive. I argue that through the creating of specialized teams and strategic planning, as stated in the *organizational level* of community policing (Fullbright-Anderson 2006, 106), the specialized unit in the 2010 scene were more prepared and trained for drug sting operations. The calmness of the officers and the decent amount of force used also shows that the officers appreciate the rights of the suspects. Thus the suspects can be considered as members of the community. Again, it must be remembered that a simple explanation might also be that the changes are because of the producers need to make this a better show.

In the 1995 scene, the officers are not fully prepared for the drug sting and their main goal is to get the offender at any cost. Even once the suspect is stopped and evidently caught, the officers use extreme force to apply handcuffs on the suspects. This aggressive behavior is against the ideology of community policing. Co-operation with convicted felons, suspects, etc. is part of community policing, as Dan Silk (2012) stated in the FBI bulletin. Physical fights with suspects might deter the possibility for later co-operation between suspects and police officers.

My findings suggest that in the case of drug sting operations officers in the 2010 scene are more specialized in the specific task and have more strategic planning in the operation than in the 1995 scene. Another suggestion is that the 2010 scene is a better planned show, made to be more entertaining. However, the officers involved are supposed to prepare the special operations stings and being more effective is an agenda itself for the police. In addition, the officers in the 2010 scene try to resolve the situation peacefully and with respect towards the suspects. The officers show no signs of aggressive behavior in the 2010 scene. The agenda for the show might be then to show a task force unit as efficient. Thus I conclude that the special operations unit scenes portrayed in the television series *Cops* suggest that the strategies of community policing as presented by Fullbright-Anderson (2006) have been implemented in the procedures of police organizations. If not, then at least the way police want to present themselves through the television series *Cops* indicates that they want to be presented as more friendly and professional towards suspects than in the 1997 scene. The main evidence for this is the fact that in the 2010 scene the officers are part of a specialized drug sting unit. In the 1995 scene officers use more force, are disorganized and seem

unfamiliar with the special settings. In addition, since the officers in the scene are no more than normal police officers, it seems that at least the idea of creating teams and specialization have not yet been applied by police organizations.

My major conclusion is that Cops portrays a change in the way officers work in drug sting operations when comparing the 1995 and 2010 drug sting scenes. The changes were in the amount of officers involved in the special operation, the equipment officers carried and the way officers approached the suspects. The officers in the 2010 scene were portrayed as more friendly, safer and effective than were the officers in the 1995 scene.

6. Community policing

In this section I focus my interest on how officers in the series portray their relations to the community. In addition, I analyzed how officers value the help of other community members. The idea is to find indicators for the transformation towards community policing from the comments that officers give to the camera. From this material I cannot determine whether the way officers talk about their jobs and others is because of a strategic change in policing or some other major phenomena. However, I did find evidence from the series that a policing strategy change towards community policing might be an influencing factor for the observations that I have made.

In this section I introduce the cases where officers reflect why they act the way they do as a police officer. I will start by analyzing the background talk that officers give to the camera in the start of the scenes. After this, I will take a look at how other members of the community affect the incidents. At the end, I analyze the endings of the incidents for the reason that officers usually in the series go through what has just happened and state their opinions about what was good and what was bad about the incident.

6.1 Background talk from police officers

In the start of a scene, officers usually explain how and why they have joined the police force. For example, in the 1995–1997 episodes the officers mostly talked about how they loved the exciting feeling they experience in their work and the idea of catching the bad guy:

Example 3

"You know I love to catch a bad guy. You come out here and you work and you work and you come so close sometime catching somebody doing something that they just get away. That once every month or... every two months you catch somebody that's just committed a burglary or trying to steal a car or just shoots or stabs someone. There's... There's no... no rush like that."

(OM, S08E06)

In the next example (Example 4) the officer also emphasizes that the important thing is catching the bad person. This officer also emphasized the idea of making "the world a little bit safer", however it

is not as specific as the examples from the 2009–2011 episodes, where the officers present their main objective being protecting the community.

Example 4

"– – It's hard to make a difference being one person or one deputy. But I... I personally think that, you get one person off the street during your shift that is obviously a bad person or a criminal or some sort umm... That you at least made the world a little bit safer."

(OM, S08E07)

There is not much of a difference in the 2009–2011 episodes since the officers usually express their attachment for their jobs as well as in the 1995–1997 episodes. However, a major difference is that in most episodes the officers in 2009–2011 explain that they joined the force because of their sports background and that it helped them when applying to become a police officer. In addition, the emphasis on catching the criminal has almost disappeared. I present two examples of the emphasis of sports in joining the force:

Example 5

"I decided to get into law enforcement because when growing up I was always active in sports. And to me this incorporates a lot of that with the team work comradery. - - I decided to go work for the Hillsborough county sheriff's office. And I love coming to work every single day."

(OF, S24E01)

Example 6

"I grew up playing softball and I went to college and played ball. It definitely helps me with my career because this is definitely a career where you can't let yourself go. To play softball, it's definitely a team sport. You know it's a team sport out here, you have, you know, be able to work well with other people and you have to, you know, communicate well with other deputies and work together."

(OF, S24E02)

From these examples, an attitude change for joining the police force can be recognized. In the 2009–2011 episodes, officers portray the reason for joining being because of a sport background. The officer in example 6 relates her sports background into teamwork. The officer feels that her sports background has taught her a lot about team work and police work is all about team work as well. In addition, in the 2009–2011 episodes officers mention either the positive relations with the community or the importance of helping the community:

Example 7

"I'm not originally from Lafayette, but I a moved here and I mea... immediately I fell in love with the city. The people here are real easy to get along with. You meet somebody once and they treat you like family every other time they see you. Everybody here just loves having a good time, you know it's real easy to go out and meet people. It's just a great city to live in."

(OM, S24E06)

"Recently my son decided that what he's seen over the years, that he wants to get involved with law enforcement. I am kind of proud of him for making that decision and wanting to go out trying to help the community and do something positive with his life."

(OM, S24E10)

The two examples above suggest that the officers in the 2009–2011 episodes value the community in a different way than before. When in the 1995–1997 episodes the officers described their job as fighting against dangerous criminals, the officers in the 2009–2011 episodes saw themselves as working in the community and trying to help members of the community. The motivation for doing their job has shifted towards the idea of community policing. Officers emphasized the importance of making the community safe. Another reason might be that the producers have wanted make the television show more community friendly and have requested the officers to talk about the community in a positive matter.

I argue that there is a connection between the danger talks to the single officer mentioning the lack of understanding between the police and the community. The next example is from a 1995 episode that depicts how a male officer felt about his job:

Example 8

"It's a brotherhood. Yo... your closer to these people sometimes you may feel like your closer than your own family. Because they really understand what's your going through on a daily basis and I understand what they go through. And we

know that we're out here and put our lives on the line every day. And umm... I think that a lot of people don't realize the kind of stress that carries with it to know that every time you put on this uniform and leave your home and kiss your wife and kiss your child and it may be the last time you are able to do that."

(OM, S08E06)

The officer emphasizes the dangers of his job. He sees the future and the people he has to deal with as a threat. In addition, the officer makes a distinction between us (the officers) and them (others). The others do not fully understand what the officers have to deal with and what they might lose (their family) when fighting crime. These kinds of talks seem to disappear in the 2009–2011 episodes and converts to passion for the job and the importance of protecting the society. My findings suggest that a shift in actual procedures has changed the officers' attitudes towards the community and the threats of the community. However, there is a possibility for an attitude change despite procedural change. One reason might be that the producers have wanted an image change for the television program. Another reason might be that police departments have wanted this image change.

The aforementioned differences suggest that attitudes that officers have towards their work and towards the community have become more positive. This gives some evidence to the fact that strategic guidelines of the police have changed. In the 2009–2011 episodes officers talked about their job in a more positive manner and disregarded its dangerousness. In addition, officers more often mentioned positive aspects of the city they lived and worked in. Moreover, officers more often saw themselves as protectors of the community instead of, as in the 1995–1997 episodes, active crime fighters.

The way officers described their background is not the only indicator of a procedural or an attitude change. I made a small observation in the way officers describe how they got a "call" to a scene. In the 1995–1997 episodes, the officers used expressions such as "I've just been called to an incident" or "the 911-operator just informed us about" In the 2009–2011 episodes the officers usually mention about anonymous callers, informants and 911-calls. The officers shift the origin of the call to the actual informant instead of implying that the 911-operator was the informant. The officers also used passive sentences in the 1995–1997 episodes instead of referring to an actual caller. (Table 4) I argue that due to community policing the officers put more emphasis on the citizen informing about the incident than before. This way the officers reflect the co-operation between the

citizens and the police and build a positive image of the police organizations as a community servant rather than as a monitoring organization.

Table 4. The amount of times officers used passive and the amount of times officers referred to an actual informant.
Excluded two special operation stings.

Excluded 2 scenes.	Episodes from 1995–1997	Episodes from 2009–2011
Officers used passive sentences	11/14	3/14
Officers referred to an actual informant.	3/14	11/14

6.2 Interaction between the officers and others

The television series Cops portrays a change in how officers feel about people involved in the scenes. There are changes in how officers interact with eyewitnesses, victims and suspects.

The next two examples are from two different scenes in a 1997 episode. In the first one, the officers have just caught a suspect who had robbed a small store a couple of times before, but who has always gotten away. After catching the suspect, the officers enter the store and compliment the victims for pointing out the criminal. In the second example, an officer asks the victim what had just happened. In this scene, a suspect tried to break into the victim’s car, but got caught by the victim who also carried a gun with him.

Example 9

OM: Sir?

VM: Hello!

OM: I wanted to thank you. Pointed out him like that. You gave us good directions, he didn’t have prayer. And thank you for identifying him (looking at the second male)

VM2: Yes, sir

*OM: You did a good job keeping tonight by keeping him out because he um.. would have done the same thing.
(S08E06)*

OM: What a... what happened sir?

VM: (cannot understand, talking about a screw driver on the ground and being around the car)

OM: Okay, you had him laying down?

VM: Oh yeah. I... He was in the car

OM: He was in yo... which car?

VM: I got... this one

OM: okay

VM: The - - is still open

OM: Okay, okay. Yeah why don't you just put some... clothing on (S08E06)

In the first scene the officer show their gratitude for the victims for pointing out the criminal, thus building up a positive image of their co-operation. However, in the second scene the officer is strictly interested in what has happened and that the suspect has been caught, but has no interest in chatting with the victim. As can be seen from the example the officer only shows petty interest in what the victim is saying by replying shortly. Even after getting a description of what happened, the officer shows no interest in what the victim is saying.

The first scene in the 1995–1997 is exceptional. In most cases, the officers are only interested in what had happened and do not engage in casual conversations with the victims or anybody else. The officers portray themselves as being professional and unemotional in the situations whereas in the 2009–2011 episodes the officers actively engage in casual conversations with the victims and with other people involved. A good example of this is a scene from an animal call, where the informants called the police because of a snake in their yard:

Example 10

OM: So how'd you feel now that it's bagged in the little... container

VF: I wonder where the mother is.

OM: The mother ? (W: laughter) They usually don't travel in packs, I don't think

VF: I hope not, it's so scary (O: laughter)

OM: The first one you've seen like that? (W: yeah) In the neighborhood or anywhere else?

*VF: Like in the wild yeah
(S23E01)*

The officer actively engages in casual conversation even after the snake has been caught. In addition, the officer leads the conversation by asking more casual questions from the informants. Both the officer and the residents laugh when having the casual conversation, thus portraying how the officers and members of the community communicate in harmony.

This is not the only case when officers engage in casual conversation with the victims or eyewitnesses. In the next example, the wife of the victim tried to hire a hitman to kill his husband. The police was informed about the intentions of the woman and a sting operation was established in order to catch the wife. An undercover officer played the role of the hitman who then was approached by the wife. After the interviews and the arresting of the wife, the husband talked about his feelings to a detective in the example.

Example 11

VM: I'm really not surprised that I'm here. And it hasn't sunk in to me yet that somebody was going to try to kill me or have me killed today... And that part honestly hasn't hit me.

OM: Yeah, the only thing that matters (interrupted)

VM: (Talking at the same time as OM): It's going to take while that that'll roll into me.

OM: Yeah, well this is going to be a new beginning (smiles). You know (VM: yeah), today's your lucky day and you get a chance to, you know, (VM: laughing) start all over again. That's the way I would see it.

VM: Yeah, I feel, honestly I gotta say, I feel this much bad for her. You know, I mean I'm not going to block this, I mean, she gets what she gets but umm...

OM: I'm just glad (VM: trying to say something)... The best thing is that I'm just glad that you're here to talk about it, you know. We're gonna get your stuff together and get you home, alright?

*VM: Thank you so much (laughter).
(S24E03)*

As can be observed from this, the detective is being emphatic towards the husband and tries to make the husband see this as a positive thing by emphasizing that the main thing is that he is alive. Even though in most cases officers portray themselves as being cold professionals, in 2009–2011 some episodes were constructed in a manner to give out positive images of police-citizen relations. (Table 4) This was a difference when compared to the 1995–1997 episodes, where there were no episodes portraying this positive relation.

Table 4. Number of scenes where a positive relation between police officers and citizens were shown. Two special operations scenes excluded.

Excluded 2 scenes.	Scenes from 1995–1997	Scenes from 2009–2011
Number of scenes where a positive relation between police officers and citizens were shown.	0/14.	2/14. One animal rescue scene and one murder for hire scene.

An important factor in preventive crime fighting has always been the use of informants. Officers actively use the help of regular informants such as individuals who have been arrested but have made a deal with the district attorney that they will not be prosecuted if they provide assistance to the police. An informant can also be an innocent citizen who calls for help when seeing a crime been committed. The difference is that regular informants try to infiltrate a group that is committing crimes and inform the police about their oncoming actions.

As officers have switched their talk from talking about passive calls to referring to callers calling for help, the series portrays more informant interactions with the police. For example, in drug stings the special operations units usually rely on informants that willingly help the officers. In many cases the stings are only available if someone provides the contact information of the suspects. In addition, officers give more emphasis on the citizens helping them in catching the suspects. Ritti and Mastrofski (Crank 2002, 192) noted that at the same time that policing was ran from a professional perspective there was a lack of trust between the citizens and the police. This meant that when crimes were done, the average citizen was not as keen to report about a crime. Fullbright-Anderson et al. (2006, 105–106) argue that one important factor of community policing is understanding the importance of help from the community. In the 2009–2011 episodes officers emphasize the help of informing citizens. Such as in the case where the wife tried to hire a hitman

to kill her husband, the officers mention that they got the information from an informant. In the 1995–1997 episodes, officers sometimes do not mention the informant at all.

Even though officers mention the help of informants, in rare cases the interaction between an informant and the officer is shown. This is understandable due to the fact that regular informants might be recognized in the series and end up being at risk because of this. However other informants, such as eyewitnesses are more often shown in the 2009–2011 episodes than in the 1995–1997 episodes. (Table 5)

Table 5. The amount of times informants are mentioned and the amount of times eyewitnesses are shown.

Excluded 2 scenes	Scenes from 1995–1997	Scenes from 2009–2011
The amount of times informants are mentioned	1/14	3/14
Amount of times eyewitnesses are shown.	4/14	6/14

In the case of suspects, I observed both positive and negative interaction between the officers and the suspects in the 2009–2011 episodes. The aggressiveness of the suspects affected the way officers reacted towards them. As can be observed from the next two examples, the officers treat the suspect in a non-appreciative way in the first example whereas in the second one the officers treat the suspect with full dignity and respect (Table 6).

In the first example (Example 12) the officers believe that the female suspect is lying and thus mock the suspect with repetitive questions which after the situation ends up with another officer laughing at the suspect. The officers portray lack of respect and trust towards the suspect. In the second example (Example 13) the officer treats the suspect with full respect from the start and wants to make sure that he understood correctly what the suspect was saying. In addition, the officer presents the option that through co-operation something mutually beneficial could be achieved.

Example 12

OM: Who's bottle of morphine is that?

SF: Bottle of what?

OM: Morphine?

SF: Morphine?

OM: Yeah

SF: You need to test that, that's water.

OM: Uhum. They just did test it

SF: (saying something at the same time as the officer)

OM: Did you guys just test that? (talking to he's colleagues)

OM²: Huh?

OM: You tested that

OM²: That's water? (showing a small container with liquid)

SF: That's water

OM²: That's water?

SF: Yes

*OM²: That's water? Looks like morphine to me (laughter from a male officer)
(S23E03)*

Example 13

"Can you run me through it, coz I'm... I gotta be the one who's going tell the story here and I certainly don't wanna put anything against you that you don't deserve."

(Small break)

"You've got the felony charges on you already. If there's something you wanted to do about that you have to... give us something. It's an exchange system."

(OM, S23E01)

Table 6. Number of times officers verbally treat suspects in a disrespectful manner. Excluded two special operation stings, one emergency call and one animal call.

Excluded 4 scenes	Scenes from 1995–1997	Scenes from 2009–2011
Number of times officers treat suspects in a disrespectful manner.	5/13	9/13
Number of times officers treat suspects in a positive manner.	3/13	5/13

Even though the situations and the alleged crimes differ from one another, the second example shows that the officers give the suspect a chance for error. In the first example (example 12), even before the officers know the results of the tested substance, the officers do not trust the suspect's claims at all. In fact, the officers make the suspect look foolish.

The differences in behavior might be because of the agenda of television show. It might be that, in example 13, the producers have wanted to show police officers in a more positive and understanding manner. It also might be because of cultural differences related to the two crimes. There are harsh laws in the United States when it comes to drugs. This might induce the officers to treat suspects dealing with drugs more negatively than suspects that steal.

The next two examples are from 1995 and 1997 episodes. In the first example, the officer's interaction towards the suspect can be deemed hostile. The interaction is straightforward commanding of the suspect. In addition, the officer discredits the suspect from the start by not believing that the handcuffed suspect cannot get up by himself. By observing the scene, I argue that it might be rather difficult for the suspect to get up from the rough terrain and with his hands cuffed behind his back. Less than a minute later two officers pull the suspect up.

Example 14

OM: Stand up! Stand up!

SM: I can't

*OM: You can stand up.
(Officers pull the suspect up)*

OM: Why you running?

SM: Why my running?

*OM: What are you an echo? Why are you running?
(S08E06)*

Example 15

SM: Hey!

OM: Hey man!

SM: May I help you with something

OM: (Grabs the man) put your cigarette down man.

SM: I didn't do nothing

OM: I just wanna talk to you for a couple of minutes. You've just been kinda hard to find

*SM: Alright, I di... realize the kids and all were over here. My kids.
(Later inside the police car)*

SM: Well umm... What about all the scratches on me and everything like that. I mean if you're taking me to jail for Tuesday night, why um... How come you're not locking her up for Tuesday?

OM: Look at her eye. And her shoulder (Interrupted)

SM: okay, look at my face and my shoulders and my legs and my stomach

*OM: (Nods) (Silently) Alright, alright (turns his head away from the suspect)
(S09E36)*

As can be observed from the example, after the officer asks his questions and the suspect confirms that he understood the questions, the officer presents a negative attitude towards the suspect by asking whether the suspect was an echo. By this question the officer questions the intelligence of the suspect and portrays himself as being the higher authority.

In the second example (example 15), the officer presents his lack of trust on the claims that the male suspect presents. From the start the officer grabs the suspect and handcuffs him and later in the squad car the officer portrays disbelief in the suspect's claim that his wife had also assaulted the suspect. This is typical in some of the other episodes as well: the officers only comment by saying okay to the suspect's claims and do not listen what the suspects have to say. The officers are only interested in what happened and only from the perspective that the suspect actually did the crime. The officers display disbelief if the suspects try to explain their innocence.

The major difference when comparing the 1995–1997 and the 2009–2011 episodes is that even though officers mock suspects throughout the series, the officers actually listen to the suspects in the 2009–2011 episodes. As can be seen from the second example (Example 13, 59) of the 2011 episode, the officer gives the suspect a chance to co-operate with the officer and wants to make sure that he explains the suspect's side of the story in accordance with the suspect. The series portrays a more positive image of officer-suspect interactions in the 2009–2011 episodes whereas in the 1995–1997 episodes suspects are portrayed as unreliable and somewhat amusing.

6.3 Reflecting talk

18/30 of the scenes from 1995–1997 and 2009–2011 end the same way: the suspect is put in the squad car and is transported away. However, some of the scenes end in situations where the officers reflect the outcome of the situations.

The reflective talk showed only one clear difference. In the 1995–1997 episodes officers either go through of what just happened or they go through of what might have happened if the suspect would have not been arrested. An example of this is from a 1997 episode where officers try to arrest a person who has a warrant for his arrest. When officers approach the scene they discover that the suspect has barricaded himself inside a bus. After arresting the suspect, the officer explains why the arrest was the best outcome:

Example 17

"When we arrived on the scene, umm... we quickly determined that it was more of a danger to leave him there, because if he were able to start that bus and take off, we may had a loss of life and he was taken into custody peacefully."

(OM, S09E32)

The explanation is common when observing the 1995–1997 episodes (Table 7). The next example is from a 2011 episode which shows the difference in reflective talk. In this example officers had stopped a driver who drove recklessly and issued him a criminal citation. The driver was let go with the citation and he was not arrested.

Example 18

OM: You just made a bunch of people happy on state road 60, coz they all saw him driving like that and they were all looking at us. And they definitely knew that (OF: we were coming after him) coz they moved out of the way and we didn't even have our overheads on yet so. We got a lot of complaints about that kind of driving in that area (OF: the racing) so that's going to make the public really happy that at least for tonight we took one person and hopefully he learnt a lesson and won't do that again.

(S24E02)

The officers express their satisfaction by stating that the neighborhood will be happy because of the actions of the police. The officers reflect and justify their actions by referring to the needs of the community. The 2009–2011 episodes also express situations where the officers reflect what might have gone wrong if the outcome would have been different. However, the biggest difference when comparing the episodes is that the word "community" in the 1995–1997 episodes is never used. The officers refer to "people's safety" and/or the safety of the officers when reflecting the situation whereas in the 2009–2011 episodes officers mention the needs and safety of the community (Table 7).

Table 7. Number of times officers reflect that they stopped something from happening and number of times officers reflect they served the community/the wishes of citizens. Excluded two special operation stings, one emergency call and one animal call.

Excluded 4 scenes	Scenes from 1995–1997	Scenes from 2009–2011
Number of times officers reflected they had stopped something from happening	3/13	5/13
Number of times officers reflect they served the community/the wishes of citizens	0/13	4/13

In the case of the special operations stings, both scenes (1995 and 2010) end up with a short debriefing. In the 1995 scene, the officers go through of what went wrong, and explain why they

could not continue the pursuit of the last suspect who got away. The reason was that there were a lot of children in the neighborhood and they were not allowed to engage in a high speed chase. In the 2010 episode the officer goes through briefly what they found in the cars and how many people got arrested. Another officer's comment "outstanding" indicates that the sting was a success. However, in both of the scene the officers only summarize what happened and what was the outcome.

6.4 Conclusions

The talk of the officers give evidence that the attitudes of officers have changed from thinking about the dangerous aspects of the job to a more community friendly attitude. The officers stopped talking about the dangers of the job and started to reflect more about why they joined the force. Moreover, officers mentioned positive aspects of the people that lived in the community and of the people they interacted with. In the 1995–1997 episodes the word "community" was never used whereas in the 2009–2011 episodes it was sometimes used.

The background talk portrays the ideology of community policing in a broader view. It shows that officers see themselves as working in the community whereas in the 1995–1997 episodes officers portray themselves as crime fighters. The background talk gives evidence to Fielding's (2005, 460–461) third meaning for community policing: the emphasis on communication between officers and members of the community. Through the emergence of the word "community" and the positive remarks officers gave about the city and its residents, I argue that the change in the way officers talk can be connected with the wider change in policing procedures. The background cannot be clearly linked to the four dimensions of community policing due to the fact that the talk indicates the value changes of officers than actual procedural changes. However, since the idea in community policing is the co-operation between the police and the community, the changes or the portrayed change of the series does suggest an actual change in procedures and possible changes in the training of officers. Thus, Fullbright-Andersons (2006, 106) fourth level, the *organizational level* of community policing, cannot be dismissed when studying why the series portrays a change in background talk. However, it must be noted that the producers have wanted to manipulate the talks of the officers to make officers seem more approachable by the audience. Even so, the organizational level of community policing includes value changes, which I argue is the main reason for the portrayal change towards a more positive image of police-community relations in the

television series *Cops*. The value changes include a change in police training (e.g. how to communicate with victims, eyewitnesses and suspects).

The portrayed police-citizen interactions in the television series *cops* suggest that actual procedural changes have occurred. There is also the possibility of a change in the way the producers have wanted the television show to be portrayed. In addition, it might be that the police organizations have requested the producers to present the show in a manner that would portray positive police-citizens interactions. For instance, the questioning of suspects has changed from a skeptically performed questioning towards an understanding type of questioning. In the 1995–1997 episodes the officers in many instances discredited the suspect's explanations or plea of innocence. In addition, the officers straightforwardly blamed the suspect for the incident and did not give the suspect a chance to explain himself. In the 2009–2011 episodes the suspect was given a full chance to explain the situation and he was not strictly declared guilty for the unlawful action that was done. However, as mentioned, the officers did mock suspects for their statements in the 1995–1997 episodes as well as in the 2009–2011 episodes. This suggests that officers had already made up their mind whether the suspects were guilty or not.

Despite the fact that officers had assumptions of the innocence of the suspects, they did recognize the value of co-operating with the suspects. As Dan Silk (2012) mentioned of the benefits of working with risk groups, the officers bargained with the suspects: If the suspect would reveal beneficial information to the officers, then the suspects would benefit something themselves. I did not observe this at all in the 1995–1997 episodes.

The major problem with the idea of community policing is that it does not clearly state who can be seen as a member of the community. Broad ideologies such as positive communication and increased co-operation with members of the community do not indicate whether the ideologies include suspects as members of the community. However, since I observed a change towards a more positive communication and increased co-operation between the suspects and police officers in the series, I suggest that the strategies in community policing include working with suspects. Thus I argue that the *strategic level of community policing* has influenced the portrayed change of police behavior in the television series *Cops*. Strategic level of community policing includes increased community-police interaction as well as the goal to increase trust between the community and the police. (Fullbright-Anderson 2006, 104–105). By applying Silks (2012) strategy in building

positive relations with risk groups, the same strategy can be applied when interacting with suspects and criminals in order to deter crime.

Interaction with others than suspects or victims was rarely shown in the 1995–1997 episodes and the 2009–2011 episodes. In both of the timelines, positive interaction with eyewitnesses was sometimes shown and in all of the cases the officers were grateful for the help of the eyewitnesses. Thus, I conclude that I did not observe a change in the way officers interacted with eyewitnesses.

In the case of officers interacting with victims, I did observe a change. In the 1995–1997 episodes, interactions were more straightforward: officers asked what happened but did not engage nor show any interest in casual conversation with the victims. In the 2009–2011 episodes, officers were keener in casual interaction with the victims and in addition, the interaction involved empathic listening of the victims. The 2009–2011 episodes presented some scenes that only included police interaction with the victim in situations where an actual crime had not happened. Instead, the police was called to assist the victims, for example in the case of the resident reporting a snake in his yard (Example 10, 55.) This particular scene included jokes and laughter between the officer and the residents. Moreover, the scene included the officer being truly active in casual conversation with the residents. I argue that the scenes were presented in the series to build up positive images of police-community relations. Since these types of scenes were only shown in the 2009–2011 episodes, I argue that the positive image building is at least partly due to the strategic change towards community policing.

The scenes where officers only interact with victims clearly show the presence of community policing. I argue that the addition of these types of scenes indicate that the *strategic level of community policing* has been applied. In addition, Fielding's (2005, 460–461) third meaning for community policing also relates to these types of scenes. Moreover, I argue that through empathic listening of victims the officers try to build up trust between the officers and the citizens and try to openly communicate with the victims. Both of these also suggest that the strategic level of community policing has been applied.

It seems that there are no direct guidelines that would refer to the importance of the police to protect or serve the community from danger. Even so the direct written evidence can be seen against the idea of community policing. For example the Supreme Court ruling in the *DeShaney vs. Winnebago County Department of Social Services* case (Legal Information Institute, ref. 10.6.2013) it was ruled

that the police have no duty to protect citizens from direct harm but they should do so whenever possible. In addition, Wisler and Onwudiwe (2009, 3) argued that community policing has already reached its peak and the favor of the ideology is actually declining in many countries.

Even though the DeShaney vs. Winnebago County Department of social Services case (Legal information institute) actually weakens the rights of citizens, I find its importance to be for the protection of police officers. However, this protection from being prosecuted does not mean that police departments would disregard the safety of the citizens. In fact, what I observed through the series was that in the 2009–2011 episodes the reflective talk of officers indicated that by solving a case they actually help the citizens and emphasize the preventive perspective of their work. By stopping a criminal, they make the neighborhood safe. In addition, officers in some of the scenes mention that a certain type of crime has induced a number of complaints, and that by stopping one perpetrator, the officers have pleased the community. The 1995–1997 reflective talk of officers indicated that officers were more interested in stopping crime than helping the community.

The emphasis on making the community safe is one way to build up positive community-police relations. It is an indicator of another policing change. By referring to the communities complaints on a certain type of crime, officers indicate that they have used resources to prevent crime that upset the community. The *philosophical level of community policing* includes the idea that members of the community are taken into account when decisions on allocating police resources are made (Fullbright-Anderson 2006, 104–105.) Even though the series does not portray the actual decision making process, the show does present the idea that police organizations have heard the needs of the citizens. In addition, the *strategic level of community policing* (ibid.) can be applied here as well, since I argue that through the portrayal of the series Cops, police organizations want to build up positive images of the police-community relations. However, whether the community has been heard when considering police decision making process cannot be determined by this research material.

In the case of the drug stings, I saw no evidence from the reflective talk of the officers of a procedural change. The only procedural changes of the special operations units are presented in chapter 6, where I analyzed the use of force. In addition, a lot of the scenes both in the 1995–1997 and the 2009–2011 episodes ended up without any reflecting talk of the officers. In most cases the scene ended when the suspect was transported away from the scene. With the support from my

analysis, I conclude that the implementation of community policing can be observed by the portrayal of the television series Cops.

7. Discussion

As an overall conclusion, the reality television series *Cops* does portray a change towards positive images of police-citizen interaction. Moreover, I could connect some the portrayed changes to the dimensions of community policing. However, there were no clear indicators of the philosophical level of community policing (Fullbright-Anderson 2006, 104–105). The decision making process is not portrayed at all in the television series *Cops*. In addition, the television series did not portray any elements of associations such as the Neighborhood watch. Both Fielding (2005) and Fullbright-Anderson (2006) mention, that in community policing one important factor is the development of community associations that help police organizations in deterrence of crime.

One reason for the absence of portrayed community association in the television series *Cops* might be due to the fact that officers do not appreciate the associations. If the show portrays the interest of police organizations, then there would be no reason to implement episodes of community associations. In addition, as Rosenberg et al. (2008. 302) concluded in their study, police officers at least in Edmonton did not see the community associations as important.

The interesting fact is that since the television series *Cops* portrays more positive images of police-community interaction in the 2009–2011 episodes then it should be expected that the series would portray community associations as well. The absence of the portrayed work of the associations raises questions about how officers actually work with the associations. In addition, if the appreciation of these associations is low, then one might expect that officers would not want to work together with these associations. However, at the same time, at least according to the ideology of community policing, police organizations want to emphasize the positive relationships and trust between officers and citizens. I find that there is a demand for studying closely how community policing has been implemented in police departments and in the work of officers or whether community policing is only a media stunt to increase citizen's trust in the police, one which is portrayed in the television series *Cops*.

Validity as a problem

When I presented the idea of my thesis, I got a lot of criticism about the material I used. Since the material is commercial and is edited according corporate interests. The key question arouse: can there be found anything real in the portrayal of a commercial television program. Since the work of officers is guided by federal and local laws and police guidelines, the portrayal of their work should be in accordance with rules even in a commercial reality television program. In addition, with the fact that the program is showed in front of millions of people that live in the United States, the behavior again should be in accordance with the laws. If police organizations are involved in the choosing of episodes, it should be expected that no scenes are shown where an officers would break the law. Despite this possible choosing of episodes, I am only interested in the procedural change that the show portrays. Thus, when I observed increased aggressiveness in the behavior of police officers this should indicate that the guidelines have changed. Otherwise, this aggressiveness might be considered unjustified or even illegal. As a conclusion, I argue that the show actually does portray at least some procedural change through the behavior of police officers.

Another critic pointed out that the officers say what the procedures of the show and the police departments want the officers to say. Some of the critic included that the officers would portray a positive image of the co-operation between citizens and officers. The other was that the show would be portrayed as thrilling. I do agree with these arguments in to some extent. The shows are meant to sell and thus the observed changes in the series might be related to the producer´s wishes. There is a possibility that there has been a decrease in viewers which has caused the producers to change the content of the show and make the television program more appealing. However, since there was a clear difference in how officers expressed themselves and how they talked about citizens, it suggests that also the police organizations wanted an image change. If the statements that officers gave about their job changed from indicating the dangerous aspects of their job to talking about sports and the positive aspects of the city they live in, wouldn´t this portray some strategy change in police organizations? In addition, if community policing did become more important and used in the 21st century in the United States (e.g. Silk 2012), then police organizations would want their officers to give a positive image about the work of the police. Moreover, the “thrill” of the series would actually decline as the officers would not express verbally the dangerous aspects of their job.

In the end, this thesis can be considered as a pilot research of how reality programs could be observed in order to find specific changes that relate to the real world. This thesis gives a small example of whether a reality television show can be truthful. However, I do realize that due to the fact that I was unable to retrieve an older version of the police standard operations guidelines, I lack validity in my findings when connecting portrayed changes to actual procedural changes. The older version of the police standard operations guidelines is only available at local police departments in the United States. I had no resources for applying them.

Additional research

Additional research is needed in order to find out whether reality television presents truthful facts about different occupations. One reason for the importance in this is the fact that reality television could be used in a cheap way in, for example surveillance. In the United States police corruption and police brutality is a highly discussed issue and this is why commercial programs should be utilized (e.g. Police Corruption: An analytical look into police ethics, ref. 31.7.2013).

In order to strengthen my conclusion for this study, an additional research should be conducted in order to observe and compare whether the portrayed actions of police officers in the reality television series Cops is according to formal standard operating procedures. This kind of a research would require professional help from police departments when determining and evaluating whether officers have actually followed standard operating procedures.

On the field of police research, I believe that it is important to study police procedures and changes thereof. There are a lot of strategic changes in police organizations and in many cases it seems that the changes are implemented without proper knowledge of the effects. In order to enhance the work of police officers and police organizations, it is important to study which changes can be considered to be as effective and which changes lead to more problems. One possible way to study what effects do changes in policing have is by closely observing how officers act differently and how citizens react to these differences. Statistics only give a narrow perspective on the effectiveness of policing changes and more qualitative research is needed.

References

- Alpert, Geoffrey P. & Dames, Marvin 2011. Intra-agency and inter-agency cooperation in international police work. *Police Practice & Research* 12:2, 104–106.
- Brown, Ben 2007. Community policing in post-September 11 America: A comment on the concept of community-Oriented counterterrorism. *Police practice and research* 8:3, 239–251.
- Chon Ho Shon, Phillip & Arrigo, Bruce A. 2006. Reality based television and police-citizen encounters: The intertextual construction and situated meaning of mental illness-as-punishment. *Punishment and Society*, 8:1, 59–85.
- Clarke, Curtis 2006. Proactive policing: Standing on the shoulders of community-based policing. *Police practice and research*, 7:1, 3–17.
- Crank, John 2003. Institutional theory of police: a review of the state of the art. *Policing: An international journal of police strategies and management*, 26:2, 186–206.
- Crank, John & Langworthy Robert 1992. Fragmented centralization and the organization of the police. *Policing and society*, 6, 213–229.
- Cronin, James M. & Ederheimer, Joshua A. 2006. Conducted Energy Devices: Development of Standards for Consistency and Guidance. U.S. department of justice office of community oriented policing services and police executive research forum, Washington, D.C.
- Fielding, Nigel G. 2005. Concepts and theory in community policing. *The Howard Journal* 44:5, 460–472.
- Fullbright-Anderson, Karen & Auspos, Patricia 2006. *Community Change: Theories, practice and evidence*. The Aspen Institute, Washington.
- Fourth amendment — Excessive force — Ninth circuit holds female plaintiffs brought valid excessive force claims against police officers who tased them. — *Mattos v. Agarano*, 661 F.3d 433 (9th Cir. 2011) (en banc). *Harvard law review* 2012, 125:1844.
- Gianakis, G. A. & Davis, J. D. III. 1998. Reinventing or repackaging of public services? The case of community-oriented policing. *Public Administration Review*, 58:6, 485-498.

- Katz, Charles 2001. The establishment of a police gang unit: an examination of organizational and environmental factors. *Criminology* 39:1, 37–74.
- Kosovoski, Jason R. & Smith, Douglas C. 2011. Everybody Hurts: Addiction, Drama and the Family in the reality show *Intervention*. *Substance use & misuse* 46, 852–858.
- Liliokanaio, Peaslee 2009. Community policing and social service partnership: lessons from New England. *Police practice and research* 10:2, 115–131.
- Maguire, Edward & Shin Jeunhee & Zhao, Jihong & Hassell, Kimberly 2003. Structural change in large police agencies during the 1990s. *Policing: An international journal of police strategies and management* 26:2, 251–275.
- Morris, Theresa & McInerney, Katherine 2010. Media representation of pregnancy and child birth: An analysis of reality television programs in the United States. *Birth: issues in perinatal care* 37:2, 134–140.
- Pinizzotto, Anthony J. & Davis, Edward F. & Bohrer, Shannon B. & Infanti, Benjamin J. 2012. Law enforcement restraint in the use of deadly force within the context of the ‘deadly mix’. *International journal of police science & management* 14:4, 285–289.
- Prise, Emma 2010. Reinforcing the myth: Constructing Australian identity in ‘reality TV’. *Journal of media and cultural Studies* 24:3, 451–459.
- Prosise, Theodor O. & Johnson, Ann 2004. Law enforcement and crime on Cops and World’s wildest police videos: Anecdotal form and the justification of racial profiling. *Western journal of communication* 68, 72–91.
- Rosenberg, Helen & Sigler, Robert T. & Lewis, Scott 2008. Police officer attitudes toward community policing: a case study of the Racine Wisconsin police department. *Police practice and research*, 9:4, 291–305.
- Skogan, W 2007. *Police and community in Chicago*. Oxford university press, New York.
- Sieberg, Katri. From the Lectures of crime and criminal policy (ref. 20.4.2012)
- Sieberg, Katri 2005. *Criminal Dilemmas: Understanding and preventing crime*. Springer, Berlin.
- Silk, Dan 2012. Community policing to prevent violent extremism. *FBI Law enforcement bulletin* 2012.

Stafford, Sarah L. 2012. Private Policing of Environmental Performance: Does it further public goals? *Boston college environmental affairs law review* 39:1, 73–95.

Staples, Robert 2012. White power, Black crime and racial politics. *Black scholar* 41:4, 31–41.

Stefanone, Michael A. & Lackaff, Derek & Rosen, Devan 2010. The relationship between traditional mass media and “social media”: Reality television as a model for social network site behavior. *Journal of broadcasting and electronic media* Sep/2010, 508–525.

Vejnovic, Dusko & Lalic, Velibor 2005. Community policing in a changing world: A case study of Bosnia and Herzegovina. *Police practice and research*, 6:4, 363–373.

Secondary references:

Mastrofski, S. and Ritti, R. R. 1996. "Police training and the effects of organization of drunk driving enforcement" in Crank, John 2003. *Institutional theory of police: a review of the state of the art. Policing: An international journal of police strategies and management*, 26:2, 186–206.

Electronic references:

Absolute astronomy: Review of Cops (ref. 10.06.2013)
[http://www.absoluteastronomy.com/topics/COPS_\(TV_series\)](http://www.absoluteastronomy.com/topics/COPS_(TV_series))

Community oriented policing services: Community policing defined (09.05.2013)
<http://www.cops.usdoj.gov/Default.asp?Item=>

Community oriented policing services: Use of force (10.06.2013)
<http://www.cops.usdoj.gov/default.asp?Item=1374>

Court case no. 06-40151-JAR United States of America vs. F. Jeffrey Miller, Stephen W. Vanatta, Hallie Irvin, and Sandra Jo Harris (ref. 9.8.2013):
http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/USCOURTS-ksd-5_06-cr-40151/pdf/USCOURTS-ksd-5_06-cr-40151-2.pdf

DeShaney vs. Winnebago County department of social services. Legal information institute, Cronell university law school (ref. 10.6.2013):
http://www.law.cornell.edu/supct/html/historics/USSC_CR_0489_0189_ZS.html

Florida statues 776.06 Deadly force (ref. 01.02.2013):

http://www.leg.state.fl.us/statutes/index.cfm?App_mode=Display_Statute&URL=0700-0799/0776/0776.html

Gallagher, Catherine & Maguire, Edward R. & Mastrofski, Stephen D. & Reisig, Michael D. 2011. The public image of the police. Final report to the International association of chiefs of police by the Administration of justice program. George Mason university. (ref. 05.08.2013):

<http://www.theiacp.org/PoliceServices/ProfessionalAssistance/ThePublicImageofthePolice/tabid/198/Default.aspx>

Geiser-Getz, Glenn C. 1995. COPS and the comic frame: Humor and meaning-making in reality based television. Electronic Journal of Communication/La Revue Electronique de Communication, 5:1. (Referred 2.4.2013 html version)

<http://www.cios.org/EJCPUBLIC/005/1/00514.HTML>

Global Security. M84 stun grenade (ref. 10.6.2013):

<http://www.globalsecurity.org/military/systems/munitions/xm84.htm>

Millan, 4 F.3d at 1044 Crime resource manual 26 (Release and detention pending judicial proceedings 18 U.S.C. §§ 3141 et seq) (ref. 9.8.2013):

http://www.justice.gov/usao/eousa/foia_reading_room/usam/title9/crm00026.htm

Miranda rights (ref. 12.8.2013):

<http://www.mirandarights.org/>

S.W.A.T, Tampa police department (ref. 10.6.2013):

http://www.tampagov.net/dept_Police/ABOUT_US/INVESTIGATIONS_AND_SUPPORT/Special_Support_Division/Specialty_Teams/Tactical_Response_Team/

Tampa standard operating procdures (ref. 10.6.2013):

http://www.tampagov.net/dept_police/Files/publications/TPD_SOP.pdf

Official Cops website (ref. 1.1.2012):

<http://www.cops.com/>

Police corruption: An analytical look into police ethics (ref. 31.7.2013):

http://www.fbi.gov/stats-services/publications/law-enforcement-bulletin/may_2011/law_enforcement_professionalism

Police employment (ref. 10.6.2013):

<http://www.policeemployment.com/resources/articles/women-law-enforcement>

Bureau of justice statistics (5.3.2013):

<http://bjs.gov/index.cfm?ty=tp&tid=5>

Seitamaa-Hakkarainen, Pirita 2000. Kvalitatiivinen sisällönanalyysi (11.6.2013):

http://www.academia.edu/589363/Kvalitatiivinen_sisallon_analyysi

United States department of justice, Task Forces (14.9.2013):

http://www.justice.gov/usao/paw/task_forces.html#vtic

Uniting and strengthening America by providing appropriate tools required to intercept and obstruct terrorism (USA Patriot Act) Act of 2011. Public law 107–56—OCT. 26, 2001. 115 Stat. 272. (ref. 23.2.2013):

<http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/PLAW-107publ56/html/PLAW-107publ56.htm>

University of Turku: Media research (22.6.2013)

<http://www.hum.utu.fi/oppiaineet/mediatutkimus/>

Wikipedia: Cops (4.5.2013)

[http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Cops_\(TV_series\)](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Cops_(TV_series))

Appendix 1: List of chosen Cops episodes for analysis

Season 8	Episodes: 6–8
Season 9	Episodes: 32, 36
Season 22	Episode 19
Season 23	Episodes: 1,3,4
Season 24	Episodes: 1–3, 4–7, 9–10