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Abstract

The terrorist attacks on September 11, 2001, changed law enforcement policy and practice forever. At a glance, one could argue that this was the seminal moment in U.S. law enforcement history where traditional police officer training and equipment quickly transitioned to training and equipment that some argue is more conducive to soldiers on a battlefield. Closer analysis of the changes in police training and equipment reveals that years earlier, the executive branch of the U.S. government initiated the transfer of military equipment to local, state, and federal law enforcement agencies to provide such resources in an effort to stem what has been known as the “war on drugs.” Thereafter, a number of legislative actions both prior to and since 9/11 appear to have contributed to the militarization of police in the United States. Add to these changes the phenomenon of active shooters and mass casualty incidents, and police officers are now facing previously unforeseen responsibilities and threats to their safety. They have responded by facilitating relationships with military and medical professionals to find solutions to ever-shifting challenges.

Much of the literature holds that police armed with nontraditional weapons and training contribute to a sociological and governmental state-controlled force dynamic which favors those in power and threatens minority classes. Broadly speaking, the literature has focused its attention on citizen perceptions of police equipment and training. The purpose of this study was to determine police officer perceptions of the militarization of police and, more broadly, gain their insight into its place in law enforcement operations. A phenomenological qualitative approach using interviews of on-duty police officers representing three different law enforcement agencies was undertaken in an effort to capture differences and similarities in their perceptions of the
militarization phenomenon and their approaches to training and equipment when addressing new and emerging threats.
Chapter 1: Introduction

Background and Contextualization of the Issue

This study intends to address a gap in the literature regarding the militarization of police in the United States. Since the early 1990s, scholars have argued that a growing trend is evident in the use of paramilitary training by civilian police officers (Balko, 2006; Endebak, 2014; Kappeler & Kraska, 1997). The literature suggests that, given that police do not operate in a wartime environment, any use of military-style training is not appropriate in the domestic environment in which they work (Stoughton, 2015; Stuart, 2011).

By implication, any military-influenced force is excessive and coercive in a domestic social order context and so the government is, by proxy, authoritarian (Kienscherf, 2016; Murch, 2015). In today’s complex world, rife with acts of social disorder, where police use of excessive force is often part of the dominant discourse, the growing perception of the potential for an authoritarian police state would undermine public confidence, thereby rendering the public unable to entrust the police to fulfill their roles as public servants (Hutson et al., 2009; Micucci & Gomme, 2005; Skolnick & Fyfe, 1993; Smith & Holmes, 2014; Terrill, 2003; Worden, 2015).

Problem Statement

From a socio-political perspective, history is marred by examples of stratification, race, and power conflicts between the police and the public, which has often fueled concerns of a government that is authoritarian (Arnaud, 2015; Carter, Corra, & Jenks, 2016; Gamal, 2016; Hixson, 2015). For example, Carter, Corra, and Jenks (2016) and Arnaud (2015) contend that the Michael Brown incident in Ferguson, Missouri, was representative of the growing animosity between minorities and police in the United States, with the emergence of a militarized police
state jeopardizing the right of the public to peacefully assemble. Gamal (2016) and Hixson (2013) add to the concern that militarized police are a threat to the American public and argue that patterns of police militarization serve to exacerbate racial stratifications between dominant and minority classes in the U.S.

Much of the literature frames the militarization of police through a critical lens and it appears that very little of it consists of empirically based, qualitative studies where the focus of inquiry is the perceptions of police officers (Kappeler & Kraska, 1997). For example, apart from Kappeler and Kraska’s (1997) study, which is cited across the literature, research using either direct observation or experimental methods appears to be very limited when police officers are the unit of analysis, and investigation of police paramilitary teams in areas of law enforcement training or operations is the focus (Jiao & Rhea, 2007; Mihal, 2015; Moule Jr., Fox, & Parry, 2018; Pereira, 2015; Perry, Jonathan-Zamir, & Weisburd, 2017).

Across quantitative studies investigating the militarization of police, scholars have approached this subject by studying methods of military equipment acquisition and legislative influences enabling the militarization trend to continue, and by examining theoretical associations among militarization of police, use of force, and race (Ajilore, 2015; Baumgart, 2016; Carriere, 2016; Gamal, 2016; Hanley, 2015). Contessa’s (2016) study using quantitative content analysis approached the interview of police officers using research questions framed around demilitarization contexts, as opposed to police perceptions of the militarization of police (Hall & Coyne, 2013).

As armed criminals continue to evolve in their tactics and choice of weapons, law enforcement culture has reacted to this changing threat landscape with additional military-
influenced training and equipment for self-defense, despite critical scholarly review of such actions (Dansky, 2016; Keinscherf, 2016). Some studies examining the evolving role of police in society suggest that the aftermath of the terrorist attacks on 9/11 has changed the policing paradigm in the U.S. and note that a new hybrid of security threats exists for the police, which led the Federal Bureau of Investigation to restructure and the Department of Justice to emphasize that terrorism prevention includes addressing domestic, home-grown threats as well as international threats (Bayley & Weisburd, 2009; Bowling & Newburn, 2006; Brown, 2010; Campbell & Campbell, 2010; Waxman, 2009).

**Purpose Statement**

The intent of this study is to identify the perceptions of the militarization of police among law enforcement officers and the phenomenon’s integration into police operations. Given the limited number of empirically based studies involving police officer perspectives, this study uses semi-structured interviews of police officers to learn how they perceive the phenomenon and its influence upon their public safety operations.

**Research Questions**

1. What are police officers’ perceptions of the militarization of police?
2. What do a sample of police officers perceive as the effect(s) of militarization within law enforcement operations?

**Overview of Theoretical Framework and Methodology**

This study begins with briefly framing previous training pedagogies and the theoretical principles that have, over the years, supported policing curriculum in the United States. Historically, law enforcement has evolved in its use of a number of approaches to training police
officers, including problem-based, community-oriented, and adult-oriented learning in addressing core competencies desired in law enforcement curriculum (Chappell, 2008; Jordan, 2014; Killacky, 1991; King Stargel, 2010; Queen, 2016; Werth, 2009). The theoretical framework aligned to this study is then discussed with focus given to a synthesis of Bronfenbrenner’s (1979) principles of human development and Kotter’s (1997) change management model, which this study draws heavily upon.

Using a qualitative research approach to address an apparent gap in the policing literature, this study uses semi-structured interviews within a phenomenological framework supported by particular methods to collect and analyze data and mitigate researcher bias when investigating the perceptions of participating police officers.

Significance of the Research

Garland (2001) notes in his treatise on government control that “today, there is a new and urgent emphasis upon the need for security, the containment of danger, the identification and management of any kind of risk” (p. 12). The power of prose that takes a critical view of government also fuels an argument that, absent empirical study, fails to ask whether or not there are other motivations driving this trend of members of the military and police officers training together.

Concerns over public safety and the protection of individual civil liberties manifest when the appearance of state-controlled force increases through the presence of police officers possessing military training and equipment (Alimahomed-Wilson & Williams, 2016; Cooper, 2015; Kienscherf, 2016; Meeks, 2006; Mythen & Walklate, 2008). Any ambiguity as to whom the aggressor would be or what would constitute a reasonable threat when encountering training
involving techniques or equipment found on the battlefield appears to be part of what fuels the concern that any training nexus between the police and military may be problematic.

This study broadens the scope of inquiry into areas where academic access is limited: interviewing police officers within their natural setting. When law enforcement officers are engaged, questions are asked and answered and their voices become part of the police militarization discourse. These previously unheard voices offer new insight into the literature which currently lacks deeper, contextualized insights of the militarization phenomenon from police officer perspectives. If one of the goals for academic research is to influence policy and practice, it is vital that police officers are heard and their insights are shared regarding the militarization of police (Cherney, Povey, Head, Boreham, & Ferguson, 2012; Elmore, 1979; Mack, 2002; Masten, Powell, & Luthar, 2003; Pettigrew, 1990).

Kappeler and Kraska’s (1997) seminal work on the militarization of police is rooted in conflict theory as promulgated by Marx where the police, acting as agents of the government, use coercive force as necessary to compel others to take action (Coser, 1967; Poulantzas & O’Hagan, 1978; Snyder, 2013). From this view, Kappeler and Kraska (1997) argue that, in the context of using force and equipment more associated with the military, the union of military and police practices in response to social problems is associated with government repression. Much of the police literature aligns itself to this proposition and critical scholarship has expanded the conflict theoretical lens to include examples of race and police brutality, supporting a narrative that is explicit in suggesting that militarizing police will place minority populations at risk (Gamal, 2016; Hayes, 2015; Hesford, 2015).
Delimitations of the Study

The population of interest in this study is confined to currently serving sworn police officers certified by recognized governing bodies pursuant to laws authorizing police officers to perform law enforcement duties (Criminal Justice Standards, 2018; FDLE, 2018). This study did not interview retired police officers and instead narrowed its scope to participants currently authorized to train and interact with military veterans in compliance with their respective agency training and operational protocols.

Limitations of the Study

Access to interview on-duty police officers was limited by time constraints due to the work responsibilities of the participant population. Operating under a cooperative arrangement with the law enforcement agencies representing the police officers contributing to this study, the researcher adjusted to minor interruptions caused by law enforcement-related circumstances outside the study. The interviews placed each on-duty participant in a position where, despite their interest in volunteering for this study, public safety emergencies occurring during the interview required them to react, assess the level of priority the situation would merit, then respond as necessary to fulfill their work obligations.

Occasionally, as interviews took place, interruptions (which were expected) occurred by way of phone calls, emails, and text messages from police officers and headquarters to a few of the participants. As a result, interviews were momentarily interrupted and resumed after each participant was able to respond to the inquiry and return to answering interview questions. Only one of the participants left the office area used to conduct the interview and stepped just outside the interview room, leaving the door open for long enough to speak to police officers under his
command about a developing public safety issue. When interruptions occurred, the researcher took a few moments to repeat the question or line of thought in an effort to assist the participant in returning to his/her earlier reflection and thoughts.

**Organization of the Study**

This study is segmented into the following sections: Chapter 1 introduces the background of the issue, problem statement, research questions and highlights the theoretical framework and methods of the study. Chapter 2 provides a review of the police militarization literature which also includes human development, change management, the current professional literature on the subject, organizational culture, and leadership as viewed in the context of this study. Chapter 3 includes the procedures and methodological approach used and highlights a number of techniques used to ensure rigor. Chapter 4 provides analysis of the data which includes the emerging primary themes, domain analysis, and taxonomic review of the data. Chapter 5 concludes this study with conclusions, implications, and suggestions for future research.

**Chapter Summary**

The academic literature highlights case histories revealing significant perceptual concerns over the use of what appears to be militarized equipment and training in use by police during law enforcement operations. Critical scholarship has confined much of the scope of inquiry to public perceptions of the issue. Given the gap in police officer perceptions, theoretical frameworks founded in social psychology provide the structure to research questions which examine police perceptions of the phenomenon. From a phenomenological perspective, a qualitative approach using semi-structured interviews is discussed.
Chapter 2: Review of Literature

The following review of literature begins with a brief history of police training pedagogies and related empirical studies that investigate learning outcomes within the police training setting. The section which follows includes a review of the literature aligned to this study which investigates the nexus between the police and military through multiple prisms: human development ecology, change management, police professional literature, organizational culture, leadership, militarization of police, and public policy. It is not all-inclusive, but represents a select view of the convergence of literature as applied to the training of police officers during a period of rapid expansion of police militarization.

Theoretical Framework Underlying the Research

Much of the pedagogical framework underlying law enforcement training curriculum in the U.S. has included adult and problem-based learning (Bruner, 1966; Knowles, 2012). The theoretical orientations in adult learning are founded in the psychological and educational writings of William James (1890) and James Dewey (1938), where pragmatist views of problem solving, interaction, and adaptation to the environment are fundamental principles. Law enforcement’s approach to problem-based learning has, for a number of years, employed Bruner’s (1966) constructivist principles of applying problem-solving techniques to conflicts within a social context.

Empirical Studies

Studies have found mixed results as far as achieving positive learning outcomes in the use of student-centered learning and the principles of adult learning (Berkson, 1993; Colliver, 2000). Concerns exist over whether police instructors’ unfamiliarity with adult learning
principles and student expectations, which engenders loss of classroom control when the focus of learning is student-centered, is at odds with traditional police academy training pedagogies where the focus has traditionally been instructor-centered (Frank, 2017; Killacky, 1991; Lettic, 2015; McCay, 2011; Vander Kooi, 2006; Werth, 2009). Other evidence suggests improvement in entry-level police cadets’ perception of instructor-student relationships using student-centered learning pedagogies (Ericsson & Charness, 1994; Frank, 2017; Jordan, 2014; Killacky, 1991; Werth, 2009). Studies investigating student perceptions of the effectiveness of problem-based learning in law enforcement training have shown benefits in applying cognitive-based instruction to problem solving activities commonly found in firearms and defensive tactics training (Birzir, 2003; Herndon, 2016; King Stargel, 2010; Lettic, 2015; McCombs, 2015; Queen, 2016).

The theoretical framework aligned to this study is founded in Bronfenbrenner’s (1979) ecological notion of human development and Lewin’s (1947) field theory; both are grounded in the field of social psychology. Lewin’s (1947) theoretical views are presented within the framework of Kotter’s (1996) eight-step change model. Both are introduced next in a discussion involving human development and change management.

**Human Development Ecology**

Urie Bronfenbrenner (1977) defines his conceptualization of the ecology of human development as “the scientific study of the progressive, mutual accommodation between an active, growing human being and the changing properties of the immediate settings in which the developing person lives, as this process is affected by relations between these settings, and by the larger contexts in which the settings are embedded” (p. 21). In his distinction between actor and environment, Bronfenbrenner is clear in his contention that both humans and environment are
dynamic and change as a result of reciprocal interaction between the two. Bronfenbrenner (1977) contends that a microsystem is nested within the environment and is subject to the influences of external structures beyond the microsystem setting. The term *nested* contextually in this study refers to an inner setting, which is explained in greater detail below, where significant face-to-face relationships exist which are surrounded by a larger system that includes the interactive relationships of others (such as an employer’s trainers, for example) which interconnect within the microsystem during the life course (Leonard, 2011).

Bronfenbrenner’s (1979) conceptualization of human social systems describes settings where people act in particular ways and, given their role in the system, perform activities related to those roles. These roles, relationships, and activities among actors are part of what Bronfenbrenner (1979) coins a *microsystem*, which is defined as “a pattern of activities, roles, and interpersonal relations experienced by the developing person in a given setting with physical and material characteristics” (p. 58).

A microsystem, as Bronfenbrenner contends, is a physical place where patterns are established, transactions occur, and relationships are developed between actors. Bronfenbrenner (1979) asserts that each person possesses a unique ecosystem and, in adaptation to factors affecting one’s ecosystem or the ecosystem of another, roles emerge and interact even as ecosystems overlap and intersect. In describing microsystems, Bronfenbrenner (1979) argues that the setting, roles, relationships, and activities and their temporal patterns must be specifically identified. It is within the framework of this microsystem that this inquiry will investigate the roles, relationships, and interaction in the context of militarized training and organizational activities between police officers and military veterans within their natural work setting.
Shelton (2018) explains Bronfenbrenner’s notion of the development process, which is said to be where personal growth is obtained through distinguishing ideas and analyzing concepts present in the environment. Over time, one engages in activities of increasing complexity. It is posited that within the ecosystem where the microsystem is nested is a place where teaching and learning activities – such as those involved in mutual shared interests in firearms and tactics – take shape between police officers and military veterans. These shared interests are driven by mutual trust and common professional and social interests. It is here that new skill acquisition may take place, which is perceived as beneficial and reciprocal to both actors and may play a role in the changing of law enforcement culture over time.

Bronfenbrenner’s (1979) reciprocal view of an activity is expressed as two actors performing complementary activities and, when performed together, the actions contribute favorably toward motivation and, ultimately, learning. For Bronfenbrenner (1979), the role of experience within the phenomenological setting is emphasized because of its influence upon growth and the meaning that one gives to situational contexts. Within the training setting, it is hypothesized that the influences of experience in both training and work operations may play a role during collaboration between police officers and military veterans as each contributes to their shared learning environment. It is postulated that the reciprocal interaction between actor(s) and their environment may play a central role in both learning and problem solving during dynamic life-threatening situations which frame a significant part of law enforcement operations (Crank, 2014; Paoline III, Myers, & Worden, 2000).

In his emphasis on the importance of meaning, Bronfenbrenner uses Thomas and Thomas’ (1928) conceptualization of what they refer to as the definition of the situation,
asserting that “if men define situations as real, they are real in their consequences” (p. 572) to emphasize the nature of action as a result of the interpretation of a situation. Beyond training, the meaning which is given to situations that put the safety of police officers in jeopardy is given high priority in police culture and is often used to drive the training and operational narrative within police professional literature (Dror, 2007; Nolan, 2017; Pagnucco, 2017; Peterson, 2017; Staller & Zaiser, 2015; Strong, Benoit, & Calhoun, 2017).

**Empirical Studies**

It appears that a gap exists in the literature with respect to Bronfenbrenner’s (1979) notion of human development and whether a nexus between militarization and police training exists. A review of the literature does not appear to reveal empirical studies examining Bronfenbrenner’s (1979) ecological model in the context of police militarization involving police officers who are military veterans interacting with police officers who have not served in the military. Studies consistent with critical narratives brought forward in the militarization literature do exist – such as the use of force by police and perceived legitimacy for the expansion of power – and have followed Bronfenbrenner’s (1979) thoughts on human development. Within this literature, scholars have examined human ecology in the context of police involvement in the shootings of unarmed minority males as well as the interaction between individual and terrorist group behaviors (Boyd, 2014; Pratt-Harris et al., 2016).

Given the legislative mandates placed upon local, state, and federal law enforcement as a result of the terrorist attacks of 9/11, law enforcement in the United States experienced significant unplanned changes to its core public safety mission (Bloss, 2007; Dubal, 2012; Etter Sr., 2015; Marks & Sun, 2007; Waxman, 2009). The traditional roles of criminal apprehension,
service, and crime prevention were altered as a result of presidential directives found in the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (Andreas & Price, 2001; Whitehead & Aden, 2001).

Kotter’s (1996) work in organizational change provides a framework for understanding the change process when considered in context with the militarization of police literature and the temporal progression of public policy that has enabled its growth. It offers some insight into the influences that have contributed to the emergence of militarizing the police.

**Change Management Theory**

Kotter’s (1996) book *Leading Change* outlines an eight-stage change process for implementing transformational organizational change. For the purposes of this research study, the following stages are enumerated: 1) establishing a sense of urgency; 2) creating a guiding coalition; 3) developing a vision and strategy; 4) communicating the change vision; 5) empowering broad-based action; 6) generating short-term wins; 7) consolidating gains and producing more change; and 8) anchoring new approaches in the culture.

Embedded within Kotter’s (1996) discussion of empowering others to act is the notion that structural barriers must be removed to effect lasting change. Concerning well-executed training, Kotter (1996) contends that, in order for a workforce to improve skills and alter behaviors, it is necessary to confront the challenges organizations face in a rapidly changing world. Kotter’s (1996) model is anchored in the social psychology work of Lewin (1947), who asserted that human behaviors and environmental conditions that Lewin (1947) dubbed *field conditions* formed an ever-changing equilibrium with one another, and to understand how and why behavior changes requires understanding how the environment continually adapts to forces affecting it. Lewin’s (1947) position placed a greater emphasis on arguing that the environment
modifies group behavior because, until the complexities of group norms and culture are altered, he contends that individual behaviors will not change. Kotter’s (1996) focus moves from analyzing group behavior to individual change as a result of environmental conditions (Sarayreh, Khudair, & Barakat, 2013).

This study will use interviews to discuss, in part, lived experiences where, contextually, the interaction of two or more actors is prompted by environmental influences as law enforcement officers adapt to field conditions – specifically those involving threats to personal safety. Both Lewin (1947) and Kotter (1996) contend that this interaction is the result of evaluating environmental stimuli, and specialized skills acquired through training are used to solve unique problems.

**Empirical Studies**

Despite the enormous popularity of Kotter’s (1996) change model, there appear to be no empirical studies examining the entire eight-step change management process and simultaneously building criticism of Kotter’s model (Appelbaum, Habashy, Malo, & Shafiq, 2012; Todnem By, 2005). Some have tested a portion of Kotter’s eight-step model and criticized its ambiguity concerning how change is to be accomplished. Studies take issue with the absence of clarity surrounding handling unique obstacles in organizational cultures such as political influences that would, in time, blunt many of his principles from taking effect (Gorran Farkas, 2013; Pfeifer, Schmitt, & Voight, 2005). Pollack and Pollack (2015), however, contend that Kotter’s model is effective, but should be modified to adapt to the unique needs of a given organization.
Figure 1 provides Bronfenbrenner’s human development principles as used in this study and Kotter’s eight-step change management model in its entirety. Each of Bronfenbrenner’s (1979) principles under inquiry in this study are aligned to all eight principles within Kotter’s (1996) change management model. The model should be viewed as interconnected linearly with actor, experience, reciprocity, and environment prompting response from the corresponding principles of change management.
Figure 1 Human Development – Change Management Principles

![Diagram showing the relationship between Bronfenbrenner Human Development Principles and Kotter Eight-Step Change Management Principles.]

Figure 1. Adapted from Urie Bronfenbrenner's The Ecology of Human Development. Experiments by nature and design, 1979. John P. Kotter’s Leading Change, 1996. Experience notes of face-to-face setting with physical and material features. Actor experience notes the scientifically relevant features within the environment as perceived by an actor in the environment. Reciprocity refers to a mutually accommodating interaction between actors within the environment.
Police Professional Literature

In contrast to critical scholarly literature condemning the police and military training together, S. Warner (personal communication, August 24, 2019) reported that professional trade literature within policing organizational culture has argued the need for integrating military and police expertise using evidence of escalating threats to law enforcement officers as the motivation to take action (Alexander, 2010). In circumstances where police officers responded to the terrorist attacks in Mumbai, New York, Paris, and San Bernardino, F. Butler, R. Carmona, K. Gerold, and D. Rathburn (personal communication, August 24, 2019) describe an imminent need for expanding knowledge in tactics and consideration of medical casualty protocols found in theaters of war (Braziel, Straub, Watson, & Hoops, 2016).

Military and medical experts have argued that inadequacies exist in the underdeveloped civilian advanced life support capacity to handle traumatic soft tissue injuries when considering the value of implementing combat casualty care training and protocols in handling traumatic soft tissue injuries involving civilian operations. The results of lessons learned in trauma care during military operations and its relevance to treating injuries occurring as a result of law enforcement operations has medical experts arguing the need for training to mitigate the gap in police officer acute trauma care in the field (Butler Jr., Holcomb, Giebner, McSwain, & Bagian, 2007; Cain, 2008; Carhart, 2012; Landry, Aberle, Dennis, & Sztajnkrycer, 2015; McDevitt, 2001).

Addressing the reality that offenders pose greater threats to police when armed with higher-powered rifles using ammunition capable of producing much greater soft tissue injuries than conventional handguns, K. Gerold, S. Rush, and M. Sztajnkrycer (personal communication, August 26, 2019) reported that certain drug protocols and extremity tourniquets designed to
reduce severe hemorrhaging encountered in the treatment of traumatic soft tissue wounds in permissive environments may be useful tools in emergency medical care involving law enforcement incidents and are supported by clinical evidence of their effectiveness (Cain, 2008).

Policing is broadly recognized as dangerous and consideration is given to the degree that the number of police officers killed or assaulted in the line of duty plays a role as motivation behind calls to augment training and equipment to address new and emerging threats. Analysis of the Federal Bureau of Investigation’s Law Enforcement Officers Feloniously Killed report is revealing.

From 2001–2010, a trend appears to exist where offenders armed with rifles were involved in criminal incidents that resulted in police officers either getting assaulted or killed, as seen in Table 1 (FBI, 2018). During this period, the United States averaged 54 officers killed in the line of duty annually (FBI, 2018).
Table 1
Law Enforcement Officers Killed Annually in the United States 2001–2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of victim officers</td>
<td>541</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total firearms</td>
<td>498</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handgun</td>
<td>362</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rifle</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shotgun</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of firearm not reported</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knife or other cutting instrument</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bomb</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blunt instrument</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal weapons</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Adapted from the Federal Bureau of Investigation, Department of Justice. Law Enforcement Officers Feloniously Killed, Type of Weapon report. 2018. Retrieved from https://ucr.fbi.gov/leoka/2017

A trend is also evident in the increasing number of active shooter (mass shooting) incidents across the United States; of note, 160 occurred in 40 states from 2000–2017, as shown in Figure 2 (FBI, 2017). The use of rifles was noted in approximately 29% of the incidents (FBI, 2017). Rifles as suspect weapons present additional concerns for responding police due to their larger-caliber rounds which generate greater velocity, resulting in more serious soft tissue damage to the human body and, given their design configurations, are more accurate than handguns (Fackler et al., 1989).
A call to action appeared to emerge organically from within both the military and police cultures to recognize commonalities shared in tactics, techniques, and procedures and to consider strategies such as those described in Kotter’s (1996) vision of leading organizational change, according to K. Duggan and J. Alexander, (personal communication, August 28, 2019). Police professional trade literature called for enhanced training, which noted that sustained change would be difficult if organizational cultures could not withstand threats of complacency, lack of
vision in communication, and failure to root changes firmly in place, according to J. Gnagey and
J. Witty (personal communication, August 28, 2019).

According to J. Alwes, A. Cantele, J. Osborn, J. Witty, and J. Krimmel (personal
communication, August 28, 2019), the police professional literature reacted to *active shooter*
*events* and associated mass casualties with calls to strategically examine the mental processing of
offenders, utilize scenario-based training, and consider asymmetric tactics, self-aid, and new and
expanding roles and responsibilities at mass casualty scenes. An active shooter event is defined
as “one or more individuals actively engaged in killing or attempting to kill people in a populated
area” (p. 1, FBI, 2018).

Following suit, police executive leadership represented by national-level organizations
disseminated recommended active shooter policy and practice standards to their members in law
enforcement (IACP, 2018; Zakhary, 2013). As the police culture adjusted to emerging new
public safety threats, scholars similarly have noted the need for changing the status quo and
innovation in managing leadership and strategic thinking during periods of rapid social change
(Berkes, 2009; Boin & McConnell, 2007; Graetz, 2000; Senior & Fleming, 2006).

Studies in police and military organizational culture have critiqued the commonalities
and differences between police and military use of force and missions, and findings are mixed
regarding the paradox that exists between the application of military training and equipment and
policing (Beede, 2008; Benson, 2000; Contessa, 2016; Crank, 2014; Den Boer, Janssens, Vander
Beken, Easton, & Moelker, 2010; Easton & Moelker, 2010; Kappeler & Schafer, 2018; Paoline,
2003). For example, Den Boer, Janssens, Vander Beken, Easton, and Moelker (2010) contend
that the lines are blurred when border protection practices are considered, and integrating
military and police resources complicates already fragile social control policies. Meanwhile, Beede (2008) notes that enhancing police capabilities may be too high a price to pay to meet security challenges. Next is a discussion of organizational culture to offer perspective as to why the police culture is by its nature so amenable to the influences of the U.S. military.

Organizational Culture

Schein’s (1988) view of culture describes a pattern of assumptions which constitute daily activities conducted by a group, considered valid over the course of time, and taught to proceeding members entering the group as a method of negotiating problems. He contends that culture can be viewed on three levels: artifacts, values, and underlying assumptions. Artifacts, as Schein (1988) notes, are those portions of culture that are apparent to the eye – an organization’s physical environment (which includes the architectural design of buildings), the protocols that meetings follow, and the unique language used by the organization’s members.

For example, law enforcement agency environments are commonly adorned with framed mission statements and police badges on full display, and are replete with informational placards noting institutional protocols and historical contexts in open areas for analysis. The espoused values of an organization can be seen in how the agency implements strategic goals and organizational strategies for problem solving. In the context of the interaction between individual and group, Schein (1988) contends that the genesis of behavior-driven values stems from group learning which, over time, becomes shared, socially validated, and assimilated into organizational culture. To that end and in the context of this study, data derived from interviews may illuminate behaviorally driven values of the participant officers and their perceptions of a nexus between training and safety practices.
Underlying assumptions, as Schein (1992) contends, are the means for achieving goals. The metrics for how success is to be measured may not be questioned enough by the members of an organization to the extent that, over time, information loses its value, and how employees feel about things of importance to them is rarely discussed.

The national security literature recognizes the links between military and police organizational culture and offers the following examples: the credibility given to the wearing of official uniforms, the taking of oaths to serve others, the swearing of allegiance to agency and community, and the challenges personnel in both fields face with threats to their safety as a fundamental part of their work (Chapin, Brannen, Singer, & Walker, 2008; Crank, 2014; Myers, Schafer, & Levin, 2010; Parker, 2013; Thompson, 2013; Woody, 2005).

One focus of this study is the individual’s perception of what has been learned in the context of addressing threats to officer safety and its influence upon the self and the organization. These principles can be drawn from Argyris’ (1991) notion of culture and learning, which is noted across the public administration scholarship. Argyris (1991) contends that some aspects of organizational culture, which for the purposes of this study are viewed from the perceptual lens of the individual, may influence how and what is learned. Knowledge which is interpreted and socially constructed between multiple actors may lead to organizational change (Argyris & Schon, 1978; Daft & Huber, 1986; Walsh & Ungson, 1991). Using Bronfenbrenner’s (1979) microsystem view of human development and Kotter’s (1996) change management approaches, this study investigates each police officer participant’s perception of militarization and the influences of corresponding training and equipment across a number of police organizations.
Empirical Studies

Evidence across the qualitative and quantitative literature suggests that organizational culture directly influences employee attitudes and performance (Abdul Rashid, Sambasivan, & Abdul Rahman, 2004; Gregory, Harris, Armenakis, & Shook, 2009; Hunt, 1997; Meyer, Stanley, Herscovitch, & Topolnytsky, 2002; Schein, 1992). Studies have empirically tested Schein’s (1992) three-layer model of artifacts, values, and basic assumptions within the framework of service firm performance and found support for the interrelationships between these characteristics and beliefs and their effects upon organizational performance (Hogan & Coote, 2014; Marcoulides & Heck, 1993).

Studies have found that influences of military culture such as organizational discipline, individual and group behavior, and shared mission interests in public safety – including the strategy to recruit military veterans – has had a positive effect on the perceptions of police officers and their institutional culture (Anthony, 2018; Bushong, 2017; Dinsmore, 2018; Dukes, 1999; Hunt, 1997; Payan Alvarado, 2001). A deeper exploration in organizational learning and culture is beyond the scope of this study. Leadership is discussed next as it is posited that, whether or not change occurs as a result of training, the interaction between police officer and military veteran requires leadership on the part of either actor to initiate change and produce the desired outcome.

Leadership

Within the literature are numerous definitions for the term leadership. MacFarlane, Senn, and Childress (1993) contend that the following themes are essential in defining leadership:
(1) Leadership is no longer the exclusive domain of the top boss; (2) leadership facilitates excellence in others; (3) leadership is not the same as management; (4) leadership has a sensitive, humanistic dimension; (5) leaders need to take a holistic approach, applying a variety of qualities, skills, and capabilities; (6) leadership is the mastery of anticipating, initiating, and implementing change. (as cited in Bass, 2008, p. 15)

The literature is replete with studies analyzing leadership in the context of police operations and whether any particular leadership style is better suited to the law enforcement culture (Deluga & Souza, 1991; Densten, 1999; Morreale, 2002; Russell, 2014; Sarver & Miller, 2014; Tseng & Kang, 2009).

Criticisms

Recently, critical scholarship examining varying approaches to leadership and the growing trend of mass casualty incidents in the U.S. involving the use of force has expanded the lens to include practitioner views from both public medicine and law enforcement (Jacobs et al., 2013; Wexler, 2015). Emerging from this narrative is a discussion suggesting that public safety agencies respond to new and developing threats that may expand law enforcement’s traditional role in public safety. The following considers the scholarship which has investigated one leadership style – transformational leadership – and its application to law enforcement practice.

Transformational Leadership

*Transformational leadership* involves a number of actors in an organization and, as an attribute, is not exclusive to the executive possessing the highest level of influence in an organization (Burns, 1978). James Burns (1978) describes the transformational leader as one who:
1) Raises the followers’ level of consciousness about the importance and value of designated outcomes and ways of reaching them; 2) gets the followers to transcend their own self-interest for the sake of the team, organization, or larger polity; and 3) raises followers’ level of need on Maslow’s (1954) hierarchy from lower-level concerns for safety and security to higher-level needs for achievement and self-actualization.

Transforming leadership elevates the followers’ level of maturity, ideals, concern for the well-being of others, the organization, and society. (p. 619)

Bernard Bass (1985) expanded Burns’ (1978) work with his seminal contribution to the study of transformational leadership as the first to empirically test the theoretical frameworks of transformational and transactional leadership using surveys of military members. In their responses, he found that charisma, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration existed as three correlating factors in transformational leadership.

During the latter part of the 1980s, research efforts expanded in transformational leadership within organizational management as a result of the demand for change during a strained economic period (Jung, Chow, & Wu, 2003; Yukl, 1989). Researchers studying transformational leadership have developed a rich body of scholarship examining its effects upon law enforcement organizations (Andreescu & Vito, 2010; Cockcroft, 2014; Densten, 1999; Dobby, Anscombe, & Tuffin, 2004; Girodo, 1998; Johnson & Cox III, 2004; Morreale, 2002; Murphy & Drudge, 2004; Russell, 2014; Vito, Higgins, & Denney, 2014).

**Empirical Studies**

Self-report studies have investigated the perceptions and job satisfaction of police officers and the relationships between various leadership styles as demonstrated by supervisors,
managers, and law enforcement. Empirical studies have found positive relationships between organizational effectiveness and transformational leadership in the performance of law enforcement executives (Alarcon, 2005; Kiehl, 2013; Jervis, 2014).

Moreover, the positive effect of transformational leaders upon indirect followers has been found in other empirical investigations, which supports the theory’s foundational principles (Dvir, Eden, Avolio, & Shamir, 2002). To illustrate its broader scope of influence, empirical studies have found positive effects on increasing employee performance using an integrated transactional and transformational approach by law enforcement executives (Densten, 1999). A review of the relevant police militarization literature follows next.

**Militarization of Police**

A growing body of critical research examines the militarization of law enforcement officers in the United States (Balko, 2006; Beede, 2008; Bolgiano, 2001; Borelli, 2002; Brown, 2010; Dansky, 2016; Endebak, 2014; Gamal, 2016; Hall & Coyne, 2013; Hayes, 2015; Hill & Berger, 2009; Kopel & Blackman, 1996; Kraska & Kappeler, 1997; Meads, 2015; Paul & Birzir, 2008; Rivera, 2015; Rizer, 2015; Schlichter, 1992; Stoughton, 2014; Vagle, 2016). Studies have found that the trend in police militarization emerged from a 1970s–‘80s emphasis on the war on drugs in the U.S. It has recently found itself part of the conversation in the politics of government growth and influence as federal funding incentivizes state and local law enforcement operations (Cooper, 2015; Hall & Coyne, 2013; Paul & Birzir, 2008).

Critical studies have categorized the influence of militarization as an enforcement tool used by the police in the so-called war on drugs as simply another means by which the state can repress the American public (Bolduc, 2016; Keinscherf, 2016; Murch, 2015; Tiffe, 2015). A
number of other studies that conclude that race is a factor in the use of excessive force by police against African-American males also contend that militarization has exacerbated the problem (Hesford, 2015; Ifill, 2015; Kochel, 2014; Kopel & Blackman, 1996; Marcus, 2016; Meads, 2015; Murch, 2015; Shane, 2018).

The locus of arguments appears to be critical, non-empirically based socio-political legal arguments which claim that the militarization of police fuels race, class, and power inequities in the U.S. and continues to drive the police militarization narrative today (Deflem & Sutphin, 2009; Eick, 2015; Meeks, 2006; Moore et al., 2016; Paul & Birzir, 2008). Thus, this literature can be analyzed more closely and focused into two narrow lines of inquiry: 1) paramilitary activities; and 2) normalization of military training into law enforcement operations. These two core research areas will be discussed; the concept of paramilitary activities is examined first.

**Paramilitary Activities**

From a definitional perspective, the literature in this study draws heavily from the seminal work of Kappeler and Kraska (1997) and their conceptualization of *police and military units*, which they define as:

1) The unit must be state sanctioned, operating under legitimate state authority… 2) they must be trained and operate as a military special teams unit, such as the Navy SEALs, with a strict command structure and discipline (or the pretense thereof); and 3) they must have at the core and forefront of their function to threaten or use force collectively, instantaneously and not necessarily as an option of last resort… Two contributing factors – military appearance and military weaponry – are critical to distinguishing paramilitary policing from standard policing, but they are not always necessary. (p. 4)
In Beede’s (2008) socio-political review of the term *paramilitary*, he departed from Kappeler and Kraska’s (1997) definition using the terms partially paramilitary and quasi-military to support his contention that a convergence of operating practice involving both police and military training was occurring internationally during this period and was not solely a U.S. phenomenon. Beede’s (2008) position recognized that the development of police paramilitary-trained teams may have been a response to changing social conditions. Andrade (1985) also noted that police may be responding to new and emerging threats when he pointed out an increased use in firearms by offenders and expressed the following: “Even the lawbreakers retain some respect for authority, and partly because courts were less lenient if weapons were used against police officers” (p. 1).

Since his initial qualitative study in 1997, Kraska (2007) appears to be the most referred-to scholar in contemporary literature regarding the militarization of police phenomenon; his work is cited across the field of militarization of police research and this study draws heavily upon his interview findings with police officers. Given the time in which he and Kappeler conducted their original analysis, the phrase *militarization of police* was not employed as a part of normal discourse in the context of police operations; it is unclear in the literature when the phrase took hold. It appears that the earliest citation in the literature that references the phenomenon of militarization was Klare (1978) when he contended, “a nation’s military apparatus assumes ever increasing control over the lives and behavior of citizens… and through military goals and values dominates the national culture at the expense of civilian institutions” (p. 1).

Kappeler and Kraska (1997) confined their conceptualization of police and military units to special weapons and tactics (SWAT) teams and approached their inquiry not from a
perception of militarized police standpoint, but by asking police officers why the use of these teams appeared to be dramatically increasing from 1982–1984. Kappeler and Kraska (1997) discovered that the use of police paramilitary teams had increased by 538% nationally by tracking their responses to police calls for service.

**Normalization of Military Training In Law Enforcement Operations**

Kappeler and Kraska’s (1997) findings were evocative as some police commanders admitted to using SWAT teams for the purposes of testing the utility and eventual integration of military equipment into broader law enforcement practice. For example, police commanders conceptually viewed police paramilitary units (SWAT teams) as a tool for enhancing their ability to perform tactical operations such as executing high-risk search warrants, gang investigations, and duties where small, trained teams were deemed to be more effective than using personnel with no military training. The study uncovered some interesting revelations from police officers who were involved in the execution of search warrants by SWAT teams. Senior and command-level personnel admitted to overreach in their use of force involving drug search warrants where an equal emphasis was placed not only on the recovery of drugs, but the seizure of guns and money (Kappeler & Kraska, 1997). The study suggested that it cannot be assumed that a law enforcement officer’s intent solely focuses on developing a criminal investigation, but should be questioned as “a proactive tool through which the police gather evidence and crudely conduct an investigation into suspected illegal activity” (p. 9).

**Synthesis of Police Militarization Studies**

Much of the trend in empirical work has involved the metric of perception to drive the militarization of police research. Generally speaking, scholarly inquiry in this field can be
reviewed through two prisms: 1) public and police perceptions of paramilitary training operations; and 2) public policy legislation surrounding the training and integration of police and military personnel and equipment.

**Perceptions of Paramilitary Training and Operations**

In a recent national survey, Moule, Fox, and Parry (2018) found that 63% of white, 20% of Hispanic, and 16% of African-Americans surveyed indicated that when increased levels of cynicism for the police are considered, there were negative effects regarding the perception of police militarization. Moule et al.’s (2019) findings are supported by legal socialization literature which, following racial stratification lines and other perception-based militarization research, has shown that dependent variables such as citizen perception and legitimate police actions positively correlate to other studies where results demonstrate citizen support for police militarization (Perry & Jonathan-Zamir, 2014). By comparison, Perry and Jonathan-Zamir (2014) argue that context and certain demographics (e.g., personal background, views of the police, etc.) alter how the public views the militarization of police.

**Empirical Studies**

A recent study by Lockwood, Doyle, and Comiskey (2018) took a different approach to the issue of perception, asking whether the public would support the notion of permitting the police to use military weapons and equipment under certain conditions. Using terrorism, drugs, gangs, and riots as dependent variables, random telephonic surveys of citizens identified citizen support for the militarization of police using the independent variables of race, gender, political affiliation, education, region of residence in the U.S., and whether the respondent believed the police had been either helpful or harassing to the public (Lockwood, Doyle, & Comiskey, 2018).
Only one recent empirical study in the literature appears to investigate the perceptions of rural police officers’ attitudes toward the demilitarization of police (Contessa, 2016). All of the officers interviewed (N=21) were against any move to demilitarize the police, reaffirming their desire to remain equipped with semi-automatic weapons to the degree they believe members of the public have already become.

Research is consistent in one approach: Empirical studies appear to center the focus on investigating citizens’ perceptions of the militarization of police. In doing so, research results illuminate only one part of the militarization of police narrative. Since Kappeler and Kraska’s (1997) study, there appear to be no other empirical studies in the literature which use interviews of police officers to examine their perceptions of the use of paramilitary-style teams or militarized teams in law enforcement practice.

Criticisms

The critical literature is narrow in scope yet clear in its rebuke of the nexus between law and the phenomenon of police militarization with specific attention drawn to how law has been used as an enabling tool in its development (Delahanty, McWhirter, Welch, & Wilks, 2017; Hanley, 2015; Meads, 2015).

Within the paramilitary activities and normalization of military training in police operations focus of inquiry, studies have further analyzed the militarization of police through two more narrow lenses: a) the relationship between police deaths in the line of duty and the degree of violent encounters involving police, and b) views of the transfer of military equipment to police as responsible for increasing negative perceptions of the police versus contentions that militarization embraces the use of force as an appropriate method of problem solving. These
studies have not found positive correlations between the use of military equipment and deaths or injuries to innocent persons (Delahanty, McWhirter, Welch, & Wilks, 2017; Hanley, 2015; Meads, 2015). A closer look at the progression of legislative steps lawmakers have taken to bring the militarization of police into the focus of national conversation follows next.

**Public Policy and Police Militarization**

Using law as a mechanism for change, Congress has taken steps to further the interaction between the police and members of the military. Much of the research thus far has continued to question legislative actions which have enabled this phenomenon to develop (Kopel, 2015; Lockwood, Doyle, & Comiskey, 2018; Meads, 2015; Murch, 2015; Paul & Birzir, 2008; Wickes, 2015). The progression of legislation enabling the militarization of the police can be tracked temporally.

**Posse Comitatus Act of 1878.** The original intent of the Posse Comitatus Act of 1878 was to provide a clear separation of roles between military and domestic law enforcement agencies (Bolgiano, 2001). For example, the U.S. military is not to be used as a replacement for domestic law enforcement officers in their responsibilities to apprehend criminals (Doyle, 2000). In 1981, Congress passed the Posse Comitatus Amendment which eliminated a number of budgetary restrictions, allowing the military greater involvement in law enforcement drug operations. Military vehicles, aircraft, and personnel are now widely used in supporting surveillance involved in law enforcement narcotics trafficking arrests (Doyle, 2000; Matthews, 2006; Schlichter, 1992).

**National Security Directive 221.** In response to a 1986 presidential order designating narcotics trafficking as a threat to the national security of the United States, this directive
compels law enforcement to identify the impact of the international narcotics trade upon U.S. national security, and enables direct, specific actions involving military support, equipment, and training to increase the effectiveness of U.S. counter-narcotics efforts to enhance U.S. national security (Exec. Order 221, 1986).


The most recent revision of this federal code occurred in 1990 when additional language was included in two different sections allowing the Department of Defense to transfer equipment to and engage in collaborative training with local, state, and federal law enforcement agencies in counter-drug operations (S. 1215. National Defense, 2019).

Homeland Security Act of 2002. As a result of the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001, which is arguably the single most important transformative event in American law enforcement history, President George W. Bush signed the Homeland Security Act of 2002 into law (Homeland Security, 2002). The act altered the traditional powers, mission statement, and duties of local, state, and federal law enforcement by providing them investigative and prosecutorial responsibility to respond to acts of terrorism.

Stop Militarizing Law Enforcement Act of 2017. In 2017, House of Representatives Bill HR 1556, 115th Cong. Stop Militarizing Law Enforcement Act was introduced into congressional subcommittees in an attempt to impede the authority of the National Defense
Authorization Act of 1990 (HR1556, Stop Militarizing, 2017). The new bill restricts the transfer of certain surplus military equipment to law enforcement, which includes:

Sec.2 (D): 1) weapons, weapon parts and weapon components, including camouflage and detection equipment, and optical sights; (2) weapon system-specific vehicular accessories; (3) demolition materials. (4) explosive ordinance. (5) night vision equipment. (6) tactical clothing, including uniform clothing and footwear items, special purpose clothing items and specialized flight clothing and accessories; (7) drones; (8) combat, assault, and tactical vehicles, including mine-resistant ambush-protected (MRAP) vehicles; (9) training aids and devices; (10) firearms of 50 caliber or higher, grenade-launchers, flash grenades, and bayonets. (p. 3)

Concurrently, House of Representatives Bill HR 426 is moving through sessions in the Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism, Homeland Security, and Investigations in Congress. It was written specifically to stop this opposition bill and continue the transfer of military equipment to law enforcement (Protecting Lives, 2016).

While the literature is dominated by studies characterizing the militarization of police from one perspective, there are others that recognize that, apart from law, there are commonalities, differences, and similarities that exist in mutual training interests, physical techniques used in self-defense, training modalities, marksmanship, weapons, command-and-control practices in handling crises, resources, and exposure to high-stress environments involving mass casualties that the police and military share with each other (Alexander, 2010; Borelli, 2002; Borum, 2003).
The advantages of enhanced military equipment and training for the police in crisis intervention that offer the greater strategic value for the government include more advanced vehicles, weapons, and ammunition that can defend against larger-caliber weapons used in drug trafficking. What is not clear is the degree of overreach this engenders in law enforcement from domestic policing contexts, as well as the potential for this level of force to violate constitutional protections afforded the American public.

Critical scholarship has raised concerns regarding what role military influences would play domestically in American social order beyond their effect upon local, state, and federal policing as the expansion of a military industrial complex is now evident in cooperative working agreements among American universities and government agencies (Giroux, 2004; Ifill, 2015; Keinscherf, 2016; Paul & Birzir, 2008).

Figure 3 illustrates the hypothesized convergence of the factors discussed thus far in this study. At the forefront of the militarization phenomenon appears to be public policy-driven training in response to emerging new threats that the police have faced since 9/11. Supporting these developments are the epistemologies gleaned from police and military veterans teaching and learning from one another and what appears to be an emerging training ecology shared by these actors. Epistemology is viewed in Dewey’s (1938) terms of knowledge emerging from active adaptation of the human organism to the environment. Lastly, the tenets of transformational leadership appear to have been used to leverage change management strategies.
Figure 3 Convergence of Factors Contributing to the Militarization of Police

(a) Refers to Bass’ (1985) principles of transformational leadership in its entirety. (b) Denotes Kotter’s (1996) principles of change management in its entirety. (c) Denotes Bronfenbrenner’s (1979) human development ecology. (d) Denotes learning and teaching epistemologies as argued by Dewey (1916).

Chapter Summary

Empirical studies and research using either direct observation or experimental methods offers evidence as to whether learning outcomes have been achieved. Part of the evidence in the gap in the police literature is the apparent absence of police perceptions of the militarization phenomenon and whether specific military influences have translated into law enforcement operations. Organizational culture as it pertains to police operations offers some insight into the similarities that exist between military and law enforcement cultures.
As this synthesis of literature suggests, the police officer and military veteran have collaborated through training vis-à-vis law enforcement’s desire to use military techniques and equipment in their operations and, leveraging leadership and collaboration with expertise in both the medical and military fields, have begun to change through the influence of public policy to address threats encountered during public safety operations. A gap appears to exist across the field of police research in examining whether human ecology principles and change management may play a role in this phenomenon. The following research methodology is presented as a guide that follows phenomenological traditions and attempts to narrow the lens on police perceptions of the militarization of police phenomenon.
Chapter 3: Procedures and Methods

Qualitative Research Paradigm

The following section identifies the methodological approach to this study. It briefly discusses the strengths and weaknesses of the phenomenological method, its advantages as applicable to specific research goals, and selected empirical studies within the literature to inform the reader. Following this, a description of the sites selected to interview the participant police officers is described as well as the criterion used to select this group. The instrumentation used in this study follows next, supported by a detailed summary of data collection and analysis techniques appropriate to this study. Lastly, human subject protection is discussed, which includes a discussion of informed consent, then the methods of treatment and cleaning the data concludes this section.

Qualitative research involves the analysis of social phenomena, social life, and the problems, solutions, and interpretations that arise when humans interact (Moustakas, 1994). Qualitative researchers try to understand social processes in context, which often requires that they question their own experiences and those of the people around them (Esterberg, 2002). As Rossman and Rallis (2017) note,

Qualitative research begins with questions; its ultimate purpose is learning. To inform questions, the researcher collects data – the basic units or building blocks of data. Data are images, sounds, words, and numbers. When data are grouped into patterns, they become information. When information is put to use or applied, it becomes knowledge. (p. 4)
**Strengths of qualitative research.** This study is framed around questions that are designed to generate data from a unique participant population: police officers within their natural setting. It is exploratory in nature and relies on interviews, setting, and context to expand and explore a deeper understanding of the phenomenon with participants who might ordinarily limit their responses if research interaction were generated solely through the completion of surveys.

**Weaknesses of qualitative research.** The act of interviewing participants by the researcher, although effective in richer data collection design, reveals the potential for researcher bias and the challenge of efficiently and accurately coding the data. As the researcher becomes part of the research, as Patton (2015) explains, parsing out thematic data from participants with varying and differing perceptions offers potential for gathering inaccurate data.

A number of approaches to qualitative research involving human subjects can be considered: ethnography, case study, grounded theory, and phenomenology (Patton, 2015; Reeves, Kuper, & Hodges, 2008). The first, ethnography, involves the examination of behavioral patterns involved in group interaction that will, over time, develop culturally as a result of patterned behavior and beliefs that represent group standards which become expected behavior (Howard, 2002; Patton, 2015). Ethnographic studies are designed to take place over extended periods of time and involve embedding with groups in a process of direct observation of group social behaviors (Wolcott, 2016). Traditional ethnographic methods which include direct observation and fieldwork involve analysis of actor-driven cultural perspectives (Patton, 2015).

Ethnographic methods present unique disadvantages to this study as they require protracted time to conduct direct observation of actors’ social behaviors and, with the focus on
training and learning, that becomes problematic. For example, semi-structured interviews—which would likely be more effective immediately following periods of training—would likely extend full-time work schedules and generate overtime costs. Given the agreements reached with the appropriate chief law enforcement executives—namely that their personnel would be on duty when interviewed—prioritization of on-duty tasks favors returning participants to their work in responding to calls for public service rather than expending time on academia-related interviews.

Case studies in qualitative research have been defined in a number of ways. Yin’s (1984) notion of case study is explained as “an empirical inquiry that investigates a contemporary phenomenon (the ‘case’) within its real-life context, especially when the boundaries between phenomenon and context may not be clearly evident” (p. 16). Choosing a different emphasis, Stake (2005) contends that the central focus in case study research is capturing the essence of the unit of study—the researcher must determine what the case is determined to be. For Stake (2005), “Case study is less of a methodological choice than a choice of what is to be studied” (p. 443). Although case studies hold a central place in qualitative research, the variance that exists in defining what a case study is becomes problematic when researcher interests include comparisons of participant perceptions from police officers, who represent unique and varying training and operational cultures within different law enforcement agencies, and defining the method used to investigate those perceptions is ambiguous (Baxter & Jack, 2008; Paoline, 2003). A case study approach was not considered for this study.

Next, a grounded theoretical approach to qualitative research is described as a systematic method of collecting, coding, and analyzing data where theory emerges from inquiry (Strauss,
No preconceived notion of any theoretical construct exists and, in a process designed to construct theory, a number of methods are used: memo writing and the creation of codes, categories, and themes that develop from the data (Charmaz, 1996). Given this study’s focus on using Bronfenbrenner’s (1979) notion of human development in conjunction with Kotter’s (1996) change management principles in investigating whether the perceptions of the police officer participants reflect these influences, a grounded theoretical design was not considered. It is from the framework of inquiry and asking questions surrounding a social phenomenon that a discussion framed around phenomenology follows next.

**Phenomenological Method**

Given the apparent lack of qualitative empirical research involving interviews of police officers regarding their perceptions of militarization, phenomenology is the preferred methodology chosen for this study. The phenomenological approach to inquiry is chosen because of its use of language or, in this case, interviews which give structure to participant-perceived experiences with the phenomenon (Patton, 2015). Police officers are individuals who belong to a group that emphasizes shared experiences; a focus on phenomenology investigates how humans make sense of individual and shared experiences (Patton, 2015).

Husserl’s (1970) seminal work on the science of phenomenology guides this study. He defines the philosophy as “the study of consciousness as experience from the first-person point of view… Phenomenology thus characterizes a given form of consciousness from the person’s own subjective, first-person perspective” (as cited in Smith, 2013, p. 180–81).

According to Husserl (1970), experience can be analyzed through three different perspectives: a) the physical, where the content of the act is analyzed, b) the meaning of the
experience, and c) intentionality of the act (Zahavi, 1996). In the context of this study, the meaning of experience is investigated through the perceptions of the participant population. Further exploration of intentionality and the physical are beyond the scope of this study.

Giorgi (1985) expands the phenomenological discussion in his analysis of reduction, considered an essential criterion of Husserl’s (1970) philosophy. As Giorgi (1985) contends, it is “the difference between the way in which a situation is in the way it is experienced” (p. 49). In relation to this study, it is posited that conceptual differences may exist between the researcher’s understanding of the circumstances in question and the officer’s perception of the same circumstances. The participant (police officer) lives in the situation under inquiry and the researcher is to take the meaning understood by the participant precisely as the participant perceives that experience (Giorgi, 1985). Both of the guiding questions in this study are based on perception of the militarization phenomenon and are designed to obtain an officer’s interpretation of an experience or circumstance and the situational and environmental contexts surrounding it (Moustakas, 1994).

Human science research includes interviews as a method of choice within the phenomenological genre (Moustakas, 1994). Interviews are an ideal way to frame a lived experience around questions that are meaningful for law enforcement participants in expressing their perceptions regarding the sharing of collaborative training tactics, techniques, or practices with other law enforcement officers – both who are and those who are not military veterans – as they relate to the foci of this study.
Advantages

The advantages of interviews as a methodological instrument in phenomenological studies include capturing differences and similarities in situational contexts and personal meanings and reflections of the participants (Pitel, Papazoglou, & Tuttle, 2018; Polkinghorne, 2005). Seidman (2013) notes that “at the root of in-depth interviewing is an interest in understanding the lived experience of other people and the meaning they make of that experience” (p. 9). Apart from quantitative studies, phenomenological methodologies used in the investigation of police operations have found best-fit application and rigor through the use of a qualitative approach to inquiry (Corpas, 2018; Fisk, 2017; Fuentes, 2017; Fields, 2019; Myers, 2018).

Empirical Studies

Studies have shown that follow-up questions can tease out layers of additional meaning when they are worded in ways that stimulate an interviewee’s memory, as when drawing distinctions between keywords such as “the” and “an” that may suggest the existence of something and promote reconstruction of a memorable event (Loftus & Zani, 1975). Police qualitative scholarship that has focused on the perceptions of police officer participants has found unique insights from a population which views a phenomenon through lived experiences as a result of playing a role within the phenomenon (Bailey, 2018; Quesada, 2017; Sheets, 2017; Ward, 2017).

Site Selection

Interviews were conducted at law enforcement headquarters, substations, or other agency-designated locations where police officers would ordinarily meet to conduct officially
authorized operations. These agency-authorized locations were capable of offering isolated rooms where the study could be controlled for interview security for the participants and privacy from intrusions. The researcher acquired written authorization to use each facility from the commanding officer in charge of each agency location. The authorizations are stored in a password-protected storage area under the oversight of the University of North Florida’s Internal Review Board.

Participants

The participant pool consisted of 12 graduates of state-certified, accredited law enforcement training programs who are currently serving as full-time police officers or deputy sheriffs employed by three law enforcement agencies in the state of Florida (Criminal Justice Standards, 2018; FDLE, 2018). Police officers are sworn personnel employed by a local police department functioning as a general-purpose law enforcement agency, whereas deputy sheriffs are employed by a sheriff’s office, which is operated by a unit of local government such as a town, city, township, or county (BJS, 2019). Police officer and deputy sheriff are terms used synonymously as law enforcement officer classifications in the state of Florida pursuant to Statute 943.1397 (FDLE, 2018). Traditionally, deputy sheriffs are line-level personnel under the command of an elected sheriff while police officers are under the command of a police chief (Falcone & Wells, 1995). Both positions must pass the State Officer Certification Exam in the state of Florida prior to employment (FDLE, 2018). Twelve participant officers were chosen to provide greater likelihood of interactivity between the different law enforcement agencies represented in this study (Stake, 2006).
Participant Selection

The desired participant criterion includes groups such as shown in Figure 3. The first group involves the following: 1) police officers with no prior military experience; 2) police officers who currently hold no law enforcement rank as well as those who hold the following ranks: corporal, sergeant, lieutenant, and chief; and 3) police officers possessing at least 1–10 years of law enforcement experience.

The second group involves the following: 1) police officers who are currently serving or hold veteran status with the United States military in the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard; 2) police officers who currently hold the following law enforcement ranks: corporal, sergeant, lieutenant, and chief; and 3) police officers possessing at least 11 or more years of law enforcement experience. Figure 4 illustrates the selection criterion.
The participants are members of three law enforcement agencies in Florida. In comparison to one another, these agencies include one large, one medium, and one smaller law enforcement agency. Law enforcement agencies are typically categorized by the number of officers per 1,000 residents (BJS, 2019). The large agency in this study has a contingent in excess of 1500 sworn personnel, the medium sized agency has more than 320 sworn personnel, and the smaller agency numbers in excess of 275 sworn police officers.

Rising from the terrorist attacks against the United States on September 11, 2001, the first-person accounts provided by the participating officers in this study should provide some insight into similarities and differences in training among the agencies participating in this study and the decentralization of investigative responsibilities shared among local law enforcement.
agencies with their state and federal partners (Schafer, Burruss Jr., & Giblin, 2009; Waxman, 2009).

The point of origin of the militarization phenomenon appears to have occurred approximately 33 years ago (Executive Order 221, 1986). Over this period, both military and police techniques, tactics, and practices have evolved (Weisburd & Neyroud, 2011). Of interest in this study is obtaining the perceptions of the militarization of police from varying groups representing differing spans of time spent in their professional careers within the broader militarization period in order to gain a mix of contrasting insights, perspectives, and contexts.

Content, pedagogies, and program emphases vary widely nationally in police academy training curriculum, and differing perceptions and experiences of police officers and how each views the phenomenon under inquiry may be uniquely disparate or analogous to one another (Alpert & Dunham, 2010; Berlin, 2014; Bradford & Pynes, 1999; Chappell, 2008; D'everage, 2016; Madrigal, 2017; Palmiotto, Birzer, & Prabha Unnithan, 2000; Reaves, 2009). Isolating a particular agency training ethos and identifying the broader influences affecting training may offer greater clarity to methods of training as a result of speaking to police officers from different agencies. Using the existing police literature as a guide, interrelationships between officers, organizations, and cross points that may emerge during discourse may identify unique, contradictory, or similar perceptions concerning the militarization phenomenon between police officers, their agencies, and/or their organizational culture.

The researcher inquired with each commanding officer in charge regarding the best pool of available police participants who fit the criterion for this study. In particular, one focus of this study surrounds police officer participants who are not veterans and who have had frequent law
enforcement training or operational interaction with police officers who are either currently serving or are military veterans.

This study investigates the militarization of police phenomenon emphasizing depth rather than breadth and the perceptions unique to each participating officer’s lived experience. As Patton (2015) notes, “Qualitative methods permit inquiry into selected issues in great depth with careful attention to detail, context, nuance; that data collection need not be constrained by predetermined analytical categories contributes to the potential breadth of qualitative inquiry” (p. 257). Scholarship has found that richness and depth in qualitative findings is largely dependent upon the quality of sources, and the researcher explains in detail why each participant was chosen as a unique source of data (Cleary, Horsfall, & Hayter, 2014; Polkinghorne, 2005; Russell & Gregory, 2003). The data collection instrument chosen for this study is discussed next.

**Qualitative Research Paradigm**

As a data collection instrument, the study utilized an adaptation of Dolbeare and Schuman’s (1982) thematic three-interview series format to enable the participant population to establish contexts relative to their training and reconstruct and reflect upon their experiences.

Deviation from Dolbeare and Schuman’s (1982) original format occurred in that the three-interview model was compressed into one extended interview as agreed upon by the researcher and law enforcement agency executives involved in this study. Dolbeare and Schuman’s (1982) study in higher education policy making analyzed the impact of postsecondary education with a group of 15 participants using interviews as a data collection instrument. Noddings (2018) contends that Dolbeare and Schuman’s (1982) interview methodology is grounded in Husserl’s (2012) psychological phenomenology, given its a priori
approach to studying one-to-one reciprocal relationships and the patterns of caring which exist within these relationships.

In its original form, the three-interview series included eight interviews of each participant over a period of several days. Dolbeare and Schuman’s approach was to inquire about each participant’s previous lived experience, then question in detail the participant’s reaction to the intervention which was the focus of research under inquiry. In the last interview, they recorded the participant’s reflection of his/her lived experience. As Schuman (1982) explains,

In the first interview, the interviewer’s task is to put the participant’s experience in context by asking him or her to tell as much as possible about himself or herself in light of the topic up to the present time… The purpose of the second interview is to concentrate on the concrete details of the participant’s present lived experience of the topic area of the study. In the third interview…participants…reflect on the meaning of their experience. (as cited in Seidman, 2013, p. 21–22)

Schuman’s (1982) Policy Analysis, Education and Everyday Life includes only generalized commentary reflecting its broad-based questions aligned to policy making. However, Velasquez, Graham, and Osguthorpe’s (2013) empirical test of the three-interview series instrument found that the “three-stage process facilitated rapport between participants and the interviewer over time and enabled increased in-depth examination of relevant themes by the interviewer during the interviewing process” (p. 100). Interviews involved determining the level of caring between teacher-student relationships in the context of high school distance learning/instruction (Velasquez et al., 2013).
Dolbeare and Schuman’s (1982) data-gathering sequence (getting to know the participant, examining the lived experience under inquiry, then obtaining participant reflection) informs a list of questions designed for this study. Bronfenbrenner’s (1979) and Kotter’s (1996) work guides the interviews, which were designed to generate responses addressing participating officers’ lived experiences and personal perceptions of the militarization of police. The interview list in this study is marked Appendix F.

Participants were asked about their perceptions of the two research questions through a number of secondary and follow-up questions designed to obtain detailed responses. Specifically, questions surrounding the reciprocal interaction between actor and environment, and decision making in the context of situational dangers were used to obtain participant perceptions of these relationships. Other questions were asked in order to understand the steps police have undertaken over time to address change management in policing as a result of the influences of legislation and changes in offender weapon choices, terrorism, and mass shootings.

Because of budgetary constraints placed upon every public service agency today, and recognizing that any overtime paid to a participant officer involved in this study would be funded through taxpayer dollars, the researcher designed the topical interview guide as an extended, one-time, three-part interview with each participant during their on-duty hours, and each interview allowed for comfort breaks as needed for the participants (Amendola, 2016).

**Data Sources: Data Collection Procedures**

**Prior.** Collecting semi-structured interview data required making site visits to local law enforcement agencies to speak to police officers. Command staff personnel the researcher has familiarity with were asked permission to interview a purposeful, criterion-based sample of
police officers with varied years of experience, military veteran status, and law enforcement supervisory status (Patton, 1990). The choice of criterion-based sampling is founded in the standards of performance that each participant officer shares with one another (Patton, 1990). For law enforcement officers, each participant officer was required to emerge from both an individual and group-formatted training environment, pass minimum qualifying standards in established standards of practice, and demonstrate proof of competency of curriculum where standardized metrics must be achieved as mandated by their state of employment (Criminal Justice Standards, 2018; FDLE, 2018).

The chief executive law enforcement officer in charge of a large metropolitan law enforcement agency in Florida with whom the researcher has familiarity was contacted. The agency and its chief executive have considerable experience in Homeland Security initiatives aligned to law enforcement operations, a subject responsible for much of the scrutiny in the critical police militarization literature (De Genova, 2007; Endebak, 2014; Radil, Dezzani, & McAden, 2017; Schlichter, 1992; Shaughnessy, 2016; Vaughn Lee, 2010; Weber, 1999). This experience supported the chief executive’s understanding of the contextualization of this study, its rationale, purpose, section parameters, and data collection methods during the course of initial discussions of the study. The chief executive law enforcement officer in charge was very supportive of the study and its criterion-based approach to selecting the participant population. A direct-report commanding officer was apprised of the details of this study, echoed his support, and assigned a law enforcement analyst to assist in developing a list of police officers according to the methodological parameters for this study.
The chief executive law enforcement officers of medium and smaller-sized metropolitan law enforcement agencies in Florida with whom the researcher has familiarity were independently contacted. Both executives have considerable experience in law enforcement training, equipment allocation, and operations – three other components of law enforcement organizational structure often aligned to the militarization phenomenon within the critical policing literature (Biddle 2013; Chappell, 2008; Dansky, 2016; Hanley, 2015; Kappeler & Kraska, 1997). After an explanation of the issues aligned to this study; its rationale, purpose, and selection parameters; and an overview of the data collection methods, both chief executive law enforcement officers extended their support and agreed to provide a sample of participants that followed the criterion-based approach in this study. An agreement was made with all three law enforcement executives to secure official written authorization to conduct interviews on the premises of each official agency site.

By mutual agreement, the chief executive representing the smaller law enforcement agency agreed to choose participant officers through face-to-face selection following the criterion-based parameters outlined in this study (Patton, 1990). No part-time officers were considered for selection in this study. The researcher was neither involved in the selection nor did he personally know any of these participant officers.

The researcher worked with each agency’s chief administrative officer support staff to determine the best schedules for the participating officers. The smaller agency’s schedule allowed for its personnel to be the first agency involved in data collection in this study. The assignments of the officers in the smaller-sized law enforcement agency ranged from special operations to patrol to criminal investigations and they held the following ranks: chief and three
sergeants. The demographics representing the officers participating in this study from the smaller-sized law enforcement agency are listed in Table 2.

Table 2

Demographics for Participants from Smaller Law Enforcement Agency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Officer</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>≤10 yrs</th>
<th>≥11 yrs</th>
<th>Military</th>
<th>Assignment</th>
<th>Supervisor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carl</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>Spec. Operations</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>AfA</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>Patrol</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Randy</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>Patrol</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leslie</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>Investigations</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


By mutual agreement, the chief executive representing the medium-sized law enforcement agency agreed to choose participant officers through face-to-face selection following the criterion-based parameters outlined in this study (Patton, 1990). The assignments of the officers in the medium-sized agency ranged from criminal investigations to training to special investigations. With respect to rank, the medium-sized agency was represented by a corporal and three senior-grade police officers. The demographics representing the officers participating in this study from the medium-sized agency are listed in Table 3.
Table 3
Demographics for Participants From Medium Law Enforcement Agency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Officer</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>≤10 yrs</th>
<th>≥11 yrs</th>
<th>Military</th>
<th>Assignment</th>
<th>Supervisor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Griffin</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>Investigations</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colt</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>Training</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamie</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>Investigations</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garrett</td>
<td>ArA</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>Spec. Operations</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The executive at the larger law enforcement agency agreed to assign an analyst who would, in compliance with the criterion-based selection parameters established by this study, access a list of possible participant officers using an agency database housing information pertaining to all sworn police officer demographics meeting the selection parameters of this study. The agency employs more than 1500 sworn police officers who are classified as “permanently employed.”

The analyst ran a database query guided by the study selection parameters and emailed the researcher indicating that 136 police officers met the criterion-based parameters in the following categories: sex, race, ethnicity, job title, years of law enforcement service with the agency (eg. fewer than 10 years and more than 11 years, respectively), whether a military veteran, and their current law enforcement rank (eg. police officer/deputy, corporal, sergeant, lieutenant, or chief). As requested by the researcher, none of the officers were identified by name in the query; only their demographic information was listed.
An email notification distributed by the analyst was sent to the 136 police officers meeting the selection parameters. From this pool, 27 officers responded indicating their interest in volunteering for this study – a response rate of .199, or 19.9%. Attached to the email was a Participant Request/Recruitment memo drafted by the researcher which detailed the nature of the study, a brief explanation of informed consent, researcher plans to protect participant anonymity and directions on how to contact the researcher. The memo was redacted in portions identifying the agency and section where the assisting analyst works. The memo can be found marked as Appendix H.

Of the 27 officers expressing an interest, the agency analyst randomly chose four police officers meeting the criterion-based selection parameters in this study (Patton, 1990). Of the four officers, two held the supervisory rank of sergeant, the other two were senior-grade police officers. Two of the participants were military veterans; the other two were not. Current assignments for the four officers included community affairs, patrol division, and the criminal investigations division.

The researcher was not involved in any way in the selection of any agency participant police officer in this study and none of the officers selected were known by the researcher. These steps were taken to add controls against selection bias and to create an audit trail to mirror the internal validity criteria expected in the quantitative research process (Lincoln & Guba, 2000; Morrow, 2005; Patton, 2002). The demographics representing the officers participating in this study from the larger agency are listed in Table 4.
### Table 4
Demographics for Participants From Larger Law Enforcement Agency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Officer</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>≤10 yrs</th>
<th>≥11 yrs</th>
<th>Military</th>
<th>Assignment</th>
<th>Supervisor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dayna</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>Community Affairs</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirk</td>
<td>AfA</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>Investigations</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ross</td>
<td>Al</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>Investigations</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris</td>
<td>AsA</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>Patrol</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


**During.** As the format for participant interviews was agreed upon with each chief law enforcement executive, each participant police officer was contacted via either email or telephone. By mutual agreement, the participants met the researcher at an official agency location.

Each interview was conducted in a business office setting which was isolated from official activities within the agency. Each interview occurred in the following manner: The researcher introduced himself and thanked the participant for volunteering for the study; a period of off-tape rapport building began after the introduction to ensure that the participant was comfortable with the researcher and the overall research process (Moustakas, 1994). Each participant reviewed an informed consent form which clearly explained the intent of this study as well as its purpose, objectives, protections against coercion, and assurances of anonymity. A more detailed explanation of this document can be found in the Human Subject Protection section.
During the off-tape period, a copy of a topical interview guide was introduced to each participant, who was then provided with a brief explanation of how the research instrument was designed. Each participant was asked if there were any questions the researcher could answer. No participant officer involved in this study asked any questions regarding the research instrument or the interview format. To ensure participant officer anonymity and assist with ease of researcher coding, each participant police officer was assigned a pseudonym by which he or she would be referred to during the interview (ex., Officer Carl, Officer Michael, etc.). Each interview was conducted in the following manner: A digital voice recorder was placed on a desk in front of the participant and was used as the primary device to audio-record the interview; a secondary device, the researcher’s smartphone, was also placed on the desk and used to record the interview in the event that the primary device malfunctioned.

Advantages exist in audio-taping interviews instead of recording field notes when interacting with a number of participants. Audiotaping offers more accuracy than manually recording notes, thus producing a more effective outcome in the generation of human subject data (Devers & Frankel, 2000; Doody & Noonan, 2013).

The interview guide contained a number of questions using Dolbeare and Schuman’s (1982) three-interview format as a framework for the interview. The interview guide followed the following sequence: The first sequence of questions was designed to develop insight into the influences on each participant’s life prior to the beginning of his or her law enforcement career; the second sequence included questions that focused on individual perceptions of the topic of this study as the officer’s career developed from its beginning to the present day; the third sequence of questions was designed to allow each participant to reflect upon his or her personal
conceptions of any relevant lived experiences. The participants were prompted not only to recall their experiences, but also to reconstruct them contextually (Seidman, 2013). Close-ended questions were used when appropriate to obtain specific answers in relation to this study. The primary focus of each interview was the use of open-ended questions designed to promote in-depth responses from each participant (Hsieh & Shannon, 2005).

**After.** An agreement was made during each interview to meet the participant separately at a later date to review the transcript of the interview. This was for the purpose of checking the accuracy of the data gleaned from the interviews and review data security details with each participant once again. Each participant was independently contacted within three weeks of his or her initial interview and met the researcher at a mutually agreed upon location. A cleaned, redacted copy of the transcript was provided to the participant/member.

The qualitative software process used to transcribe the data is described in greater detail in the section entitled Data Mining and Transcription.

**Memo writing.** Memos pertaining to each participant officer were written after each interview in a private setting. Memo writing involves a reflective process of thinking, learning, reasoning and making meaning of one’s experience. The interview process is a shared experience by the researcher and participant officer which allows for reflecting upon the perceptions and insights of the participant officer.

Rogers (2001) distills Dewey’s notion of reflection in the following explanation of the concept: “Reflection is a meaning-making process that moves the learner from one experience to the next with deeper understanding of its relationships with and connections to other experiences and ideas…and is a rigorous, disciplined way of thinking” (p. 845).
**Researcher Positionality**

Chavez (2000) refers to Viswesaran (1994) to explain some of the more apparent advantages to insider status, which include unique, nuanced perspective for observation and interpretation; insight into the linguistic, cognitive, and emotional principles affecting the participants involved; and immediate legitimacy, given the researcher’s history in the field. Complications in positionality are noted when the researcher over-identifies with him- or herself and exhibits an overdependence upon previous status in the field, which then obscures or alters the researcher’s role.

Researcher positionality includes being a former law enforcement commanding officer with experience in Homeland Security issues and expertise in weapons and explosives as well as experience as a former police academy training instructor in high-liability topics (e.g., firearms, defensive tactics). The researcher’s career included assignments as a special weapons and tactics marksman and, years later, returned to the agency team by sheriff’s appointment as its commanding officer. The researcher is also a former bomb squad member and graduate of the U.S. Army Redstone Arsenal where he earned an explosives technician certification. While credentialed, the researcher acknowledges that as a result of his retirement more than 10 years ago, the effects of institutional change within the policing profession may place him in a disadvantageous position: It may foster perceptual differences between the participants and the researcher in the understanding of the phenomenon in question. Also, the researcher acknowledges that any participant’s knowledge of his career experiences may have a negative effect upon their perception of or beliefs toward police officers with similar backgrounds as the researcher. The researcher also has a background in homicide and internal affairs assignments.
and has received training in and used the Reid interview technique (Inbau, Reid, Buckley, & Jayne, 2011), Ekman’s (2009) work in micro-facial expressions, and Fisher and Geiselman’s (1992) cognitive interviewing techniques within higher education teaching for a number of years.

With respect to the interview process, Chavez (2008) expands on Frey and Fontana (2005) notion that during traditional structured and unstructured data collection, the researcher controls the event, asking questions which may impede group socialization and communication patterns. Chavez (2000) contends that every researcher should anticipate alternative methods to acquire information successfully in anticipation of inevitable problems.

Data Analysis Techniques

Saldaña’s (2016) concept coding is the manual method of data coding for this study. As Saldaña explains, “A code in qualitative inquiry is most often a word or short phrase that symbolically assigns a summative, salient, essence-capturing, and/or evocative attribute for a portion of language-based or visual data” (p. 4). Saldaña’s (2016) method of coding requires the researcher to choose the most appropriate attribute relevant to the study. “Concept coding…has been referred to as ‘analytic coding’ by selected research methodologists” (p. 119). Saldaña’s (2016) concept coding as a stand-alone method allows for larger units of data from within the study to progress into ideas and themes found within the interview narratives. In concept coding, analysis is highly interpretive and can be guided by the research questions, disciplinary interests, and the development of concepts likely to be found within the data (Saldaña, 2016).

Saldaña (2016) also notes that concept coding aligns with the phenomenological genre and offers particular applicability to data within interview transcripts. Epistemologically and
ontologically, concept coding aligns with the research questions which are perception-based and investigate the nature of interpretive meanings (Saldaña, 2016).

**Data Mining and Transcription**

This study utilized NVivo data analytics qualitative software for Windows as a secondary means to confirm manual data mining and assist in final coding, categorizing, and enabling qualitative data to be presented in visual forms in terms of modeling the data (e.g., human development, change management, leadership, public policy, etc.) associated with this study (QSR International, 2018). Studies have found qualitative algorithmic-based software to be beneficial to achieving rigor in research studies where data coding, thematic analysis, and cross-comparisons of participant data are important pieces in the research process (Pope, Ziebland, & Mays, 2000).

**Rigor**

This study used semi-structured interviews as a stand-alone method. To ensure that a process that promoted qualitative research validity and trustworthiness was established and verifiable, the strategy of triangulation was also utilized (Johnson, 1997; Noble & Smith, 2015). Triangulation uses a number of measures to support data analysis. Iterative questioning, negative case analysis, member checks, critical peer review, reflective commentary, the epoché method, transferability, confirmability, and researcher beliefs are discussed next.

**Iterative questioning.** To ensure that the interview data revealed depth, unbiased questions tailored to the subject matter were used in systematic fashion where answers gleaned from the initial questions were followed up with additional questions, allowing the participant to reflect upon the earlier question with additional context provided by the follow-up questions.
This allows for a fuller range of experiences to play a larger role in the interviews and add to the larger field of study (Flick, 2006; Seidman, 2013). This study was designed to use an adaptation of Dolbeare and Schuman’s (1982) three-interview instrument during one session with a participant taking short comfort breaks of approximately five minutes between each phase of the interview.

The topical questions were asked in a systematic manner: The same sequence in questioning was used with each participant. When follow-up questions were asked and answered, the researcher asked the participant the next question appearing on the topical question list. The researcher possessed a copy of the topical questions from which to read and used a system of placing tick marks next to each question to keep track of which questions had been asked and which were remaining. If at any time the participant asked the researcher to repeat a question, the same format of questioning was followed. Occasionally, a participant would ask to return to an earlier question because, at the time the question was asked, the participant was unable to recall specific details, but was then able to return to the question with additional time to reflect on an answer. The question was then asked again and the participant provided a more detailed response.

**Negative case analysis.** The dominant theme in the militarization of policing literature appears to be critical of the police having any justification for using AR-15 rifles, armored vehicles, or other equipment deemed unsuitable for domestic policing use. This study used interviews as a data collection instrument in an effort to obtain participant police officer perceptions of militarizing the police through training and equipment. It also drew from
documented government legislation which likely contributed substantially to the arming and training of police officers over many years.

This study may be viewed as an outlier in contrast to critical perspectives in the literature and it is therefore useful to offer contrasting views refuting the data emerging in research to establish credibility (Bowen, 2008). Turner and Fox (2019) used a quantitative methodology surveying 279 police officers, 161 police executives, and 25 sitting members of Congress. One aspect of their survey inquired about support for material aspects of police militarization: the use of weapons and vehicles. The other aspects of the survey were irrelevant to this study and beyond the scope of its inquiry.

They found that, using descriptive statistical methods among the police executives, 99% were in favor of providing military weapons and equipment to law enforcement agencies; 92% of the police officers also supported acquiring weapons and equipment; and only 48% of congressional members favored arming the police with military-style weapons while 44% supported military vehicle acquisition by law enforcement agencies.

**Critical peer review.** A command-level law enforcement officer from a large Florida agency was contacted and asked if he would accept a peer review role in this study. After explaining the conceptualization of the study, how the participant population would be accessed and how the framework of qualitative methods would be conducted, an agreement was reached where the reviewer would analyze the data derived through investigation to ensure that it was accurate and credible, given the participants involved in the topic under inquiry. The critical peer reviewer is a seasoned law enforcement officer with more than 25 years of professional experience and possesses a graduate degree from an accredited university. The peer reviewer
agreed to critically examine the content generated from the interviews and provide constructive critique as the study progressed. Over the course of the data-collection period, using emails to interact with the researcher, the peer reviewer critiqued the study data and made periodic suggestions when points of interest needed clarification. As a result, the researcher corrected data points as necessary using the reviewer’s critique to improve this study’s data collection methods.

**Member checks.** Considered a crucial technique in establishing credibility, member (i.e. interviewed participant police officer) checks occurred after each interview. Each police officer was independently contacted and met by the researcher at a location and time convenient for the participant. The interviewer (researcher) provided each participant officer a copy of the written transcript of his or her interview, portions of which were redacted as necessary in deference to those private entities wishing to remain anonymous despite their training relationship with a participant officer in this study. The original transcript was scanned as a Microsoft Word document and uploaded onto an academic database. The participants reviewed their transcripts and each independently verified its accuracy and clarified statements made during the earlier interview (Lincoln & Guba, 1985).

**Reflective commentary.** Shenton (2004) describes the need for the researcher to evaluate the study as it develops. One way is to describe the effectiveness of the techniques employed in data collection and any patterns which emerge. Rolfe (1997) expands this notion of evaluation to the thinking necessary in writing. Reflection is, by its nature, written in first-person as it explicates the author’s experiences.

After the first interview, the prevailing impression the researcher had then and in each subsequent interview was that each participant police officer was initially careful in his or her
responses to the questions being asked. As time went on, their demeanor loosened notably. Their responses framed the way they’ve lived the circumstance the question was designed to tease out. At times, the looks on their faces reflected the seriousness of the nature of the questions in this study and, over the course of each interview and as rapport increased, gravity decreased and a relaxed conversation surrounding mutually interesting topics took place. The questions related to issues meaningful to the participant officers; several times, participants asked, “Do you want me to get into this?” As an interviewer, that is what is desired: the willingness of the participant to delve deeper into the questions. Not all of the officers chose the same words to explain their lived experiences, but their contextual situations and settings are remarkably similar: rapid threat evaluations, decision making, and solution evaluation in dynamic environments with emphasis evenly applied to the importance and relevance of decisive, independent actions and the fruits of collaborating with others.

All of the participant police officers described their training settings in detail; all were frank in their recollection of who motivated or influenced them and unapologetic about the equipment they use for self-defense. Officer Colt’s response to the question of whether he had changed any techniques or protocols he typically used as a result of the influence of a military veteran police trainer was, “I mean, I would listen to it. I mean, if it works and it makes you better, I don’t care if Mickey Mouse showed it to me.” The pattern emerging through these conversations as a whole reflected that these are men and women who want to find solutions to certain problems and are putting themselves in position to do that through exposure to organizational change and training.
**Epoché/bracketing.** Following Husserlian (1913/1931) tradition, the *epoché* method was used to mitigate the effects of researcher bias and preconceptions with the subject under inquiry. The terms *epoché* and *bracketing* have been used synonymously in research studies (Tufford & Newman, 2012). For the purposes of this study, Gearing’s (2004) definition of *epoché* is used and described as a “scientific process in which a researcher suspends or holds in abeyance his or her presuppositions, biases, assumptions, theories, or previous experiences to see and describe the phenomenon” (p. 1430).

The researcher initiated the practice of *epoché* by making an intentional effort to suspend previous biases and assumptions and instead focused on creating rapport with each participant officer prior to his or her interview so that each one would be more open to discussing any relevant lived experiences within the interview setting (Moustakas, 1994). Given the agreements made with the law enforcement chief executive of the agencies that each of the participant officers represented, the one-time interview format required narrowing focus on maximizing efforts toward data collection within a limited-time window through the use of interview technique(s) and not allowing prior predispositions to enter into the data collection process.

As the researcher, a statement is provided regarding researcher professional background, training, and experience with the phenomenon under inquiry so that the reader has a frame of reference through which to understand contexts and assess biases and preconceived notions as the data emerges. One method of *epoché* is writing memos throughout data collection and analysis as a means of examining and reflecting upon the researcher’s engagement with the data (Cutcliffe, 2003). Memos can take the form of theoretical notes which explicate the cognitive process of conducting research, methodological notes that analyze the procedural aspects of
research, and observational comments that allow the researcher to explore feelings about the research endeavor. Scholarship lacks consensus in determining when to introduce epoché into a research study; however, to help ensure trustworthiness, it is included as a method supporting triangulation (Tufford & Newman, 2012). This study will discuss researcher reflexivity during Chapter 5.

**Transferability**

The transferability of qualitative research to other settings is used in part to determine whether the data can be generalized to similar settings and address the validity and reliability concerns faced by quantitative studies (Krefting, 1991; Sinkovics, Penz, & Ghauri, 2008; Yilmaz, 2013). The discussion over replication in qualitative studies lends itself to some ambiguity as the focus of qualitative research when investigating social phenomena does not confine itself to the use of isolated variables in quantitative research (Yilmaz, 2013). Nonetheless, non-probability, criterion-based selection was used, given the unique expertise the participant pool possessed, which only allows for generalizations to be made within the agencies themselves and, therefore, limits any generalization to larger settings as a result of this study (Sinkovics, Penz, & Ghauri, 2008). In lieu of this, peer debriefings and member checks were used to establish credibility and lend support to a research audit trail (Thomas, 2006; Tuckett, 2005).

Random sampling of the participant pool in this study may have excluded some police officers who did not serve in the military as well as military veteran police officers who would have been the most likely to have interacted with each other in training and operational assignments. For example, in some areas of the U. S., police officers who are awaiting formal
adjudications in administrative discipline investigations are sometimes reassigned to office duties apart from their primary duties and are removed from police officer training and operational roles for an extended period of time (Stephens, 2011).

**Dependability**

Every effort in this study has been measured against the requirements established in the academy to ensure that rigorous qualitative methods were used to obtain data using methods of triangulation – namely, member checks, peer review, and epoché – for the purpose of establishing an inquiry audit trail (Lincoln & Guba, 1986). It is recognized that examinations of the processes used in this study included the review of raw data and analysis notes documented in the study (Hoepfl, 1997). Each interview was digitally recorded and conducted in a systematic fashion using a previously validated interview instrument. The participant officers volunteering for this study personally reviewed their own transcripts in an individual, private setting to confirm the accuracy of their statements.

**Confirmability**

To ensure that the data obtained in this study meets the confirmability and trustworthiness criterion expected in qualitative research, the interview instrument framework/structure used was previously validated by Velasquez, Graham, and Osguthorpe’s (2013) phenomenological study of the teacher/student level of caring relationships in distance learning (Anney, 2014; Connelly, 2016; Krefting, 1991; Shenton, 2004). The interview questions and contexts supporting this study’s conceptualization of the phenomenon were purposefully structured to follow Velasquez et al.’s (2013) sequencing of questioning to obtain participants’
lived experiences. Velasquez et al. (2013) followed Nodding’s notion of care theory which framed the analysis phase of their study (Smith, Flowers, & Larkin, 2009).

The theoretical principles of Bronfenbrenner’s nested microsystem lie in his 1979 version of ecological theory, founded in developmental psychology and woven into the framework of each interview question applicable to his theoretical work (Dewey, 1916). Specifically, questions were framed to reflect his notion of a pattern of activities experienced by a developing person within a microsystem’s structure. Of interest in this study are the perceptions of a participant police officer’s experiences with others within this microsystem setting.

Questions examining Kotter’s (1996) principles of change management are founded in Lewin’s (1947) notion of field theory. Questions were asked concerning each participant’s perception of individual change as it applied to his or her life prior to law enforcement, during his or her career with emphasis directed toward the 9/11 terrorist attacks and active shooters, and contexts within organizational change. Lastly, questions were directed toward obtaining reflective responses from each participant in these areas. The interview questions are noted in Appendix F. To ensure confirmability, methods of triangulation included in this study were the use of member checks, critical peer review, and epoché (Connelly, 2016; Krefting, 1991; Shenton, 2004).

Admission of Researcher Beliefs/Assumptions

The researcher supports Dewey’s (1938) notion of roles in teaching and learning – specifically when he refers to teaching and when he notes, “Taught is thought of as essentially static. It is taught as a finished product, with little regard either to the ways in which it was originally built up or to changes that will surely occur in the future” (p. 6). Training and learning
must not be static if they are to prepare today’s police officer; they have to evolve because threats to public safety are also evolving. The researcher also subscribes to Piaget’s (1985) position of constructivist learning where he argues that people produce knowledge, form meaning, and try new ideas based upon their experiences.

**Human Subject Protection**

Scholars are in consensus in support of an ethically principled approach to the protections involving human subject research (Levine et al., 2004; Wolf et al., 2008). Derived from biomedical research, the canons of voluntary consent emerged as a fundamental requirement for human subject involvement in social science research (Berg, 2001). Qualitative studies of police culture have addressed human subject protections as applied to the anonymity of police officers’ perceptions of misconduct and use of force in law enforcement operations (Carson, 2014; Jiles, 2019; Rieux, 2017).

**Informed Consent**

Each participant in this study reviewed an *informed consent* form prior to each interview. Informed consent means participants involved in a research study knowingly agree to freely participate as a matter of personal choice. The form serves as a communicative process which documents the participant’s awareness of the intent of this study as well as its purpose and objectives. It also addressed confidentiality and how security of the data gleaned from the interviews is to be addressed, and explained each participant’s right to discontinue his or her participation at any time (Berg, 2001). The informed consent form outlined potential risks and benefits unique to the participant group and serves as a written record that the rules governing
human subject protections were explained. Each form included signatures from the researcher and the study participant and was dated (see Appendix H).

**Internal Review Board Approval**

The researcher submitted a completed “Request for Review of the Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human and Animal Subjects” form to the University of North Florida’s Office of Research and Sponsored Programs. On 8/21/19, the researcher received board action approval for exempt status for this study (University of North, 2019).

**Treatment/Cleaning of the Data**

Two methods of transcription were used in this study. The data derived through interviews was initially transcribed using a professional transcription company using speech-to-text *verbatim-style* audio transcription (Rev.com, 2018). Verbatim-style recording captures every single complete and partially uttered word spoken during the interview (Corden & Sainsbury, 2006). Secondly, each audio recording was manually checked by a copy editor and the researcher independently of one another. Copies of the transcripts were manually reviewed by a professional copy editor who listened to the audio tapes and checked for errors in the original transcription. The copy editor was provided instructions following Kvale’s (1992) advice in handling interpretive issues as they pertain to verbatim versus written styles of transcription. The copy editor flagged minor words the transcription process did not pick up and left notes for the researcher when terminology was either not audible or understood. The researcher, who possessed the original transcripts, clarified notes left by the copy editor regarding terminology and/or context and redacted sensitive law enforcement details, tactics, techniques and practices, surnames, company names, agency names, and locations which might identify the law
enforcement agencies involved, where official training was conducted, or the names of professional training companies utilized by law enforcement agencies.

**Chapter Summary**

Qualitative research methodology was chosen for its application to phenomenology and the use of interviews as a data gathering instrument. Criterion-based selection was used to develop a participant population of 12 full-time, certified police officers representing three law enforcement agencies of varying sizes in Florida.

Six police officers with military experience as well as six police officers without military experience were chosen to be interviewed while on duty. The researcher took no part in participant officer selection. Participant police officers’ years of police experience ranged from 4–26 years. Within the participant population there were nine men and three women of varying ethnicities.

A previously tested data collection instrument was used. Data was manually coded using Saldaña’s concept coding, then inputted into NVivo qualitative software for data analysis. Triangulation methods included member checks, critical peer review, and epoché.

Five primary themes emerged from the data: Broad Social Change and Varying Public Mores in the U.S.; Planned Change and Militarization of Police; Utility of Military-Style Uniforms and Equipment in Police Operations; Tactics and Practices Closely Shared Between Police and Veterans; and Reflection – Consequences of Terrorism, Police Misconduct, and the Realities of Unconventional Violence; along with numerous sub-themes. Treatment/cleaning of data included verbatim transcription and two methods of manual checking of digitally audio-recorded interviews.
Chapter 4: Data Analysis and Results

The data analysis is presented in terms of individually examining 12 participant police officers’ perceptions of the topic under inquiry as well as comparing their responses across three different law enforcement agencies. Broadly, two theoretical constructs, human development ecology and change management, provided the framework from which to interact through semi-structured interviews with each participant officer. More narrowly, an adaptation of Dolbeare and Schuman’s (1982) previously tested and validated three-interview series instrument was used as a data-gathering tool (Velasquez, Graham, & Osguthorpe, 2013). Velasquez et al.’s (2013) phenomenological study of student-teacher caring relationships utilized the Dolbeare and Schuman (1982) three-interview series data-gathering instrument and found that student-faculty interaction facilitated shared understanding of experiences and reciprocity within an online learning environment. The semi-structured interview questions in this study were patterned after the Dolbeare and Schuman (1982) three-interview format to obtain participant police officers’ perceptions of this study’s research questions. As a result of the data analysis of police participant language obtained during the interviews, differences and similarities in situational contexts and personal meanings for each participant officer arose.

Using Saldaña’s (2016) concept coding method, codes were applied to particular points of datum within the interview data, representing broader ideas. A code is “a concept, is a word or short phrase that symbolically represents a suggested meaning broader than a single item or action” (p. 119). Each code symbolized an analytical memo applied in the context of the unique language/discipline of the participant officer.
For example, the researcher, a retired police officer, recognized the unique words, phrases, language, and contexts each officer expressed, having been a part of the law enforcement culture for many years himself. Concurrently, as coding occurred, analytic memos were written to reflect the thoughts generated during each individual interview and prompt meaning for the researcher in an effort to challenge previous assumptions and stimulate critical thinking in this phase of the research process (Saldaña, 2016).

The codes were clustered and a process of category creation occurred within the framework of the principles of human development and change management (Bronfenbrenner, 1979; Kotter, 1996; Saldaña, 2016). For instance, for the theme Tactics and Practices Closely Shared Between Police and Veterans, the category of strategies was created. Creating categories thereafter allowed for further analysis. Specifically, patterns between the group of military veterans and the group of non-military participant police officers developed during analysis of the strategies category within the narrative discourse. Commonalities in ways of achieving tasks between the two groups became apparent. Primary themes emerged and, through the interview and data collection process, data saturation occurred.

Strauss’ (1987) notion of data saturation refers to the point of data collection where no other additional information is learned during the process of developing fully conceptualized categories of data. There is, however, no general agreement as to a definitive number within a participant population where saturation is said to be achieved in qualitative studies, which may be attributed to the many methodological designs available (Francis et al., 2010; Fusch & Ness, 2015; Marshall & Rossman, 2014). Concept coding produced 1549 codes during initial data analysis.
NVivo qualitative analytic software was used as a secondary data analysis method and a means to confirm the manual method used in this study. NVivo software allows the researcher to use pre-coded data using manual coding techniques such as Saldaña’s (2016) concept coding. Codes are referred to as nodes in NVivo, which are explained as “a collection of references about a specific theme, place, person or other area of interest” (QSR International, 2018, p. 10). References are sources within the interview narrative content that are captured through NVivo’s proprietary data-algorithmic process which scans the interview content and codes a specific meaningful term or phrase into nodes.

The manually coded data using Saldaña’s (2016) concept coding methods were recoded into nodes using NVivo pattern-based auto-coding to verify the researcher’s manual coding. NVivo compares passages in the text – words, sentence phrases, and paragraphs, for example – to the content already coded to existing nodes. NVivo auto-coding produced 1549 codes and 3782 references (described as nodes) from the interview data (QSR International, 2018). Table 5 describes the number of transcript pages per participant officer and the number of codes and references attributed to each participant officer’s transcript.
Table 5  
NVivo Auto-Coding  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Officer</th>
<th>Transcript Pages</th>
<th>NVivo Codes</th>
<th>NVivo References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carl</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Randy</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leslie</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Griffin</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colt</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamie</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garrett</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dayna</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirk</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ross</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>272</strong></td>
<td><strong>1549</strong></td>
<td><strong>3782</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis of the data produced five emerging themes: Broad Social Change and Varying Public Mores in the U.S.; Planned Change and Militarizing the Police; Tactics and Practices Closely Shared between Veterans and Police; Utility of Military-Style Uniforms and Equipment in Police Operations; and Reflection – Consequences of Terrorism, Police Misconduct, and the Realities of Unconventional Violence.

The following section identifies the primary themes and their sub-themes. Beginning with Primary Theme #1, Sub-Theme A, and continuing through Primary Theme #5, the section draws from notable participant police officer comments and links to the literature. Each sub-theme is
further expanded through the use of the remaining participant officer comments as noted in Tables K1 through K5. Located under each sub-theme are context cues designed to provide a summative explanation of the nature of the questions prompting the participant quotes.

Following Table K5 is a discussion which narrows the focus further to the semantics involved in interview language and the utility of domain and taxonomy analysis in explaining the meaning of language.

Table 6 illustrates the primary themes, the aggregate number of files where the themes were found, and the total number of references, including sub-themes attributed to each primary theme.

Table 6
Primary Themes Derived from Data Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Themes</th>
<th>Files</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Broad Social Change and Varying Public Mores in the U.S.</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planned Change and the Militarization of Police</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utility of Military-Style Uniforms and Equipment in Police Operations</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tactics and Practices Closely Shared Between Police and Veterans</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflection – Consequences of Terrorism, Police Misconduct and the Realities of Unconventional Violence</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The first theme, Broad Social Change and Varying Public Mores in the U.S., addresses unexpected change in the public’s personal values, and general intolerance toward Muslim and Arab-Americans as perceived by the participant police officers in this study.

The second theme, Planned Change and the Militarization of Police, refers to the process of change management in terms of law enforcement organizations’ efforts to amend policy,
training, and operations and progress toward improving deficiencies in tactics, techniques, and protocols in addressing new and emerging threats to police.

The third theme, Utility of Military-Style Uniforms and Equipment in Police Operations, refers to the participant officers’ perceptions of their agencies’ approach to utilizing military expertise, equipment, and training in addressing new and evolving threats in policing.

The fourth theme, Tactics and Practices Closely Shared Between Police and Veterans, refers to the close, interactive training environment among police officers – both military veterans and those who have not served in the military – during training and operations where mutual interests in training take shape, and tactics, techniques, and procedures are shared.

Lastly, the fifth theme, Reflection – Consequences of Police Misconduct and the Realities of Unconventional Violence, refers to the perception of the participant officers and their beliefs that social media, terrorism, police misconduct, and active shooters have all contributed toward changing policing in the U.S. Theme 1 is discussed next.

**Theme 1: Broad Social Change and Varying Public Mores in the U.S.**

With a history of tenuous relationships between the police and the public in many portions of the U.S., the 9/11 terrorist attacks on the United States added another layer of complexity through which some police officers perceive an unexpected change in public behavior toward police as well as an increasing prevalence of acts of intolerance between dominant demographics and Muslim populations (Beutin, 2017; Luguri, Napier, & Dovidio, 2012). To that end, the participant police officers’ perceptions in this study offered varying views of the changing social behaviors they have experienced among the public. The following
comment compares the views of the military veterans in this study with those participant police officers who haven’t served in the military. Officer Carl said:

I think that there’s less of a respect for life amongst our citizenship… And I think that law enforcement, by certain groups, are looked at as less than human, so they’re easier to shoot… Again, I think that everything resolves or revolves around family and how the youth today is brought up with a different set of values. But as far as the response, that’s changed a lot of things in law enforcement because you have to respond to a location where your children maybe are, my child is at, my family is at. You’ve got assailants who are- have shown that they are committed to committing murder on children.

Similarly, Officer Colt stated, “I just think people are more brazen. You know, there’s less recourse for actions taken and just, you know, there’s just not responsible- There’s not consequences for their actions towards law enforcement anymore.”

Officer Kirk added his perceptions, stating,

People don’t really respect the police like they used to. And, again, it goes back to those one or two bad apples across the country who made bad decisions and either were convicted or they got off. And the public just, you know, thinks, Okay, I’m scared to send my kid to the store because the police is gonna stop him and they gonna shoot him, or It becomes really, really sensitive.

From the perspective of a participant officer who has not served in the military, Officer Garrett stated, “I think the human race is getting crazier. People are getting sicker, more people are getting on drugs, more people are getting desperate.” Two sub-themes emerged from the interviews: a) prejudice and b) social media.
**Sub-Theme A: Prejudice.** The literature chronicles links to prejudice and bias in the examples of hate crimes and criminal victimization that involve Arab-Americans living in the U.S. prior to and since the terrorist attacks on 9/11 (Ferrall, 2001; Moradi & Hasan, 2004; Nassar-McMillan, Lambert, & Hakim-Larson, 2011). These social interactions place this vulnerable population in frequent contact with government agencies and under public scrutiny as to whether they pose a threat to others. In response to a question asking whether the attacks on 9/11 changed law enforcement in some way, striking similarities were found between police participant officers representing two different agencies. These officers serve in roles that require them to be impartial arbitrators of the law, as alluded to in the comments provided by Officer Carl, a military veteran, and Officer Garrett, who has not served in the military. “So now you’ve got an integrated society where, again, simply because you’re wearing, you know, an outfit that would indicate you’re a Muslim or something to that nature doesn’t mean that you’re a terrorist,” Officer Carl explained.

Officer Garrett, who, when responding to questions of whether terrorism had changed policing and his perception of relationships between the police and the public, drew attention to the matter of racial discrimination against certain ethnic classes. He said,

There’s actually – and I’m sure it’s been around forever – but there’s actually terrorists in our country and they’re real. And it- whether they’re Arab, Muslim, Jewish, whoever they are. White, black, it doesn’t matter. A terrorist doesn’t, you know, stick with a race or gender or anything like that.

Officer Michael, formerly in the Army, offered an introspective view of race as viewed in the context of a law enforcement situation. As an African-American male, his perspective of race
has placed him in situations more than once where he has had to clarify the importance of resolving the public safety matter at hand and explain certain priorities to citizens who may be concerned about the influence of race in a given situation. He said,

‘And what I typically get is, you know, it’s just the way our society is, sometimes the African-Americans will think that I should be looking out for them, and I say, “I’m here to make sure nothing happened. I don’t specifically owe you a favor or anything. I’m here to make sure a crime wasn’t committed and that everybody’s being treated, you know, fairly and impartially and everything is being taken care of.”’

Emerging from within the discussion over broad social change was communication in the form of social media. A discussion highlighting social media through the eyes of the participant officers follows next.

**Sub-Theme B: Social Media.** Critical scholars and mass media have argued that a general lack of respect for police exists among much of the public due to law enforcement’s failure to hold police officers accountable for corrupt behavior and, as a result, underserved classes who interact most frequently with police are too often placed in greater jeopardy of victimization by police (Gamal, 2016; Gross & Mann, 2017; Hayes, 2015; Hesford, 2015; McNair, 2011; Mihal, 2015; Shjarback, Nix, & Wolfe, 2018; Stewart, Schreck, & Simons, 2006).

To the question of whether the participating police officers believed that policing itself had changed, several non-veteran police officers discussed their perceived lack of respect from the public and media influence. Officer Leslie replied,

‘I think that the rhetoric that’s been pushed is so negative, and now you’re seeing more and more with social media – it’s hurt us so bad…. And then, now people, I think, in
general, are more apt to do things like that. They find it funny, it goes on Facebook, it gets national recognition. These people are on there harassing deputies and having deputies walk away from them. It makes everybody a lot more dangerous.

Officer Jamie responded in this way:

I think, just in very recent years, you know, we’re not given the respect as used to so there’s a lot more- You know, we show up on scenes and I think there’s a lot more degrading and, you know, you- So I think that ends up being- You have to be more on your, you know, your mindset, your officer safety because I think we’re just not respected in some communities – not all.

Officer Dayna said,

I think the liberal media demonizes police. They report without all the facts. It’s too opinionated. If they would just report the facts, I think people could make their own conclusions, but I do think that they are trying to promote, maybe, a fear of police becoming too militarized to where people feel like they should be scared of us instead of trusting us.

Regarding the question of whether the media is influencing the public from a military veteran’s perspective, Officer Griffin, a former Marine, replied,

Well, to an extent, it’s always what you see in front of you whenever you have a law enforcement interaction, and so a lot of people are going to develop their own opinions, but media – the pictures or videos and the circumstances- Are you gonna see most of the things that are reported on media?

Table K1 in Appendix K offers some other relevant quotes from the participant officers.
Varying perspectives frame the thoughts of the participant officers – irrespective of military status – regarding their views of changes in public behaviors, attitudes toward legal consequences, the influence of media, and declining respect for police. These elements all speak to a degree of difficulty in police officers’ ability to do their jobs, opening the door to questions about how these challenges may be addressed. With evidence of congressional legislative actions preceding the transfer of military equipment and training to police, a number of questions to each participant officer inquired about organizational change, approaches to leadership and problem solving within their agencies, and the relationship to legislation affecting police operations.

Participant officer comments directed toward the topics surrounding Theme 2 follows next.

Theme 2: Planned Change and the Militarization of Police

The interviews covered organizational change through the lens of leadership. Each participant officer responded to questions inquiring as to how change takes place in their agency, whether they felt their organizations allowed them sufficient input with their ideas and strategies when attempting to change approaches to training or operations, and whether they perceived their operations were affected by legislative acts in some way. Kotter’s (1996) notion of organizational change expands the leadership attribute lens from individual contributions and considers the strategy when agencies empower employees to act and the outcomes which may result when communication, developing vision, and anchoring new change among mutually interested coalitions of actors is encouraged.

Three participant officers who are military veterans responded to the question of whether there was a formalized process for changing a procedure and the protocols that affect policy
becoming practice. Officer Carl said, “Change really takes place when somebody feels the pain in their ass to get it changed.” To the question of whether his agency enabled change management, Officer Griffin stated, “Depends on the change, but yes. We can put in requests to change policy. We can experiment with things and see what works. We can determine if something is not working and look for a solution.” Officer Michael answered these questions in this way:

Typically, it’ll start out with an idea. And then you get someone or a group of us who will try to see how it works, put the plan into action and then evaluate it. And then, at that point, it’s like, hey. Here’s this great idea we have; we’re submitting how we’ve assessed it and analyzed it, and here’s the pros and cons.

From a non-veteran perspective, Officer Leslie responded to the same questions concerning the process of how change took place in the agency by stating,

I mean, it depends on what the change is, like, you know, to what degree it is. Most of our agency, though, is changed based on, “I have this idea. I would like to do it,” and it goes up probably to a director level and the director says, “Go ahead and try.”

To the question of whether she felt like she had sufficient input in changing policy or practice, she replied, “Yeah. I mean, to a certain- I mean, obviously I’m a sergeant, so, like, if I was higher ranked, I’d have more.”

Although the literature on leadership defines the attribute in a number of ways, MacFarlane, Senn, and Childress (1993) contend that effective leadership is an approach which may originate from any level of an organization and depends on a variety of qualities, skills, and capabilities that people bring to bear during organizational change. This position aligns to the
arguments of Bass (1985) and Burns (1978) and their contributions to transformational leadership. For example, across the agencies represented in this study, each participant officer was clear in his or her belief that, during the process of planned change involving equipment and training, both agency and employee interacted in collaborative ways that influenced one another, employee and employer outcomes were valued, goals transcended the personal interests of employee and organization, and the importance of achievement was recognized, as was finding a balance between the well-being of the employees and the organization.

To the question of whether he felt like his input led to recent changes in his agency’s practice regarding certain tactics and procedures, Officer Garrett replied,

Sometimes, yes. Sometimes if it’s critical, it’s immediately, you know, either spread through word or by email, and “this is how were going to do this now,” or it can be a formal process of, “Hey, this incident happened. This is what I’ve learned and this is what saved my life and somebody else’s life. I think we should start doing it this way, or at least try it.” And what’s good about our agency is, if there is an incident- I can give an example of- There was an officer-involved shooting with a couple of deputies and I’m not sure if they ran out of ammunition or one of them ran out of ammunition in their rifle, but the other one had an actual-patrol duty belt, an extra AR-15 magazine holster on it, and had to take- I believe what happened was, he had to take his- get more ammunition from him. So, something like that, to where, “Hey this is what happened. This is what we learned.”

To questions surrounding whether the effect of laws addressing local law enforcement’s preparation and response to acts of terrorism impacted an agency in a positive way, the
participant officers varied in their views. For example, Officer Carl and Officer Randy both replied with a simple “No.” Officer Leslie elaborated:

The legislation that’s come through – not all of them, but some of the legislation that’s coming through – has made our jobs way more difficult, much more difficult but for officer safety, because they don’t consider the officer safety portion of what they’re asking us to do.

Conversely, Officer Jamie stated, “I think, as far as training and just the intelligence aspect of it, yes.” Likewise, Officer Ross said, “Oh yeah…it provided, like, equipment, grants, and resources; everything that they’ve given us- like, I mean, the command vehicles that we have – it’s pretty awesome.”

Three sub-themes – a) Procedure, b) Practice, and c) Communication – emerged from the interviews.

**Sub-Theme A: Procedure.** A fundamental principle of Kotter’s (1996) notion of organizational change, vision is used to identify strategies that inspire change, and the act of consistency is important in communicating the vision when instances of resistance occur. As is common with negotiating change with others, opposition to efforts toward change should be expected (Galvin & Clark, 2015). Developing procedures and processes is an essential but challenging part of organizational operations.

Comments from Officer Ross illustrated the differences in procedural expectations between command and their direct reports when he said,

Say it’s a new policy comes out or new procedures of how they’re handling things that usually gets decided- the third floor and then it gets passed down, “This is why,” as
opposed to, like, “We may not agree with it, we don’t have a say and we’ll offer opinions.” It’s just “Here’s the new rule.” No, not necessarily, because we just know that’s the way it is, and there’s no- I hate to say it, but there’d be no point in bringing it up because they’ve already made a decision.

However, Officer Griffin offered a slightly different viewpoint in response to questions of processes and procedural changes from within his organization:

Usually policy follows, and everything that I’m thinking of is- You know, we realize we’re doing something different and so we’re going to have to set the new tone, maybe create a standard operating procedure for that new policy, which eventually might turn into a policy change.

To questions surrounding changing or amending procedure, Officer Colt said,

It depends on what kind of change it is. As far as, I think, academia or, you know, policy and procedures or whatever it might be, yeah, it’s going to be a more formal route. But over here, we have the ability to, let’s say, implement things that maybe aren’t written down. And we can pass that on to people. So we can make the change here, mainly geared towards tactics and gun fighting and stuff like that.

One aspect of policy making is the eventual adoption of practices best suited for the organization’s mission (Huber, 1991; Marcoulides & Heck, 1993). The application of practice within organizational contexts is discussed next.

**Sub-Theme B: Practice.** The limited integration of military tactics, techniques, and procedures within policing has created a community of practice among police officers who are military veterans along with officers who have no prior military service record. These
communities combine the expertise of both groups in shared interests. In this case, that shared interest is training to address emerging threats to police (Wenger & Snyder, 2000; Zakhary, 2013). In the execution of practice, the interaction between a police officer who is currently serving in the military and a police officer who has not served is important. The interviews also revealed an open-mindedness as far as what other police officer peers had to say about comparing the advice of military veterans to that of non-veterans. For example, Officer Griffin, who is a military veteran, detailed his experience with other veterans during training and the organizational change process when he said, “I’d say it’s just as useful as having somebody who came from another agency. Every person comes with their own background knowledge and experiences to bring to the table.”

Officer Colt, who is a military veteran, said, “Once again, I think it depends on what it is. I mean, we’re not going to be making- excuse me- influencing commanders on administrative stuff at the main building over there, but we have a lot of influence on tactics.”

Officer Ross, who has not served in the military, offered the following when asked about the influence of military veterans during training: “Yes. I’ve been helped by them before. At the firing range and I’ve seen some tips and some other things that they provided in our scenarios that we do with the SWAT team and stuff like that.” Officer Leslie, another non-veteran, stated, “I mean, they are trained for the possibility of things going bad, probably, more than law enforcement is. You know what I mean? We’re kind of put out there on the streets and stuff like that and things go bad and we adjust it, but I think the military is trained pregame. You know?”
Communication is vital within the information sharing process if ideas and strategies are to flourish between management and employees (Daft & Huber, 1986; Levitt & March, 1988). Communication in the context of top/down, bottom/up engagement follows.

**Sub-Theme C: Communication.** Kotter (1996) is clear in his argument that for organizational change to occur, communication is dependent upon the willingness of others who use it in both words and deeds to help drive the vision for change. Essential to effective communication is feedback. Officer Chris, who has served in the military, offered the following comment regarding effective methods of communication: “Yeah, we give feedback kind of like an after-action brief.”

Officer Carl had the following to say about training practices as an outcome of communicative processes throughout his organization:

Actually, I think in our agency, change is initiated at all levels. I think it is…. Yeah, I think it’s open and progressive…. I think everybody is pretty open to training changes based on- You know, training is- What you do is dictated based on what happens in the world. So, what you did a year ago, you may have to do differently today. It’s just that fluid. So, you have to be open for those ideas.

Officer Dayna responded to the question of whether she felt she had sufficient input into working with her organization and contributing to devising new strategies with, “I think we’ve got some good people in leadership that have put their egos aside and recognize, like, that there’s a bigger picture out there.” Table K2 in Appendix K offers relevant quotes from the participant officers across the three agencies for Theme 2: Planned Change and the Militarization of Police.
Interviews offer insight into the challenges of negotiating change within a well-established organizational culture. Several participant officers held contrasting views of the usefulness of law, and agencies made a clear choice to use transformational leadership between executives and subordinate personnel in collaborative problem solving involving matters pertaining to the safety of law enforcement personnel. Much of the critical literature has focused on police use of rifles and other specialized equipment to better and more safely carry out officers’ duties, for example, such as the use of armored vehicles during police operations. A portion of each interview focused on participant officer perceptions of the origin of choosing this equipment and the rationale behind the decisions to use it.

Participant officer comments directed toward the topics surrounding Theme 3 follows next.

**Theme 3: Utility of Military-Style Uniforms and Equipment in Police Operations**

Social learning and pragmatism hold that we make choices based upon observable stimuli and learn through our adaptations to the environment (Bandura, 1965; Dewey, 1938). The debate over the metaphor of war has been a part of the militarization discourse since the 1990s (Kappeler & Kraska, 1997). Reacting to environmental threats while using a pragmatist view of personal safety and serving others, the interviews of the participants in this study provide revealing insight into their perceptions of the militarization of police phrase and its connection to the utility of military-style equipment and the AR-15 rifle chosen to protect themselves.

Lewin’s (1939) contributions to social psychology are framed in part by his notion that problem solving from an individual and group-centered sociological perspective involves the application of specific tools to broad, concrete problems. In this light and considering the varying
perceptions of the participant officers’ views of militarizing the police, their responses reflect a multi-layered view of problem solving. Their comments also include noting what militarizing the police involves, recognizing the public optics of equipment and uniforms, and acknowledging concerns over the appearance of using militarized equipment and practices in the perceived coercive control of others.

At the heart of this study was obtaining the personal perceptions of the phrase “militarization of police” from participant police officers to answer Research Question #1.

Critical views of militarizing the police have dominated the literature since the late 1990s (Balko, 2006; Kappeler & Kraska, 1997). The perceptions of the participant officers varied across the three agencies. Their comments are categorized first as police officers who are military veterans, followed by those who are not military veterans. To the question of what the phrase “militarization of police” meant to the military veterans, Officer Michael responded in this way:

I believe what it means to me is, you’re seeing law enforcement having a necessity to have better equipment, militarized equipment- Coming from the military, whenever we deployed, we had top-of-the-line equipment and a lot of it is for survivability purposes.

Officer Griffin stated, “My understanding usually refers to the equipment in the sense that it will be hardened or armored vehicles and other sorts of personal equipment, such as heavier vests or helmets or long rifles that are issued to police.” Officer Colt had the following to say: “People tend to see the big armored vehicles and the rifles, and, you know, all that- ‘you don’t need all that kind of stuff,’ but they don’t understand the context of what it’s being used for.”
Moving in a slightly different direction from the other military veterans, to the question of what militarizing the police meant to him, Officer Chris stated,

Very little to me, because in the patrol aspect of it, we don’t hear- we don’t see it too much. But my understanding of militarization of police – it’s just from what I hear – is the police mimicking operations, even the looks of the military when they’re performing certain functions. And it probably refers to more a tactical aspect like the SWAT, versus your line-level patrol officers.

In response to the question of what militarization of police meant to the participant police officers who are not military veterans, Officer Garrett said, “I think, putting it from a public perspective, is when people see it as the way people dress, the way law enforcement dresses in a particular way.” Officer Jamie stated,

Well, in a simple sense, kind of law enforcement being like the military. Meaning, you know, having similar equipment, the same equipment, you know, tactically using- uniform is different. I mean, we are changing our uniforms now – or trying to.

Half of the 12 participant officers in this study viewed the militarization of police as relating to how police mirror the appearance and equipment that the U.S. military uses. The other half varied in their views of the militarization of police and described the phenomenon as one where police use military rank structure similar to the U.S. military, as well as the public perception of police appearing to use coercive, authoritarian methods in their interactions with the public as presented by the national media. Comments from several of the participant officers in this study also indicate that they’ve given thought and consideration to the optics of how
police are uniformed and equipped and recognize that it may fuel public concerns that military-
influenced training and equipment will alter police behavior.

From a Lewin (1939) or Dewey (1938) perspective, the uniforms and equipment discussed during this study were described by each participant officer in terms of their functional advantages and suitability against threats and weapons faced during law enforcement situations, and therefore appear to follow the tenets of social psychology’s pragmatist approach to problem solving. The utility of specialized equipment like the AR-15\(^1\) rifle and armored vehicles as used in domestic law enforcement operations follows next.

Concerning the application of the AR-15 rifle in law enforcement operations, participant officers who have not served in the military had some notable comments. Officer Dayna said, “Well, a handgun’s only good accurately – for most patrol officers – what, five to seven yards? So, a rifle allows us more of a safer distance – more accuracy on a longer shot. It’s a beautiful tool.” In responding to the question of his perception of the usefulness of the AR-15 in law enforcement operations, Officer Randy replied,

Absolutely, yes. We always want to be, you know, one up, if we can. So if there’s a suspect, or whatever call we’re going to, has a pistol, we’re obviously gonna bring a rifle. And that’s the highest-grade weapon that we’re issued, so we’re obviously gonna bring that.

Officer Jamie shared the following: “I see it as a help to me in law enforcement because I don’t believe that we receive the same training as the military with that weapon.” Officer Garrett stated, “I think it’s a great tool. Distance, little bit greater firepower, more accuracy.” Officer

\(^1\) Semi-automatic rifle followed the M-16 rifle used in U.S. military operations.  
https://www.wilsoncombat.com/5-56/
Ross provided unique insight beyond the utility of the rifle and shared what it meant to his confidence when armed with this equipment:

I think it’s a great tool to have as a police officer. I feel confident to go into a bad situation. If a person has a high-powered rifle as well or they’re like- it’s a standoff and, you know, most people on the streets have rifles now, and so it makes me feel- ‘cause I’m confident in it, I know what I can do.

From the perspective of military veteran police officers, Officer Carl offered his experience in the field with the AR-15 rifle handling issues in populated rural areas:

For me, it’s a more precise shot. Even at close range. But again, if you- we’re very rural so we may go out to a guy who’s held up on a two-acre lot and it’s 400 yards from the road to his house and there’s nothing to hide behind, so you need a rifle with the ability to reach out that far in the event he starts shooting back.

Officer Colt said the following:

I’m very biased when it comes to a long gun. A lot of people we have come through in-service – they’ll touch that rifle once a year. They’re not proficient with it. They’d much rather try to take a 50-yard shot down a hallway with a handgun – and they can’t barely pass the qualification anyway – than deploy a rifle. I’m completely comfortable with my rifle. I would take it anywhere.

While the introduction of rifles has received considerable critical review, the use of armored vehicles in law enforcement operations has added fuel to the argument that a culture crisis exists in policing (Endebak, 2014; Paul & Birzir, 2008; Peake, 2015). Officer Colt offered his position on the confusion over the use of armored vehicles in law enforcement:
People tend to see the big armored vehicles and the rifles, and, you know, all that—“You don’t need all that kind of stuff,” but they don’t understand the context of what it’s being used for…. A piece of equipment you use in the tactical world. People look at it and say, “Oh, it’s, you know, a military vehicle.” Well, it’s armored. So, I mean, you can’t make an armored vehicle not have armor, usually.

Viewed another way, Officer Chris replied the following when asked if he could see why people might feel threatened by armored vehicles:

I can see their perception of it possibly being a threat because of this worry about the police state, you know, being controlled by the police and being oppressed by the police.

So, I can see that aspect of it.

In responding to questions seeking an example of the need for armored vehicles, Officer Carl recounted a recent public safety situation involving a former Marine armed with a shoulder-fired rocket launcher. When asked if he had encountered suspects with prior military training, he noted, “And they’re only getting better-armed…. To the point where they even can get possession of an AT4 shoulder-launched rocket.”

Another notable change in equipment which emerged during the interviews was the use of tourniquets by the participant officers during law enforcement operations. The use of tourniquets as a life-saving device is more often referred to in professional police and medical journals rather than in the academic literature (Butler, 2017; Kleinman & Kastre, 2012). The literature has kept its focus on armored vehicles, unmanned aerial vehicles, long rifles, and tear gas used by police during high-profile national events (Arnaud, 2015; Delehanty, Mewhirter, Welch, & Wilks, 2017; Hixson, 2015). The participant police officers in this study were asked
about training conducted by military instructors involving the use of tourniquets in law enforcement operations. Officer Colt, a former Marine, noted,

I was just at ----- for my last SWAT week and, you know, some guys from ---------gave us a, you know, a revised version of our ------ and it was awesome. Those guys- the one guy was a damn pararescue guy, so, I mean, he was pretty much… He was pretty much almost a doctor. He was teaching us that stuff, so it was pretty good stuff.

In consideration of the safety of his peers within his agency, Officer Griffin shared the following:

Well, because of the possible injuries we could be facing, it’s very important; because of the possible injuries the public could be facing, it’s also very important. And there are a lot of very serious non-gunshot-related injuries that are very appropriate for a tourniquet. Actually, we just started – I want to say within the last year – issuing belt pouches for those tourniquets. So, in addition to having it strapped to something or in your car, a lot of our deputies actually are carrying that all the time.

Officer Chris offered the following example of the advantages of tourniquet use in law enforcement operations:

So all officers are issued a tourniquet, and a tourniquet is- we can either use it- It’s mainly for us when we get shot…. But if you- Of course, if you encounter someone that’s injured – doesn’t even have to be shot; stabbing, a lost limb – with my officers, I put tourniquets on for citizens as well for that immediate medical treatment…. My officer put on a- They responded to a crash with injuries – motorcyclist. And the motorcyclist’s left leg was severed after the crash from the- pretty much the knee-down. So the officer put
the tourniquet as high on the leg as possible and he actually— the doctor at the hospital said if this tourniquet wasn’t on, he probably would’ve bled out.

Officer Garrett, who is not a veteran, also noted the advantages of tourniquet use in law enforcement operations. He said,

We’re actually fortunate enough now: Somebody had the good idea to put tourniquets on us. All patrol officers have tourniquets on their duty belts. So why not only have a tourniquet for yourself if you get injured? You know, and I think there were scenarios where they used them on citizens, which is great. Not only did you save- you could have saved your life, but you save someone else’s life, not in a SWAT situation. Maybe it was a car crash or someone was shot. But, you know, why can’t we have that full capability now?

The use of medical equipment impressed Officer Dayna to such a degree she shared the following:

Well, you know, we’ve got the tourniquet now that’s been issued- Yeah. Real nice tourniquet, and I’ve seen some good videos of officers that have been able to use them, which is amazing. There is a bleed stop – it’s a powder, I think, that you put in- I haven’t been issued any yet, but I’ve thought about even buying it to keep it at home…. We also carry the AEDs\(^2\).

Officer Leslie provided another example within her jurisdiction that emphasized the importance of tourniquets as issued equipment to police officers in her agency:

Oh, absolutely. Yeah, well we had- obviously we had, after ---- was shot, for us all to get tourniquets. And then we all got go bags, and then that’s when he’s actually- I don’t know what branch of the military he’s in, but he’s the one who actually came in and trained us. There’s a guy who works here who’s medically- he’s a medical combat whatever, and so he trained all of us. And the guy who was shot in ------, that’s how he was- ended up being saved by ------. But the reason was because of the training that the deputy had received, he was able to, really, save his life.

Three sub-themes emerged from the interviews: a) Warrior Mindset, b) Self-Defense, and c) Self-Efficacy. Next follows a discussion surrounding the meaning of warrior mindset.

**Sub-Theme A: Warrior Mindset.** The term *warrior mindset* is a metaphor used to draw attention to the critique over language argued by many as inappropriate to domestic police operations and more analogous to soldiers on the battlefield (Kienscherf, 2016; Meeks, 2006; Paoline & Gau, 2018). The terminology may establish some context for a police culture approach in confronting emerging new threats such as domestic terrorists and active shooters which are unlike anything law enforcement officers have previously faced in their traditional public safety roles. For example, as proffered by Dewey (1938) and Lewin (1947), the genesis of an individual reacting to and solving environmental problems begins with perceiving the problem, then believing in an oriented plan to address a situation. In this light, the participant officers had a number of comments in response to questions pertaining to a warrior mindset. Officer Carl contributed the following to this discussion:

For me, the warrior mindset means they never say no, never give up. It applies specific to when officers are attacked or shot or injured on duty that you don’t quit fighting for your
life; even though you may lose your life, you continue to fight. That’s really the only thing that applies to…. Cops don’t want to be soldiers.

Officer Michael stated the following:

I believe the warrior mindset, when I do hear it, is that warriors are the ones who go into harm’s way every day, just like I used to ask my soldiers to go on very, very dangerous missions every day. I would go with them from time to time, but as a leader, I knew I had to send them in harm’s way just like this. I have deputies who work for me; every call that I send them to, I know it could be potentially harmful to them.

Officer Colt offered the following and included an example of training that his agency supports in addressing the warrior mindset:

I think it’s important to have a warrior mindset. We have mindset classes here for our new hires that we have come on. Then ---- comes in and gives a mindset class. We try to make sure they understand that this is the real deal. You could die just coming to work. So, I mean, you’re a target just sitting in traffic, unlike anybody else – Joe Blow plumber man going home, sitting in traffic – he don’t have to worry about somebody just putting bullet holes in his car just because he’s driving a marked patrol car.

Regarding the meaning of warrior mindset for the officers participating in this study who have not served in the U.S. Military, Officer Jamie offered, “That you’re going to make it out of whatever situation you’re in. You’re gonna live, you’re gonna survive, you’re going to take care of business, you’re gonna- You’re helping someone else.” Officer Leslie shared her thoughts as well:
Warrior mindset is to go into something knowing that there’s a possibility that you’re going to get hurt, you’re going to get killed, and you’re going to stay the course anyways, that there are- the people in there, their lives are more valuable, honestly, even than you going in to be able to secure that scene, to take over safely. And you have to have that mindset, really, in law enforcement.

A prevalent phrase used during the interviews in conjunction with describing the definition of warrior mindset was self-defense. The following section details the participant police officers’ thoughts on self-defense as part of their job.

**Sub-Theme B: Self-Defense.** The Tennessee v. Garner 471, U.S. 1 (1985) decision clarified *self-defense* parameters for police in specific instances where the use of force is necessary (Tennenbaum, 1994). The Supreme Court has recognized that police officers must protect themselves from all types of force in their work. As a direct result, police appear to have, over time, also considered weapons for use in self-defense which differ from the weapons police have traditionally used against heavily armed criminal offenders. This range of weapons for self-defense against threats involving lethal force includes less-lethal weapons such as foam projectile launched delivery systems\(^3\), traditional handguns, and, over the last several years, the AR-15 rifle (Defense Technology, 2019).

Using social psychology’s approach of applying specific tools to address concrete problems and making choices in adaptations to environmental stimuli, law enforcement officers appear to have adopted equipment and training they believe will enable them to protect themselves in dynamic life-threatening situations (Dewey, 1938; Lewin, 1939).

---

\(^3\) The 40mm multi-launcher is a less lethal weapon designed to deliver impact or gas munitions. Defense Technology, 2019.
Officer Garrett’s comments reflected an attitude of survival in defending himself when he said,

You’re talking to a citizen and all of a sudden they get very hostile, and after we’re talking just like me and you are, trying to get information, if they start balling up their fists or they start reaching in their pocket for something, and then that’s when you have to flip that switch and have that mindset of, “I’m gonna win this fight, not you.”

Also addressing her approach to self-defense, Officer Dayna said, “Like, you’re either willing on duty, off duty, no matter where you are, what you have with you, that you are going to address the problem or the threat to protect yourself and other people.”

Executing tasks during periods of increased stress requires a certain amount of personal confidence and, as viewed through the lens of the participant police officers in this study, a high degree of self-efficacy.

**Sub-Theme C: Self-Efficacy.** Bandura’s (1977) notion of having the confidence to execute an action involving a task emerges from interviews as important in the lives of law enforcement officers involved in matters of life and death. Having the confidence to execute an action under great duress is critical to ensure survival, as evidenced by a comment from Officer Ross (a non-vet) about his self-efficacy with a rifle: “I’m not a great firearm person, like, I’m not the best shooter, but I know I could shoot good with that because I can hit 50 yards and it gives me confidence that I’m not gonna miss.”

Another participant officer and military veteran, Officer Griffin, disclosed his concern for the safety of others in connection with the accuracy advantage the rifle provides, which affects anyone near an incident he is involved in:
Well, it’s safety, accuracy. The ability to hit what you’re aiming at, at a little bit longer range, which is going to protect me better and anybody else. And if I have to enter into a gun battle with the suspect, that I’m not endangering the public as much as that person might be…. You need the ability to go out there and, one, talk to people to find out what’s going on, what the needs of any situation are, and then have the presence of confidence to safely perform the job task, whatever it might be.

Officer Dayna echoed Officer Griffin’s thoughts on the importance of having confidence when executing tasks, saying,

They cycled the whole agency through, and the second day, we worked with ---- and, I mean, they came out with their equipment and their trucks and it was training for them, too, where we cleared it and then we would go in with them to the places that we had people and evacuated them. And so we worked with them, which, to me, I think the public needs to know about that because that would instill more confidence in them that we’re working together and that we’re thinking ahead in how to handle the situations together.

Table K3 in Appendix K provides other data and quotes from the participant officers across agencies regarding Theme 3: Utility of Military-Style Uniforms and Equipment in Police Operations.

Interview statements found unanimity across the agencies in support of the utility of rifles and specialized equipment as essential contributors for self-defense. Differing hues of personal meaning became apparent regarding the optics of the public’s perception regarding police weapons and specialized equipment. The importance of police officers possessing a warrior
mindset was unearthed among the participant officers, and relationships between military
veterans and police training emerged. Perceptions of the learning environment between
participant officers, their peers and police trainers was discussed as a source for answers to
questions framed at inquiring about the possible diffusion of military practices applied to police
training.

Participant officer comments directed toward the topics surrounding Theme 4 follows
next.

**Theme 4: Tactics and Practices Closely Shared Between Police and Veterans**

From a Bronfenbrenner (1979) perspective, interpersonal activities and roles are
experienced by a developing person within a particular setting that has particular physical and
social characteristics. This experience is shared with others. The participant officers in this study
were asked questions spanning their strategic interests in reciprocal learning with one another,
whether they felt like they learned through modeling the behaviors of others as well as through
personal efforts in problem solving, and whether they responded to either a situational
environment and reacted to its setting or adjusted their behavior to the actions of an offender
within the environment. Other questions included whether each participant officer felt that his or
her skill levels improved in certain contexts as a result of the guidance provided by a police
officer who was a military veteran and whether they found the interaction helpful in learning.

To the question of whether training with military veterans offers a mutually beneficial
experience, Officer Griffin, who is a military veteran, replied,

We have a great training program in-house in the agency and I know that several of our
training deputies are military veterans. They all give very insightful training to all of the
deputies who have military – or not – experience going through- because our training
deputies teach active shooter… So, certainly some good knowledge and expertise that
they can share.

Officer Jamie, who is not a military veteran, stated,

Take, for example, if I was out on the range or just in conversation and I had a vet – you
know, a combat vet – speaking with me, talking about shooting, talking about, you know,
hands-on- Yes, I would find great value in that.

Four sub-themes emerged from the interviews: a) Reciprocal Training Value, b)
Modeling, c) Problem Solving, and d) Threat-Driven Evaluation.

**Sub-Theme A: Reciprocal Training Value.** The literature has chronicled approaches to
improving police training over time, from adult learning to problem solving (Herndon, 2016;
Killacky, 1991). Evidence of Bronfenbrenner’s contention that social settings, environment,
experience and reciprocal interaction between actors impacts human development is found in the
participants in this study (Schiering, 2012). The importance of the interactive learning experience
was emphasized by participant officers who fall in the military veteran category as well as who
are in the non-veteran category, as demonstrated in comments provided by Officers Colt and
Garrett. Officer Colt, a former Marine, stated, “Well we do it all the time if we got some
downtime. ‘Hey you wanna go shoot?’ ‘Yeah, come on, let’s go.’” Similarly, Officer Garrett, a
non-veteran, replied,

If some of my guys say, “Let’s go to the range, or let’s go- it’s your day off and let’s go
here and do this,” we’ll all do it. If it’s something that our SWAT commander or sheriff
says, “Hey give this training a shot,” I’ll do it, and I even go to the range and do training on my own time.

Officer Chris, a military veteran, offered his perception of the value of shared experiences and practices when he said,

The veteran – especially those veterans that are- were in combat arms in the past – they bring a wealth of knowledge out to our young officers here. Even though they’re new themselves to law enforcement, they have that background that they can share.

Officer Carl shared the following concerning his perceptions of the value of shared experiences in training: “The guy that teaches our combat medic stuff is a combat medic. Two of them. We have two combat medics on staff who are police officers…. They’re still in. They’re reserve.” Officer Michael echoed Officer Carl’s remarks about the background of some of the police trainers on staff in his agency: “Yes, we have a couple actual combat life savers that work here at the agency and conduct training regularly.”

To the question of whether a military veteran who is a police officer adds additional insight into the training environment, Officer Griffin remarked,

We have a great training program in-house in the agency and I know that several of our training deputies are military veterans. They all give very insightful training to all of the deputies who have military – or not – experience.

Officer Colt called out the importance in practice of training with experienced hands:

Yeah, I mean, I think, like, the debriefs from the Vegas stuff, and stuff like that. You see where the more experienced people are chucking people in cars and getting them out of
there – off the X and all that kind of stuff – where maybe a newer guy would be trying to
treat them on scene in the hot zone or something like that.

Officer Ross confirmed, “Yes. I’ve been helped by them before…at the firing range, and I’ve
seen some tips and some other things that they provided in our scenarios that we do with the
SWAT team and stuff like that.” From a learning perspective, the value of modeling is discussed
next.

**Sub-Theme B: Modeling.** Bandura’s (1965) social learning theory experiments with
children found modeling cues present when choices were based upon observed stimuli. Decades
of scenario-based police training support law enforcement’s recognition of the importance of
applying social learning concepts to decision making (Weiler, 2018). Regarding participant
police officers’ perceptions of learning through modeling another’s behaviors, Officer Michael,
who is a military veteran, replied, “Yes, I take a lot of tools from other people’s toolboxes and
make it mine.” Another military veteran, Officer Kirk, responded to the question of modeling
another in the affirmative when he said,

Most definitely, most definitely… One, you get to see what he’s doing and not doing.
Then, you try to talk to him and pick his brain and figure out, “What are you thinking
when you’re going through this? Why did you make this decision?” There are a few
sergeants who are on their way out who are extremely tactical. Never been in the
military, but they just picked it up over the years because they’ve done a lot of different
trainings, and they are extremely good. So, you watch what they do, and you just kind of
pick their brains.
In her response to the question of the importance of modeling others’ behavior in learning, Officer Jamie, who is not a military veteran, said, “You get value from that. It’s beneficial.” Officer Garrett, who is also not a veteran, echoed Officer Jamie’s comments when he noted the following:

We learn a lot not just from doing it, but… Does this feel right? Does this work? Is this not faster, but is this more accurate? Is this safer? You know, when you do something, you see, whether it’s in person or you see it online, and you try it yourself in a safe environment – on a range, per se – and if you’re, you know, you’ve done the same thing for so long, are you doing what he’s showing you better? You know, is he or she showing you better, or does it not work? You know, trying to validate what you’ve seen someone do.

Working and learning together in training scenarios and during actual law enforcement operations requires police officers to solve problems together. Problem solving is discussed next.

Sub-Theme C: Problem Solving. Saaty (1988) offers the following problem solving model applicable to decision making: “One must include enough relevant detail to represent the problem as thoroughly as possible; consider the environment surrounding the problem; identify the issues or attributes that contribute to the solution; and identify the participants associated with the problem” (p. 9).

Analogously, Officer Kirk offered the following comments with respect to solving unique environmental problems encountered during public safety training:
There is an area in ----- And they have buildings that are set up and they set up different scenarios. So I know, as a unit- One of my units, we go out there and we train. And I think that there are some sergeants who are skilled in those particular areas.

Similarly, Officer Carl considered both the environment and the offender in his approach to solving an active shooter problem. He remarked,

So, if you’ve got an active shooter, for example in a school, you really have to be familiar with the layout of the school, where the friendlies are, how the classrooms are laid out, and at the same time, kind of get a general idea of where the assailant is, and you have to approach- you have to make your approach based on the environment and you have to gauge your encounter based on his actions.

For this study, the environment and actors within its microsystem setting require understanding the context from which the participant police officers respond to Research Question #2: What do a sample of police officers perceive as the effect(s) of militarization within law enforcement operations? Police operations often exist within a threat-driven environment requiring judgment, evaluation, and execution of tasks. The issue of threat-driven evaluation is discussed next.

**Sub-Theme D: Threat-Driven Evaluation.** Bandura’s (1977) notion of self-efficacy and its relationship to developing coping efforts provides the framework from which one can see why police officers create situational/scenario-based contexts while working together as part of their training experiences in evaluating threats. Consistency was evident with slight variations in the responses among participant officers between both groups – veterans and non-veterans. Officer
Chris offered the following response concerning his perception of the evaluation process of the immediate environment vs. focusing on an offender’s threatening behavior:

    I think it’s got to be a balance of both. So, of course you would- Of course, your objective is to locate and neutralize the threat, but you’ve also got to recognize if it turns into a barricaded suspect now.

Officer Griffin, similarly, responded to the same question regarding how he evaluates the environment and/or the offender during a life-threatening situation, saying, “I think it’s a little bit of both, with a heavy focus on the offender’s actions.” Officer Michael replied, “A little bit of both. Like the environment of a school, you know. The designs can be completely different and they will influence how you go in.”

Several of the participant officers who are not military veterans responded in a similar fashion. Officer Garrett noted,

    For me and my training and my agency and my team, we would respond directly to the threat and make adjustments there – unless situation dictates where we’re, you know, on the way and then something changes to make adjustments then.

    In the context of distinguishing the importance of environment versus offender in determining the degree of threat, Officer Dayna explained that most of the weight of her decision falls on the offender, saying, “I can see it being a little bit of both where- It’s him. I say ‘him’ being the attacker.” Keeping environment and offender in mind when addressing whether one is more important than the other, Officer Leslie stated,
I think you do both. Yeah, you’re going to have to go on his- but it’s going to be a big thing of what you’re walking into. Are you in a preschool or are you in a mall? You know, it depends on the situation.

Table K4 in Appendix K shares participating officers’ responses related to Theme 4: Tactics and Practices Closely Shared Between Police and Veterans.

The value of close, reciprocal training between police officers and military veterans was discussed. Choices in preferred problem solving techniques emerged that included social learning and modeling, and the discussion captured the layers of evaluative processing among participant officers and the differences given to distinguishing environmental from offender-specific threats.

In keeping with Dolbeare and Schuman’s three-interview series format, participant officers reflected upon the answers they provided during the interviews. Follow-up questions were structured to suss out differences, similarities, and deeper meanings associated with earlier interview questions.

Participant officer comments directed toward the topics surrounding Theme 5 follows next.

**Theme 5: Reflection – Consequences of Terrorism, Police Misconduct, and the Realities of Unconventional Violence**

Following Dolbeare and Schuman’s (1982) three-interview series format, each interview concluded with a series of questions that asked each participant police officer to reflect upon the meaning of their lived experiences regarding the questions asked of each of them in totality. Using Dewey’s (1916) thoughts to illustrate the importance of reflection in thinking, Saltmarsh
(1996) contends that “without fostered reflective thinking, learning cannot move beyond conditioning, beyond the classroom, beyond formal education…. Without reflection…the connection between thought and action is dissipated” (p. 18).

Given the two research questions, the follow-up questions, the primary themes that emerged from this study, and the range of law enforcement issues that have, over time, become a significant part of each participant police officer’s lived experience, all were asked to reflect upon whether they believed policing had changed in some way and, in particular, what their thoughts were on the major incidents that led to this change.

The President of the United States signed the Homeland Security Act of 2002 on 11/25/2002. The act altered the traditional powers, mission statement, and duties of local, state, and federal law enforcement by providing them investigative and prosecutorial responsibility to respond to acts of terrorism.

Several participant officers across the agencies represented in this study noted the terrorist attacks on 9/11 as a major influencer in changing policing. As Officer Colt put it, “You know, 9/11, obviously.” Similarly, Officer Garrett pointed out, “A lot of terrorism has come into our country.”

A marked increase in the number of active shooter incidents has occurred annually in the U.S. between 2000 and 2017 (FBI, 2018). Some of the participant police officers involved in this study, both military veterans and not, put active shooters on an equal footing with 9/11 as far as what has had the greatest impact toward changing policing.

Officer Jamie emphasized the importance of both 9/11 and active shooter incidents in the following reflection responding to questions concerning what kinds of events were impactful on
policing practice: “Well, 9/11, and then all the, you know, the recent school shootings. That’s definitely upped our active shooter training. You know, deputies in schools now.” Similarly, Officer Carl thought both 9/11 and active shooter incidents had had the most impact in changing policing, listing “Active shooter, terrorism.”

Other participant officers considered today’s active shooters more impactful than 9/11 as far as changing policing. For example, Officer Dayna said,

Well, some of the things that we encounter nowadays are different from law enforcement 50 years ago. We’re actively studying active shooters and we’re not even calling them active shooters anymore. We call them active attackers because they’re transitioning with their weapons style.

Similarly, Officer Colt stated, “Oh yeah. I mean, Columbine was a big thing when I first got hired—that changed a lot of stuff.”

As a result of the reflection portion of the interviews, four subthemes emerged: a) Officer Safety, b) Racial Profiling, c) Social Media, and d) Military Equipment/Training. The issue of officer safety is discussed next.

**Sub-Theme A: Officer Safety.** The importance of learning from incidents involving the injury or death of another police officer is a genuine concern for police officers striking a balance between awareness of personal safety and reacting to contact with the public where circumstances could change at any moment (Myers, 2018; Pinizzotto, Davis, & Miller III, 2007). Comments from Officer Griffin offered insight into the importance of learning to be safer through evaluating other incidents when he stated, “I got the app on my phone that pops up when an officer has been killed and kind of lessons learned- of seeing what went wrong for that officer
and is there something I can learn from them?” Officer Jamie expressed her feelings of
remaining safe in the following way: “I mean, you have to protect yourself while surviving,
while helping, while, you know, with getting work done.”

The subject of racial profiling in reflection is discussed next.

**Sub-Theme B: Racial Profiling.** Much of the police militarization discourse has been
dominated by arguments that militarizing the police through training and equipment furthers
racial stratification between dominant and minority classes in the United States (Gamal, 2016;
Hixson, 2013). Officer Randy, who is not a veteran, shed light on his concern that race has
indeed played a role in changing policing when he said, “Well, we have the Trayvon Martin
shooting. You have Rodney King- all those different incidences. Zimmerman.”

High-profile instances of police investigations where racial exploitation occurred have
altered the public optics of how minority classes are treated by police, impeding the progress of
the professional work conducted by many other law enforcement officers throughout the country
(Gamal, 2016; Gross & Mann, 2017; Hayes, 2015; McNair, 2011). The interviews found that
high-profile examples of racially charged police-involved incidents were on the minds of the
participant police officers whether they were military veterans or not. For instance, comments
from Officer Dayna, who has not served in the military, offer some evidence that her agency
carefully considers the perception of the public when a law enforcement incident occurs
involving police use of force. She said,

*Here’s an example: I think 30 years ago, had we had an officer-involved shooting, we
would’ve- we’re very protective of our crime scene, our information, our evidence. And I
feel like the ---- in particular is very good about, “Here’s the picture of the gun the*
suspect had.” Like, go ahead and getting in front of any civil unrest over it. And so, I think that’s one of the ways that we’ve changed.

Similarly, from the perspective of a military veteran, Officer Kirk said,

First thing: the public. I think the public, one- and I think it’s split down the middle. You have half of the people appreciate what we do. They understand that it’s a tough job; they understand that we have families, also. Then you have the other half that think all police officers are out just profiling certain people. All police officers are dirty, all police officers are- you know, they’ll pull you over for your tag light being out, they’re gonna draw a gun on you and they gonna try to find some kinda way to put you in jail.

The influence of social media follows next.

**Sub-Theme C: Social Media.** Social media has made its impact upon policing and video accounts of police activities have ignited a range of reactions from the public. Research suggests that the focus of law enforcement and private industry has spanned beyond the evidentiary value that technology provides in allegations of police misconduct to the advantages of legal protections and intelligence-gathering interests for law enforcement agencies (Brucato, 2015; Davis, Alves, & Sklansky, 2014). Individually, the effects of media are on the minds of the participant police officers. The following comments from Officer Leslie draw attention to her view of video in particular as a potential liability:

I think it makes deputies – especially new deputies – pause. I think it makes them-

They’re considering the video instead of knowing they’re doing the right thing and just trusting their instinct on it. It makes them pause and I think it’s going to end up with a lot of them hurt.
Officer Griffin expressed his perception of the change media attention has wrought on the way police need to operate in this way:

There’s a lot of attention in the media and social media to attacks on law enforcement or even to attacks in general that are going on in public, so the need to be prepared, to have equipment to be safe and respond to a threat.

The relevance of military-style equipment and training is discussed next.

**Sub-Theme D: Military Equipment/Training.** The relevance of military equipment and training in law enforcement operations has occupied a significant part of the militarization of police debate (Delehanty, Mewhirter, Welch, & Wilkes, 2017; Radil, Dezzani, & McAden, 2017; Wickes, 2015). Actively working police officers view military equipment and training differently than the academic literature does.

Comments from Officer Colt, for example, illustrate a specific view of the relevance of military equipment and training. When asked whether the influence of military equipment and training had crossed over to policing and changed it, he said, “Yeah, all day. I mean, we changed our tactics completely because of it.”

Officer Jamie reflected on the influence of military-style training and equipment to offer a somewhat different response when she said, “I see it as helping me in law enforcement because I don’t believe that we receive the same training as the military with weapons.” Table K5 in Appendix K provides response quotes to these questions from the participant officers across agencies for Theme 5: Reflection – Consequences of Terrorism, Police Misconduct, and the Realities of Unconventional Violence.
The interviews of the participant officers offered a candid discussion of incidents involving perceptions of the impact of 9/11, active shooters, prior police misconduct, race, media, and the influence of the military on changing police tactics, techniques, and procedures during questions surrounding reflection of these issues.

Interviews served as the data collection instrument in this study. The interactive communication that resulted provided language to analyze. Next follows an analysis of language derived from the interviews and a discussion pertaining to semantics and its place in the meaning of language.

**Semantics**

Underlying the nature of this study is the use of interviews as a communication device. Interviewing places the researcher in the position of analyzing the meaning of language as expressed by the participant police officers (Spradley, 1997). They share commonalities in culture, customs, and social institutions, yet differ in their perceptions of the outcomes involving mutually shared problems. For example, across the agencies involved in this study with respect to Research Question #1 concerning police officers’ perceptions of the militarization of police, the officers’ comments entailed a range of responses in defining the militarization of police including military equipment in use within law enforcement operations; a socially constructed label for equipment relevant to law enforcement while implying government coercion; structured, paramilitary-style procedures; and a way to survive new and emerging threats.

In Officer Leslie’s words,
To me, it would- it kind of goes to the viewpoint of regular citizens viewing us as just an ultimate authority, that we make all the rules, we make all the decisions, and it’s all based on what law enforcement wants to do at the time of how things go.

Officer Michael, on the other hand, said,

I believe what it means to me is, you’re seeing law enforcement having a necessity to have better equipment, militarized equipment- coming from the military, whenever we deployed, we had top-of-the-line equipment and a lot of it is for survivability purposes.

Spradley (1997) explains that this meaning of language from an ethnographic perspective starts with understanding the relationship between language and culture. Spradley (1997) puts it in the following terms:

All cultural meaning is created using symbols. All the words your informant used in responding to your questions in the…interview were symbols…the way your informant was dressed… A symbol is any object or event that refers to something. (p. 95)

Spradley contends that cultural knowledge is an “intricately patterned system of symbols” (p. 97).

**Domain Analysis**

To transfer cultural, symbolic language into meaning, it is helpful to analyze it as a domain in which symbolic categories contain other categories (Spradley, 1997). As an alternative and relevant qualitative data analysis technique, domain analysis provides researchers with a systematic way to classify language as a source of data (Leech & Onwuegbuzie, 2011; Tong, Sainsbury, & Craig 2007).
In domain analysis, three inherent elements constitute a domain: cover term, included terms, and semantic relationships (Spradley, 1997). Cover terms are names for a category of cultural knowledge; included terms are terms within the category of knowledge labeled by the cover term; and lastly, when included terms are linked to cover term categories, they do so through semantic relationships (Spradley, 1997). In a domain, the semantic relationship links the cover term to all the included terms in its set. The meaning of the logic of language used in an interview setting can be better understood if presented as a visual medium using a taxonomic line and nodes chart.

**Taxonomy**

Using Spradley’s voice, Leech and Onwuegbuzie (2011) define a taxonomy as “a classification system that inventories the domains into a flowchart to help the researcher understand the relationships among the domains” (p. 596). For example, Figure 5 presents included terms taken from the interviews of Officers Carl, Randy, Leslie, and Kirk as part of their responses to questions regarding their preferred methods of problem solving – specifically, questions like “Is problem solving more effective when you are working with somebody addressing officer safety issues at the firing range, or in a classroom?” In the event that the participant police officer’s reply was not replete with rich details, the researcher asked the officer to “Please explain.”
Using a different approach, another question asked regarding problem solving was, “Do you feel like you learn through modeling the actions of someone who’s good at whatever they’re doing, say, shooting or tactics, for example?” followed up with an invitation to elaborate as necessary. Keywords used by the participant police officers in their responses are represented by the included terms. To the earlier question of whether the firing range was a more ideal learning venue than a classroom, Officer Jamie stated,
Take, for example, if I was out on the range or just in conversation and I had a vet – you know, a combat vet – speaking with me, talking about shooting, talking about, you know, hands-on- Yes, I would find great value in that.

Regarding the latter question pertaining to learning through modeling the actions of others, Officer Garrett replied,

Yes. We learn a lot not just from doing it, but… Does this feel right? Does this work? Is this- not faster, but is this more accurate? Is this safer? You know, when you do something, you see, whether it’s in person or you see it online, and you try it yourself in a safe environment.

A number of participant officers’ responses varied semantically from one to another in consideration of their preferred methods of collaborative problem solving. Included term responses from Officers Michael, Griffin, Colt, Jamie, Garrett, Dayna, Ross, and Chris incorporated words and phrases like tools, seeing and hearing, seeing it, handle business, narrow it down, value, and practical.

The included term hands-on and the cover term solution acquisition share a semantic relationship defined by actors’ preferred methods of learning and ways of solving problems. These responses offer evidence of training culture similarities across all three agencies.

Table 7 offers a range of response quotes to these questions from the participant officers across agencies.
Table 7
Taxonomic Analysis of Learning Environment Preferences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Included Term</th>
<th>Participant Quotes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hands-on</strong></td>
<td>“You know, for me, a non-millennial, hands-on is the only way. I'm not smart enough to do it the other way.” -Officer Carl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Oh yeah. No, we'd rather be on the range. Yeah, I like the hands-on aspect of doing things.” -Officer Leslie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“I'm practical app. I'm practical app. Hands-on for me. I'mma see it on the screen, see it in the classroom.” -Officer Kirk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Obviously, the hands-on, physical-type experiences.” -Officer Ross</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Practical</strong></td>
<td>“Of course it's practical, like most everyone else, but I also believe the importance of a classroom.” -Officer Chris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“I'm practical app. I'm practical app. Hands-on for me. I'mma see it on the screen, see it in the classroom.” -Officer Kirk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Doing it; handle business</strong></td>
<td>“There's room for both, but I think, for me, in my particular style, doing it.” -Officer Griffin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“There's a place for- It depends. If I'm talking SWAT guys? Yeah, we're going to go straight to the range and we'll go handle business. If we are training guardians like we did last- a couple weeks ago, we should have had more classroom because I think we made some assumptions with those guys that, you know, that they could at least somewhat handle a gun and we were wrong, so we probably went a little too fast with them.” -Officer Colt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Effusiveness</strong></td>
<td>“Oh, my gosh. The range, the range, the range.” -Officer Dayna</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Chapter Summary**

Two theoretical constructs framed the semi-structured interviews: human ecology and change management. Saldaña’s (2016) concept coding was chosen as the manual method of coding data in the study. NVivo qualitative data analytics was chosen as a backup method to the manual coding method of data analysis.
Five primary themes emerged from the qualitative interviews: Broad Social Change and Varying Public Mores in the U.S.; Planned Change and Militarization of Police; Utility of Military-Style Uniforms and Equipment in Police Operations; Tactics and Practices Closely Shared Between Police and Veterans; and Reflection – Consequences of Terrorism, Police Misconduct, and the Realities of Unconventional Violence. Numerous sub-themes related to each primary theme were identified. Selected quotations from the 12 participant police officers were linked to the literature as related to each primary theme and sub-theme.

A discussion followed examining interviews as a communication instrument where the meaning of language is examined in its relation to culture. Domain analysis was then used to illustrate categories of language and meaning. The meaning of language as well as similarities and differences between preferred methods of learning and ways of solving problems was presented through a discussion using taxonomy as a method to classify language using a flowchart.
Chapter 5: Summary, Conclusions, Implications, Suggestions for Future Research

Studies investigating the effects of the terrorist attacks on 9/11 upon public safety can be found across the social sciences literature from a number of varying perspectives: public health, criminal justice, political science, psychology, and business (Bonham, Edmonds, & Mak, 2006; Chanley, 2002; Craft & Wanta, 2004; Friedmann & Cannon, 2007; Lyon, 2006; Marcuse, 2006).

Active shooter incidents have increased steadily in number in the United States from 2000–2017, killing or injuring more than 2,200 innocent people across the country (FBI, 2017). Both terrorism and active shooter threats are domestic public safety matters which fall upon local, state, and federal law enforcement personnel to address as first responders. This study considered their place in terms of the decision making process for law enforcement agencies in acquiring military-style equipment and training in addressing these threats.

At the core of much of the critical police militarization scholarship appears to be a focus on the uniforms and equipment police officers use during law enforcement operations which appear to resemble military uniforms and equipment better suited to a battlefield. As a result, scholarship has argued that tensions increase between the public and police because of the ambiguity in uniform and equipment purpose and necessity. This study addressed a gap in the literature addressing the perceptions of actively working police officers regarding the broader phenomenon of militarizing the police and, specifically, the related training and equipment associated with it.

Assertions and Interpretations of Results

This chapter discusses the findings as they relate to the two research questions. It will also address preceding chapters and their relationship to the findings in this study. Next, a
discussion of the limitations and reflections of this study follows as well as the implications involving theory development, research, practice, education and training, and educational policy. Next are personal reflections of the research methodology, impact on other research, the research sites, and the individuals involved in this study. Suggestions for future research and the conclusions drawn from this study’s data collection methods end the discussion.

Two theoretical frameworks were used to guide the investigation of the phenomenon under inquiry: human ecology and change management. Two primary research questions formed the structure that gave way to a wide range of questions which this study addressed:

1. What are police officer perceptions of the militarization of police?
2. What do a sample of police officers perceive as the effects of militarization within law enforcement operations?

A number of follow-up questions were used to fully develop the rich responses provided by the 12 participant police officers. As a result of the interviews of the 12 participant police officers, the following themes emerged: Broad Social Change and Varying Public Mores in the U.S.; Planned Change and Militarization of Police; Utility of Military-Style Uniforms and Equipment in Police Operations; Tactics and Practices Closely Shared Between Police and Veterans; and Reflection – Consequences of Terorism, Police Misconduct, and the Realities of Unconventional Violence.

The militarization of police has been the subject of critical review for more than 20 years. Framed as a threat to the public, a number of contributing factors have each played a role in its development. As a result of interviews with currently serving police officers from three Florida
law enforcement agencies, their lived experiences provide some answers as to their perceptions of the phenomenon and its place in police operations.

Assertion #1: Warrior ethos bound in culture. Piaget’s (1971) notion of mental schemas refers to the way we organize knowledge for our understanding of stimuli. In the case of police operations, stimuli would constitute threats that police officers encounter – for example, threats introduced in training or encountered during calls for police service. The application of a mental schema to the thinking process in the context of warrior mindset, therefore, appears to be part of the mental process in understanding and responding to perceived threats.

The phrase warrior mindset garners much of the attention in the critical policing literature (Balko, 2006; Paoline & Gau, 2018; Stoughton, 2014; Weber, 1999). Each participant officer was asked about his or her personal perception of the phrase. Additionally, each participant officer was asked what the phrase officer safety meant to them. All the participant police officers in this study viewed the terms warrior mindset and officer safety basically synonymously and essential as a necessary mental schema for self-defense purposes. For a representative example, Officer Carl, a military veteran, stated the following:

For me, the warrior mindset means they never say no, never give up. It applies specific to when officers are attacked or shot or injured on duty that you don’t quit fighting for your life; even though you may lose your life, you continue to fight. That’s really the only thing that it applies to.

Another military veteran, Officer Colt expressed his understanding of the warrior mindset in this way:
I think it’s important to have a warrior mindset. We have mindset classes here for our new hires that we have come on. Then ---- comes in and gives a mindset class. We try and make sure they understand that this is the real deal. You could die just coming to work. So, I mean, you’re a target just sitting in traffic, unlike anybody else – Joe Blow the plumber man going home, sitting in traffic – he don’t have to worry about somebody just putting bullet holes in his car just because he’s driving a marked patrol car.

Officer Chris, a military veteran, explained his notion of a warrior mindset when he noted,

We’re warriors; we’re wolves and we’re protecting the sheepdog. So, yes, we view ourselves kind of, I would say, in correlation with the military, but of course with a completely opposite mission – with a domestic mission versus an overseas mission…. Warrior mindset, to me- what it would mean is the willingness, the ability to fight for those that cannot. Stand up for those that are oppressed.

Officer Leslie, who is not a military veteran, said the following:

Warrior mindset is to go into something knowing that there’s a possibility that you’re going to get hurt, you’re going to get killed, and you’re going to stay the course anyways, that there are- the people in there, their lives are more valuable, honestly, even than you are going in to be able to secure that scene, to take over safely. And you have to have that mindset, really, in law enforcement.

Another non-veteran, Officer Jamie, shared the following regarding her perception of the importance of possessing a warrior mindset: “That you’re going to make it out of whatever situation you’re in. You’re going to live, you’re going to survive, you’re going to take care of business, you’re gonna- you’re helping someone else.”
There is an abundance of literature that discusses the terminology of the warrior mindset and officer safety as part of the mental approach and training ethos involved in use-of-force issues for police officers (Paoline & Gau, 2018; Rahr & Rice, 2015). Police officers as warriors are conceptualized as aggressive crime fighters instead of as guardians who protect with an emphasis on service to others (Stoughton, 2014). Generally speaking, the recommendation of scholars has been to encourage changing the police culture, in part because of the perceived differences between the meaning of the two conceptualized terms in the context of policing as well as broader cultural issues.

Research examining police use of force can be categorized into two forms: academic and professional literature, and both are somewhat different in substance from one another, yet they share a goal in common: improving practice in some way. In part, any conceptualization of a battlefield warrior image is at odds with the academic literature which has for years supported a robust effort for the police culture to change (DOJ, 2015; Rahr & Rice, 2015).

Given recent national-level police use-of-force incidents, the emphasis in the academic literature has appropriately been engineered toward the emergence of de-escalation of conflict techniques and improving existing conflict resolution procedures (Engel, McManus, & Herold, 2019; Ryan & Bowers, 2006). De-escalation in crisis intervention promotes the use of certain communication techniques where role-plays serve as a dominant pedagogical method. Richard’s (2007) definition of de-escalation involves “the act of moving from a state of high tension to a state of reduced tension” (p.160).

The professional literature holds the warrior mindset as mental readiness to survive perceived lethal violence (Asken, Grossman, & Christensen, 2011; Siddle, 1995). The term
warrior mindset was a specific research interest in this study, rather than the recent reconceptualization of that phrase: the term “guardian” (Rahr & Rice, 2015).

As evidenced by the interviews, all the participant police officers had varying perceptions of the meaning of the warrior mindset and its effect upon them personally. In describing their perceptions of the warrior mindset, they mentioned phrases like “never giving up in a fight,” “possibility that you may be hurt or killed,” “there are others’ lives more valuable,” and “you’re going to survive, you’re helping somebody else.”

The interviews offer some evidence that this debate in terminology between warrior and guardian will endure as there continues to be ambiguity in the impression of the warrior mindset and whether it should be classified as an aggressive attribute. It appears to not take into consideration the willingness of these participant police officers to sacrifice their own personal safety for the benefit of others. Underlying the comments of the participant officers also appears to be the motivation to survive a potential deadly conflict, which aligns to Maslow’s hierarchy of needs (McLeod, 2007).

The working relationship between the military and police existed long before medical professionals aligned to law enforcement argued for consideration of an expanded need for advanced trauma care in public safety operations. The 1981 passing of the Posse Comitatus Act by Congress removed a number of budgetary restrictions between the Department of Defense and local, state, and federal law enforcement agencies, allowing for greater integration in the use of military vehicles, aircraft, and personnel for drug trafficking operations (Doyle, 2000; Matthews, 2006; Schlichter, 1992).
Several years ago, medical and military professionals, many of whom participate in military and police operations as tactical emergency medical support first responders, described an imminent need to consider trauma care protocols used by the military to save lives (Braziel, Straub, Watson, & Hoopes, 2016; Butler Junior, Holcomb, Giebner, McSwain, & Bagian, 2007). A number of legislative actions since that time have contributed to furthering the relationship between the military and police and likely contributed to changing police organizational views of problem solving as it pertains to the emerging threats they encounter today (Exec. Order 21, 1086; S.2115, National Defense, 2019).

In contrast to their unanimity in defining the warrior mindset, opinions varied among the participant police officers as to the definition of militarization of police and consideration was given to whether the participant officer was a military veteran or one with no military experience. Officer Michael, a retired US Army captain, expressed his perception of the militarization of police in this way:

I believe what it means to me is, you’re seeing law enforcement having a necessity to have better equipment, militarized equipment- Coming from the military, whenever we deployed, we had top-of-the-line equipment and a lot of it is for survivability purposes.

Officer Kirk, a former Marine, described his understanding in this way: “I think it means, like, fair military-type service. Some of the things you do in the military is going to be similar to some of what they do in civilian police-style.”

On the other hand, Officer Dayna, who is not a military veteran, said, “The militarization of police- To me, that means that we adopt certain methods to address things that are going on in our country locally.”
Officer Leslie, another participant officer who has not served in the military, explained her understanding in this way:

To me, it would- It kind of goes to the viewpoint of regular citizens viewing us as just an ultimate authority, that we make all the rules, we make all the decisions, and it’s all based on what law enforcement wants to do at the time of how things go.

The need for scholars to define the militarization of police appears to ignore the underlying mental schema that some police officers have already followed toward changing police training culture through the use of military-influenced equipment and training in law enforcement operations, giving rise to what we now term the warrior mindset.

Militarizing the police appears to be the result of a number of actions including congressional legislation over a period of years directly affecting law enforcement operations and strategic decisions by police to alter their approach to training based upon evidence of emerging new threats. For example, police officers in the United States have already responded to terror attacks linked to foreign nationals in New York, Orlando, and San Bernardino, and research has found that threats from homegrown violent extremists and active shooter events has dramatically increased in the United States since 2000 (FBI, 2018; Straub, Zeunik, & Gorban, 2017).

With the influence of years of congressional legislation enabling the transfer of military-style equipment and training to local, state, and federal police; the terrorist attacks on the U.S.; and changes in the level of lethal violence attributed to mass murderers, police officers appear to have purposefully approached addressing emerging new threats with a mindset which differs from that of prior traditional law enforcement training.
Assertion #2: Relevance of martial equipment in U.S. policing. The literature does not appear to offer any specific empirical studies using direct observation, experiments, or methods which identify causal links to the injuries and deaths of innocent people through the use of police rifles and armored vehicles purchased through the government’s National Defense Authorization Act of 1990. Scholarship has focused on this legislation’s 1033 Program as the pathway by which law enforcement agencies have acquired military equipment. There appear to be only arguments suggesting associations between militarized police equipment and injuries to people (Bove & Gavrilova, 2017; Dansky, 2016; Delehanty, Mewhirter, Welch, & Wilks, 2017; Meads, 2015; National Defense Authorization, 1990; Schlichter, 1992).

At the core of critical police literature are examples of excessive use of force by police and a growing concern over the development of an authoritarian state where the public does not trust the police to fulfill their roles as public servants (Hutson et al., 2009; Micucci & Gomme, 2005; Skolnick & Fyfe, 1993). These concerns manifest when police officers possess what appears to be military training and equipment as part of their domestic law enforcement operations (Alimahomed-Wilson & Williams, 2016; Cooper, 2015; Keinscherf, 2014).

Regarding equipment typically aligned to military operations, every one of the participant police officers was steadfast in support of the AR-15 rifle as a necessary tool, citing its advantages over their issued handguns and the relevance of rifles and armored vehicles when used in specific law enforcement situations. For example, in the case of the San Bernardino mass murder of 14 victims, the suspects, foreign nationals inspired by Islamist extremist ideology, were armed with AR-15 semiautomatic rifles and fired numerous rounds at the responding police during the incident. Many of the police who responded to the eventual traffic stop where the
suspects were taken into custody were armed with department-issued AR-15 rifles and were protected by armored vehicles in the subsequent searches for weapons and explosives (Cameron, 2019; Straub, Zeunik, & Gorban, 2017).

In another case involving a mass murderer, the suspect in the Pulse Night Club shooting in Orlando, another foreign national inspired by Islamist extremist ideology, was armed with an AR-15 rifle and killed 49 people, wounding 53 others. The initial police officer at the scene of this incident was not armed with an AR-15 rifle until responding backup officers arrived minutes later, bringing these weapons and armored vehicles (Philpott-Jones, 2018; Straub, Zeunik, & Gorban, 2017).

To the point of arming police officers with the AR-15 rifle, Officer Ross, who is not a military veteran, said,

I think it’s a great tool to have as a police officer. I feel confidence to go in a bad situation. If a person has a high-powered rifle as well or they’re like- it’s a standoff and, you know, most people on the streets have rifles now, and so it makes me feel- because I’m confident in it, I know what I can do. I’m not a great firearm person, like, I’m not the best shooter, but I know I could shoot good with that because I can hit 50 yards and it gives me confidence that I’m not gonna miss.

Officer Randy, also not a military veteran, provided an example of an incident he was involved in where the use of his agency-issued AR-15 rifle played a role:

On Christmas Day 2016, I was involved in a shooting out in ----. Basically, in a nutshell, suicide-by-cop scenario where a gentleman came out of a camper and we had a loose perimeter set up, brandished a firearm at one of my beat partners that was about 15 yards
in front of me. I was in the prone position; he didn’t even know I was there. He was having a verbal confrontation with my beat partner, at which time he raised his firearm and I discharged my AR-15.

Officer Kirk, a former Marine, shared his perception of the relevance of the AR-15 rifle against the threat of someone gaining access to weapons of this caliber in a free or black market when he said,

I think that law enforcement across the country realized this is a weapon of choice in the military and is very effective, that they need to transfer that over because what most people don’t realize- A lot of people on the street that are not good people have these kinds of weapons that they get from off of the black market. And you have to compete on the street with these guys because even though you may go to the range and you’re accurate with your handgun, it doesn’t compare to a long gun.

Another example of the use of specialized equipment in law enforcement operations was provided by Officer Carl, a former Navy Petty Officer, when he recounted a call for police service that involved the use of a recently purchased armored vehicle his agency has in their inventory. He described the call and pointed out that the offender was a former Marine barricaded inside his home and armed with several guns. The man had established shooting positions inside his home for the purpose of attacking police officers from multiple vantage points if they entered. Officer Carl explained,
Show up with our BearCat\textsuperscript{4}, MRAP\textsuperscript{5} rolls up. He says, when he gives up, he says, “Listen, I was ready to go to war with you guys.” He said, “But I know what that MRAP’s used for,” and he said, “It was fruitless. I just decided it wasn’t worth the fight.”

Officer Randy, who is not a military veteran, stated the following in response to questions regarding the advantages of military-type vehicles in law enforcement operations:

I mean, we obviously have the tactical vehicles for our SWAT team, but really, they- if they review it as a point that we’re going to- We’re coming in safely, pulling up closer safely, and so it’s less likely, hopefully, as the goal is for- you know, a shooting could take place, and things like that, because we’re coming in from a different tactical advantage.

Lewin (1947) and Kotter (1996) speak to the necessity of confronting challenges in a changing world through their change management principles. Lewin’s three-step change management model focuses on: 1) possessing a willingness to discard old behavior and adopt new behaviors, 2) using motivation to take action and create new behaviors, and 3) reconciling new behaviors with oneself and the environment (Sarayreh, Khudair & Barakat, 2013; Schein, 1996). Kotter’s (1996) eight-stage change model expands this notion to include, in part, establishing a sense of urgency, developing a vision and strategy, empowering broad-based action, and anchoring new cultural approaches.

Apart from each agency’s choice to introduce the rifle as issued equipment for police officers, across the three agencies in this study, the participant police officers spoke of how their

\begin{itemize}
\item BearCat is an armored vehicle for use in military and police operations. Lenco, 2019.
\item Mine Resistant Ambush Protected vehicle. Armored vehicle for military and police operations to protect against explosives and small arms fire. Oshkosh Defense, 2019.
\end{itemize}
agencies supported their efforts in continued advanced training and introducing new uniforms such as lighter-weight uniforms and load-bearing vests into law enforcement operations. They described how these changes have become or are in the process of becoming organizational policy.

In response to specific questions about militarized uniform appearance, several officers spoke of the advantages and utility of wearing uniforms commonly associated with members of the military. Officer Leslie, who is not a military veteran, stated the following:

I think the bad thing for me, for that in particular, is, I even have a hard time seeing it that way, because I know for, like, a tactical purpose, like, it’s better for me to wear BDUs. It’s more comfortable. So just like nurses wear scrubs, because that’s what they need to wear, is that this is- this fits with that- the outer carrier is easy for me to take off.

Officers across agencies in this study shared similar perceptions of police appearing to wear military-style uniforms and its effect upon the public. Officer Griffin, a former Marine Staff Sergeant, noted,

The standard uniform right now that even our agency is going to be voluntarily changing from to some extent, is a button-down shirt with a duty belt. We are actually in the process of expanding to a load-bearing vest- an exterior vest to go over your shirt… And it does create a little bit of a different perception. At the same time, it’s not the same as what our SWAT unit puts on when they go out to respond to a call, and so there’s a little bit of- I guess there’s a range of what you’re going to have to be wearing and the perception that it causes.

---

The national public discourse and critical literature’s condemnation of police officers appearing to look like soldiers has been cited across the literature and has been responded to by some law enforcement agency executives. In her response to questions regarding uniform appearance, Officer Dayna, who is not a military veteran, offered the following insight that may reflect her agency’s perception of the public optics regarding the issue of police officers appearing to wear military-style uniforms:

I remember on field force they said, “We are not wearing our- We don’t want to look like military, so we’re not wearing our field force uniforms. You’re gonna wear your regular uniforms.” And I remember thinking, “Well, then, why do we have the uniforms?” They are military. They’re the BDU-style, and they didn’t want to look like military and so that we were never allowed to wear it… We had our shotguns at the time, so we didn’t have the long guns yet. And then our riot helmets were in the front seat, but they didn’t want us putting our field force stuff on because they didn’t want to look military.

Officer Chris, a current Army 1st Lieutenant, offered the following comments regarding police officers wearing exterior, load-bearing vests:

I believe, in my opinion, the exterior vest – load bearing vest – we don’t have them here. We don’t have them here in patrol, so I can’t speak on how it feels and all that, but from what I hear, is that it takes a lot of strain off your lower back, increases mobility. And also, the biggest thing for me is the ease of putting it on and off. Like, if you want to come back to the station, write a report, eat your meal, or you want to take everything off and cool down because of the heat, you have that flexibility and the ease to do it versus having stuff all around your waist.
Employers’ decision to engage employees in the research and development process of introducing change is aligned to Bandura’s (1978) notion of reciprocal determinism. A process of self-regulation and motivation is induced where employees expend the effort needed to achieve their desired goals. Two of the three agencies involved in this study are currently in the middle of the research and development process of changing uniforms and equipment. These processes started as in-house surveys and now have reached the pilot study phase of evaluation for future application into agency practice.

The use of tourniquets as a lifesaving medical trauma device was supported across the three agencies as an important addition to first response life-threatening acute trauma care. Tourniquet use was cited by several participant officers as a vital part of saving lives in their work. In the questions related to the issued equipment, each participant officer was asked whether he or she felt that the expertise of the military veteran instructors was valuable and whether they had observed the tourniquets in actual use in the field. Officer Randy answered in this way:

Oh well, we have one of our guys, ----, he’s in the military – EOD, if I’m not mistaken – in the military out at --- and he’s a medic. And that’s all he has- I mean, he’s, you know, the tactics side, obviously, too, but his sole job is a medic and he’s very, very smart when it comes to that, so that knowledge- passing that down to our deputies, I mean- I can remember when I was on patrol, he came into one of our briefings and taught everyone how to put a tourniquet on and how to utilize it.

This study found actual case examples as experienced by the participant officers when Officer Leslie recounted the following:
Yeah well, we had- Obviously we had, after ---- was shot, for us all to get tourniquets.

And then we all got go bags, and then that’s when he actually- I don’t know what branch of the military he’s in, but he’s the one who came in and trained us. There’s a guy who works here who’s medically- he’s a medical combat whatever, and so he trained all of us. And the guy who was shot in ----, that’s how he was- ended up being saved by ----. But the reason was, because of the training that the deputy had received, he was able to, really, save his life.

Another participant police officer provided an example of the life-saving value of tourniquets when Officer Chris said,

My officer…responded to a crash with injuries – motorcyclist. And the motorcyclist’s left leg was severed after the crash from the- pretty much the knee down. So, the officer put the tourniquet as high on the leg as possible and he actually- The doctor at the hospital said if this tourniquet wasn’t on, he probably would’ve bled out.

These lifesaving examples reflect previous warnings and recommendations offered by medical professionals years earlier of the applicability of lessons learned in trauma care during military and police operations (Butler Jr., Holcomb, Giebner, McSwain, & Bagain, 2007; Cain, 2008; Carhart, 2012; Landry, Aberle, Dennis, & Sztajnkrycer, 2015; McDevitt, 2001). The literature does not appear to contain any references to the value of military veteran instructors training police officers in lifesaving skills acquired in military conflicts abroad.

This study found that police officers have embraced their roles as first responders and obtained the necessary advanced training in acute trauma care taught by currently serving members of the military who are trained tactical medics in the U.S. Armed Forces and working
police officers in their communities. Participant officers across the agencies in this study pointed to the effectiveness of acute trauma care training taught by active military-trained police instructors as having increased their self-efficacy in dealing with traumatic injuries. For example, Officer Colt, a former Marine Sergeant, replied to a question asking his thoughts on the value of tourniquets in law enforcement operations with,

We just- I was just at ---- for my last SWAT week and, you know, some guys from ---- gave us a, you know, a revised version of our ---- and it was awesome. Those guys- the one guy was a damn pararescue guy, so, I mean, he was pretty much… He was pretty much almost a doctor. He was teaching us that stuff, so it was pretty good stuff.

The introduction of equipment and training mentioned in the interviews requires a significant organizational commitment in funding and oversight by the agencies involved. Equipment will, over time, require maintenance as well as personnel and infrastructure dedicated to engaging in the Department of Homeland Security funding process, and will then require efforts toward applying this equipment appropriately to law enforcement operations. The acquisition of martial equipment for use in domestic law enforcement operations requires a long-term, committed organizational plan that will ensure its longevity over time.

Assertion #3: Progressive training, leadership, and law fuels performance capacity in a climate of change. As noted by Härkönen (2007), three assumptions exist in Bronfenbrenner’s (1979) notion of development and the influences between environment and a person;

1) Person is an active player, exerting influence on his/her environment, 2) environment is compelling person to adapt to its conditions and restrictions and 3) environment is
understood to consist of different size entities that are placed one inside of another, of their reciprocal relationships and micro-…systems. (p. 6–7)

The term *reciprocal* is emphasized to show the benefit of learning specific tasks interactively as viewed through the lens of each participant police officer and police instructor in an adaptive environment. Questions were asked of each officer related to his or her perceptions of a situational environment involving dangerous conditions and, in this context, their adaptation to the environment.

All the participant police officers in this study were in consensus in recognizing the reciprocal benefits between police officers and police instructors with military backgrounds in learning new tasks. Moreover, questions were asked regarding the effectiveness of police trainers with military experience sharing their expertise in firearms and tactics. Several of the participant police officers spoke highly of their experiences in firearms and tactics training led by police trainers with military experience as well as the benefits received in the development of their individual skills. For example, Officer Garrett replied:

> We learn a lot not just from doing it, but… Does this feel right? Does this work? Is this-not faster, but is this more accurate? Is this safer? You know, when you do something, you see, whether it’s in person or you see it online, and you try it yourself in a safe environment.

To questions regarding whether police trainers with military backgrounds were effective in sharing their expertise, Officer Chris, a military veteran, noted,

> Absolutely. Absolutely. The veteran – especially those veterans that are- were in combat arms in the past – they bring a wealth of knowledge out to our young officers here. Even
though they’re new themselves to law enforcement, they have that background they can share.

Officer Griffin, who is also a military veteran, saw the practice of using police trainers with military experience as a matter of focusing on solutions rather than favoring his fellow veterans when he replied, “I’d say it’s just as useful as having somebody who came from another agency. Every person comes with their own background knowledge and experiences to bring to the table.”

Officer Ross, who has not served in the military, offered the following when asked about the influence of military veterans during training: “I’ve been helped by them before. At the firing range, and I’ve seen some tips and some other things that they provided in our scenarios that we do with the SWAT team and stuff like that.”

Only one of the participant officers in this study, Officer Griffin, is currently a military-trained veteran and law enforcement agency training instructor. His view of the inherent responsibility of instructors to maintain skill sets appropriate to their roles and the mutually beneficial nature of teaching others was clear when he noted the following: “So, I mean, we push each other pretty good. I mean, if we- somebody gets smoked out there on the range, you’re gonna stay there and get your shit tuned back up because you don’t want to lose anymore.”

All 12 of the participant police officers were asked questions in terms of an active shooter response and whether they felt that, in such circumstances, they would respond directly to the situational environment and make adjustments or would emphasize reacting to the offender’s actions and not as much to the environment. All of them thought both the environment and the
offender’s actions played a role in dictating their response, with an emphasis placed on the
environment. For example, Officer Leslie said,

No, I think you do both. Yeah, you’re going to have to go on this- But it’s going to be a
big thing of what we’re walking into. Are you in a preschool or are you in a mall? You
know, it depends on the situation.

Officer Ross provided the following insight that delved deeper into the context of the
environment in response to the active shooter questions:

Depends on where you’re at and what you’re- you know, if I’m in a movie theater, it all
depends on how you would react then, and then, you know- and then as opposed to wide
open space… Usually- maybe there’s two exits, maybe there’s only one or two and then
somewhere high up. What if he’s blocking? It depends on items like that as opposed to a
mall or a school where you can run into the hall and just hide, so it, you know, it would
vary.

Offering a different perspective, Officer Garrett noted,

For me and my training and my agency and my team, we would respond directly to the
threat and make adjustments there- unless situation dictates where we’re, you know, on
the way and then something changes to make adjustments then.

Questions were also asked regarding whether participant police officers felt like they
learned through modeling the actions of someone who possesses greater perceived expertise in
shooting or tactics (Bandura, 1965). All the participant police officers held modeling the
behavior of another in this context in high regard. For example, Officer Michael offered the
following response to these questions when he said, “Yes, I take a lot of tools from other
people’s toolboxes and make it mine.” Regarding modeling the behavior of another, Officer Jamie added, “You get value from that. It’s beneficial.”

There is evidence in this study of Bronfenbrenner’s (1977) contention that, in settings where stimuli in the environment exist such as threats to the safety of police officers, discernment of those threats may impact human development. Police tactics, techniques and procedures change as a result of interaction between actor and the environment. This evidence is found in the police participant statements regarding training covering active shooters and firearms. There also appears to be evidence of social learning principles where modeling cues in observable stimuli offer choices that are acted upon based on the interview data (Bandura, 1965). This evidence is also found in the police participant interview statements where questions specifically addressed the perceived value of modeling. Bandura’s seminal work in the modeling of human behaviors within social learning explains how actors are influenced by modeling the behavior of others and they respond with new patterns of behavior.

Within the participant officer statements throughout the interviews were examples of a portion of Kotter’s (1996) eight-stage change process: 1) establishing a sense of urgency, 2) creating a guiding coalition, 3) developing a vision and strategy, 4) communing the change vision, 5) empowering broad-based action, and 6) anchoring new approaches in the culture. For example, Officer Ross was not happy with the differences he had with command staff as a result of his positions on policy-related issues. However, his personal vision, strategy, attempt to coalesce support for his ideas during staff meetings, and sense of frustration that his voice was not heard is demonstrative of bottom-up leadership where he is a part of his agency’s decision making process. Officer Garrett was emphatic in his support for the use of tourniquets and, given
his special operations assignment, he is also part of his agency’s change vision process, empowering him to collaborate with staff on certain policy issues. Officer Colt was clear in his statements of the influence his current assignment holds in establishing urgency, creating vision, developing a strategy, communication, affecting broad-based action, and creating new approaches to culture in the context of tactics and strategies within his agency. Officer Chris, a supervisor, offered a specific example of broad-based action taken by one of his officers who put his agency-issued tourniquet to use to save the life of a motorcyclist during a serious traffic crash. Collectively, the interviews also offered evidence of each agency’s executive staff working with their personnel in developing a vision and strategy toward anchoring new approaches in active shooter training, uniforms, and the introduction of tourniquets as issued equipment. As Kotter (1996) contends, for an organization to improve and alter behaviors, it is necessary to confront the challenges in a rapidly changing world.

Either from an individual or organizational change perspective, efforts to improve and change practices through training are evident in the interviews. Moreover, within the data obtained during interviews, it was evident that organizational changes involving the adoption of tourniquets as issued equipment and agency support for the acquisition of armored vehicles and AR-15 rifles required considerable interaction between command-level executives and police officers with no supervisory rank working together on organizational change initiatives.

As provided by the dialogue in the interviews, the interaction between police administration and police officers appears to integrate the principles of transformational leadership. For example, outcomes were mutually considered by both leader and follower, and self-interests were approached in a manner which took stock of greater interests such as
considering the well-being of the larger population inside the organization (Bass, 1985; Burns, 1978).

Participant officers all responded to questions inquiring as to how change takes place in their agency and whether they felt their organizations allowed them sufficient input with their ideas and strategies when attempting to change approaches to training or operations. Contextually, these questions were linked to terrorism, active shooter threats, and calls for service involving heavily armed criminal offenders.

Officer Carl, a military veteran and commanding officer within his agency, put it this way in his view of change management within his agency: “Actually, I think in our agency, change is initiated at all levels.” The agency that employs Officer Carl also employs Officer Leslie, a police sergeant who is not a military veteran, who shared these thoughts on change management:

I mean, it depends on what the change is, like, you know, to what degree it is. Most of our agency, though, is changed based on, “I have this idea. I would like to do it,” and it goes up probably to a director level and the director says, “Go ahead and try.”

Officer Colt, a military veteran employed by a different agency, was asked if change occurred within his agency as a result of directives initiated by command staff during a scheduled meeting, or whether it could occur from the bottom up. He said, “It can go from the bottom up.”

Officer Garrett was asked if he could recall a recent tactical procedure or strategy that had taken hold within his agency that stemmed from ideas from police officers in the field in conjunction with input from organizational management, and he replied,
Yeah, I would think that- One of the biggest things I can remember was deploying all the less-lethal sponge 40-millimeter launchers to the entire patrol. I think that saved countless people from either committing suicide, or- mostly committing suicide.

Officer Dayna was also asked if she could recall a recent tactical procedure or strategy that had taken hold within her agency that stemmed from ideas from police officers in the field. Her response was,

Incident command. For example, the way we as patrolmen respond to a robbery now is the sergeant gets on the radio and announces himself as the incident commander, and there’s- the whole way- Like, even just listening to the radio, the way it is worded is different, and that’s getting adopted.

The earliest driver in the development of the militarization of police is clearly Congressional legislative action dating back years from recent amendments to the Posse Comitatus Act to current committee bills pending in the House of Representatives (Exec. Order 221, 1986; S.1215, National Defense, 2019). Despite a lengthy period of legislative acts enabling local law enforcement to obtain equipment and training using Department of Homeland Security grant programs, the responses from the participant officers in this study varied widely in their perceptions of the impact of law and their terrorist response plans.

For example, to questions asking whether law has helped prepare law enforcement for terrorist threats, Officer Carl replied, “No. You know, the only thing that comes up regarding the law is the restrictions it places on law enforcement for investigation.” Officer Leslie’s remarks were very similar when she said,
The legislation that’s come through – not all of them, but some of the legislation that’s coming through – has made our jobs way more difficult, much more difficult but- for officer safety because they don’t consider the officer safety portion of what they’re asking us to do.

On the other hand, there were participant officers who responded favorably to questions about whether legislation and its contribution to Homeland Security initiatives positively affected their agencies. Officer Jamie remarked, “I think, as far as training and just the intelligence aspect of it, yes.” Officer Ross noted, “It provided, like, equipment, grants, and resources, everything that they’ve given us.”

A high state of agency readiness appears to be the posture taken by the agencies represented in this study. In doing so, a number of initiatives which require the full participation of their personnel appears to have been encouraged. Organizational change appears to be the desired outcome in the improvement of processes and practice.

**Limitations in Methods**

This study’s findings are not generalizable to larger populations; only to the organizations represented. Every effort was made to achieve analytical generalization to the use of a number of strategies for trustworthiness, confirmability, and transferability to ensure the credibility of this study (Polit & Beck, 2010; Whittemore, Chase, & Mandle, 2001).

The researcher chose to utilize interviews as a data collection instrument in lieu of surveys, which have the unique potential of capturing more respondents in varying locales. Using interviews makes it personal between participant and researcher and creates rare opportunities for unique insights, contexts, and feelings about a subject matter that surveys
cannot obtain. The researcher believed interviews were more appropriate to use as a data
collection instrument with the participant pool: police officers.

Interviewing police officers on-duty was problematic. The use of Dolbeare and
Schuman’s (1982) three-interview series format as a one-time method appeared to limit the
availability of data during the reflection phase. A lengthy, detailed series of questions coupled
with the restricted time format did not lend itself to the fuller data generation desired during the
reflection portion of the interview. Because of the generosity of the three law enforcement
executives allowing the researcher to speak to their personnel, an agreement was reached to
conduct this study on-duty without burdening any agency with the expense of paying for
overtime costs. Interestingly, the work environment was both conducive to engendering comfort
for the participant officers in their interactions with the researcher, and simultaneously
distracting due to the on-duty officers’ need to constantly monitor their communication networks
even in the midst of the interviews.

Researcher Reflections

The police officers in this study appear to have taken rational steps toward protecting
themselves against perceived threats in a changing world. The rationale for the deployment of
AR-15 rifles, as in the case of an active shooter threat or heavily armed offender, are clear:
Accuracy and soft tissue penetration are paramount when one is facing an armed threat with
similar or greater weapons capabilities. Under dynamic stress, using appropriate cover and
having the ability to execute an accurate shot from a distance may save both officer and civilian
lives. A review of the literature, however, exposes a very different narrative that suggests that
police are reckless with their use of force. Nationally, there are far too many examples of police
use of excessive force and this lies at the center of the militarization debate: why law
enforcement has chosen new weapons and equipment to address applied use of force involving
emerging threats and how it is intended to be used in domestic policing.

Rarely found in the academic literature, examples of actual cases involving active-duty
police officers were provided during these interviews. They pertained to how AR-15 rifles and
armored vehicles were used to protect law enforcement officers as well as how the use of
tourniquets saved the lives of a police officer shot by an armed offender, and the driver of a
motorcycle who was involved in a life-threatening traffic crash. There appear to be signs of a
police culture change regarding equipment and training focused on addressing the heavily armed
offender.

The researcher suspects that the debate over whether or not law enforcement should be
entrusted with contemporary, asymmetric training and equipment addressing new, emerging
threats will never cease, despite any study, generalizable or not. Planned change of police tactics,
techniques, and procedures started years before the terrorist attacks on September 11, 2001.
However, the Homeland Security Act of 2002 crystallized a new mission for local, state, and
federal law enforcement: Investigate acts of terrorism. Complex problems the active
shooter/threat phenomenon has created – such as semi-automatic rifles as a first-choice weapon
for offenders, and use of improvised explosives – likely contribute to this change in police
thinking in terms of the introduction of new weapons and equipment.

Over the course of many years, Congress has facilitated the transfer of used military
equipment to law enforcement and, because of this, many agencies have achieved previously
unattainable self-defense capabilities to protect their communities. There have been, of course,
examples of abuse, and the literature has documented these in abundance. This should not be viewed by the police culture as condemnation, but as constructive critique and as reminders of the importance of achieving and maintaining contemporary standards where agencies which have achieved a high level of performance encourage accountability for those agencies which may fall short.

The group of participant police officers in this study shared many more commonalities with each other than any ideological differences they might have about how to survive in a challenging time in the public safety sphere in this country. Their answers to many questions pertinent to public concerns surrounding their need for military-style equipment and training show that, individually, all were motivated to pursue personal growth in technical skills and knowledge in order to understand the dynamic social environment they work in. In speaking to all of them, another pattern also became evident: They were all committed to adhering to their sworn oaths to protect themselves and others. It was the researcher’s hope that he would meet 12 police officers he had never met before and feel as though the profession that meant so much to him was left in good hands. It is. It was the researcher’s honor to have shared time with each of them.

**Implications for Theory Development**

The principles of social learning and human ecology emerged as important parts of the police training practices for the police participants in this study. For example, the interviews revealed that modeling, reciprocity between actors, and the importance of experience all played significant roles in learning for the police participants in firearms, active shooter, and acute trauma care training. Over time, positive experiences with social learning and human ecology
principles within an organization may create a culture of employees recognizing the advantages of service to one another, how the experience of one employee can guide another’s personal growth through motivating one another, achieving self-efficacy, and ensuring that what is learned is shared with peers.

From a developmental aspect, Bronfenbrenner’s thoughts point to the relationships and roles between actors within the microsystem, a focus of this study which was investigated in terms of police training and organizational change. These relationships and roles extend beyond a police officer’s immediate situation to other contexts. For example, external influences such as subcultures, belief systems, and patterns of social organization can have some effect on the decisions a police officer makes within the microsystem. Scholarship should investigate the principles involving these issues in the context of policing.

**Implications for Research**

This study adds to the academic literature examining police training from the viewpoint of actors teaching and learning together in a unique setting offering very limited access to secure facilities for those outside the police culture. Scholar-practitioners need to find ways to examine police training from inside the learning environment to offer a clearer view of police practice yet support police executives’ need to protect the sensitivity of law enforcement training practices.

Interviews from police officers offer rich data and rare insight into how they feel about dynamic, life-threatening situations. Research involving either case studies or ethnography within the police training setting could open the door to enabling police officers themselves to be contributors to the body of knowledge in the literature through their expertise using these research methodologies. The difficulty in gaining access to this environment and finding
common ground with law enforcement personnel remains a challenge but is not insurmountable. Should research efforts allow access into the police training environment, researchers must honor the safety rules and regulations that frame the training environment, which will present challenges as far as adhering to the tenets of research methodologies.

**Implications for Practice**

This study sheds light on current practices in police training. Among the topics discussed by the participant police officers were advanced trauma care in the field, active shooter practices, firearms training, and the introduction of specialized equipment used in crisis intervention (e.g. armored vehicles). The application of tourniquets as standard field gear for police officers could be just a step in a larger plan that considers a range of life-saving equipment that law enforcement agencies could provide their personnel. Training in these new competencies requires the highest level of expertise. Relationships between police and firefighters have always been close and the use of trainers from both disciplines – including those who have served in the military – should be encouraged.

Human ecology has great potential in police training studies in light of Bronfenbrenner’s vision of the activities, roles, and relationships among actors within the microsystem setting. The situational environment has long been a source of interest in police training, and if the goal is improving applied practice, instructional designs should put police officers in the best position to collaborate with each other and develop solutions to problems in their work environment. With Bronfenbrenner’s emphasis on actor reciprocity and experience, human ecology principles already fit into police problem-based training settings.
Kotter’s (1996) notion of competitive capacity aligns with the examples provided by the participant police officers in this study. For example, experience, self-efficacy, and initiative to seek new challenges to increase skills and abilities were demonstrated across the three agencies within interviews describing collaborative training settings involving police officers with prior military experience as well as those with no prior history of service in the military. The advantages of creating a culture which promotes competitive capacity within an organization should be encouraged.

**Implications for Education and Training**

This study adds to the police education and training literature as police officers are part of the adult learning community within colleges and universities. Higher education administrators should consider linking adult learning and human development principles together and include them as a primary instructional practice and embrace this population as significant contributors to strategies addressing lifelong learning. For example, members of the military bring substantial life experience in problem solving and working with one another under extraordinarily difficult conditions. Non-traditional adult learners who are heavily invested in their careers look upon graduate degrees earned at colleges and universities as a means to further their opportunities for successful careers.

Kotter’s (1996) change management position would contend that training is a motivator for employees who desire personal growth and career development. In a period of rapidly changing job descriptions, today’s career development training must offer employees something different to keep the organization agile and up to the task of carrying out its mission goals which
are paired to new challenges in the field. Empowering employees to be a part of the training process encourages loyalty and spurs innovative ideas in problem solving.

From a Bronfenbrenner (1979) standpoint, experience is key in the microsystem setting and it was from this view that this study explored the interaction between police officers with military experience and those who have not served in the military. He argues that few external influences affecting human behavior are derived solely from the physical conditions of something and contends that psychological growth is stimulated by the meaning a person gives to a situation and, in this context, the lived experience of the situation. Education and training opportunities should allow for one’s experiences to play a larger role within the higher education learning forum.

**Implications for Educational Policy**

In the discussion over whether militarizing the police is an unacceptable change from traditional police practices, it merits comparing the polar opposite of this willingness to change in practice to higher education’s resistance to changing certain practices (Del La Harpe & Thomas, 2009; Haviland, 2009). For example, in assessing student learning outcomes, studies have shown that resistance to assessment has been looked upon as intrusive to academic freedoms and shared governance (Gorran Farkas, 2013; Lane, Lane, Rich, & Wheeling, 2015).

Police share assessment interests with higher education in their use of organizational program outcomes (Jacobs, Keegan, Christe-Zeyse, Seeberg, & Runde, 2006; Willis, Mastrofski, & Weisburd, 2007). From a change management perspective, Kotter’s (1996) change model recognizes resistance to change in the form of embedded culture and the hidden problems of interconnectedness of smaller departments within larger organizations. Change forces one to
change everything, even when the goal was actually to change just one thing. His recommendations include a collaborative team approach, bringing in ideas and strategies from the involved departments to reinforce vision, and maintaining a committed effort to stay the course and establish long-term change.

**Reflexivity**

Macbeth (2001) sees the exercise of positional reflexivity as one of introspective analytic prose, which helps the writer to see the research through the self and reflect on the research process. In the practice of reflexivity, Kleinsasser (2000) takes the process of reflexive writing from using conversational tone to first-person. The following represent the researcher’s thoughts on the methodology chosen, on the study’s impact on research, on the site, and on the individual.

The choice to use interviews as a data collection instrument fits perfectly within these actors’ work setting. Communicators in a multiplicity of ways, police officers depend on interviews to help them communicate in the field and, given the physical advantages a building allows for organizational interaction, they are particularly suited to an office setting. For each interview, gaining office isolation proved useful, yet challenging at times for the distracted coworkers interested in what their peers had to say to me, the interviewer and a stranger. Conversations were comfortable, yet I sensed in each participant police officer’s demeanor an awareness of the time pressure variable of being on duty. For instance, most looked at their watches or phones or glanced at a desktop computer before looking back at me again. One way I can interpret this behavior is that they are comfortable and at work; in another way, it clearly demonstrates that my focus as the interviewer is essential to keep the interview on track.
Each interview covers the format instructions, informed consent, and research questions at a fairly rapid pace. I kept the participant police officers focused on each question in competition with their momentary work distractions. Each officer preferred to work through the interview without taking the offered break. Again, one way I could interpret this attitude is as the officers being used to such a pace at work, engendering a degree of comfort in the situation. No objections exist on my end, although as many questions as I have, the focus necessary to capture both attention and reflection is mentally draining both for researcher and participant officers.

Each participant officer seemed very interested in talking about my topic. They’d heard about it in the news and were ready to discuss their perceptions as the questions were presented. Off-tape, several expressed their excitement at being chosen by their agency to be involved in this study. These brief conversations got us off to a good start and established the early building blocks of rapport. It is clear in every interview that the data I am obtaining is part of a larger organizational plan involving the development of policy and practice within each of the agencies by virtue of the nature of the content in the participant officer narratives. For example, some of the participant officers mentioned prior organizational meetings involving interaction between the officers and their supervisors in relation to changes in training goals, uniforms, equipment, and employee input toward changing work patterns. None of the interviews created a problem at any of the authorized worksites, and on each occasion, the interview ended amicably.

**Suggestions for Future Research**

Future studies could more fully examine the benefits of the military and police working together rather than approaching the subject from a position of suspicion that collaboration is detrimental to public safety. Kotter’s (1996) approach to empowering employees toward broad-
based action, stage five in his eight-stage process for creating major change, highlights the need to remove structural barriers. What appears evident in speaking to the participant police officers in this study is that they have already established relationships with military veterans who are currently serving as police officers, and that these structural barriers do not exist in a way that inhibits police in achieving the training necessary to improve their capacity to protect the public.

Kotter (1996) notes that there are two common hurdles that trap organizations into believing that just training in and of itself is enough: 1) a carefully thought-out plan that does not, in fact, address the behavior, skills, and attitudes desired as a result of training; and 2) actual costs impede decision making. A sociological focus on addressing innovation in organizational change is suggested. Efforts could be focused toward initiating and implementing employee innovation within the organization. Broad employee input should be an integral part of a plan that identifies the desired behaviors, skills, and attitudes deemed essential by the organization. Contributions by employees in the form of ideas and strategies should frame the organizational commitment to dedicating funding for training. Employee buy-in is much more likely when costs are transparent and the training plan is collaborative.

Conclusions

It appears that little thought was given 30 years ago to how the transfer of equipment from the Department of Defense to local, state, and federal law enforcement agencies would change policing. More recently, since the Homeland Security Act of 2002, local, state, and federal law enforcement agencies have taken advantage of the grant programs offered by the Department of Homeland Security and have obtained training and equipment to better their self-defense positions in their communities.
Vulnerable communities articulating a need to enhance preparedness and prevention of terrorism were eager to achieve their safety goals through participation in these federal grant programs. Involvement in Department of Homeland Security grant programs also creates a perpetual need for the equipment and training as well as reliance upon the federal government to provide such equipment and training. The natural path to subject matter experts with knowledge of counter-terrorism is establishing relationships with members of the U.S. military. Neither the training nor the equipment could be acquired through law enforcement general revenues. Since then, grant funding has decreased substantially and law enforcement administrators’ concerns now involve sustaining their equipment currently in inventory.

No one can anticipate where the next mass casualty event will occur and no city manager, mayor, sheriff, or police chief wants to get in front of the public and admit deliberate indifference either to the safety of their communities or to improving the performance of their personnel in order to prepare for such situations. As law enforcement executives respond to their constituencies involving police use of force, they should also see the opportunities which exist to inform the public and provide measured disclosure of how equipment like semi-automatic rifles and armored vehicles and training are in the public’s interest in ways that also protect the security of sensitive information.

This study found that the participant police officers are engaged in their law enforcement careers, which involves a considerable commitment to pursuing continued advanced training in a changing world. Over a period of years, acts of terrorism and other incidents involving mass casualties have changed police culture. Law enforcement executives must now pursue training to address these new threats to the safety of the public as well as their personnel. This training
involves semi-automatic rifles and armored vehicles, which has drawn criticism, and the participant officers in this study shared their perceptions of these criticisms while explaining the advantages of this equipment and what the training enables them to do. Before the issue over the militarization of police gets lost in the argument over state authority and coercive power, some might consider that law enforcement officers acquiring equipment and training for addressing emerging threats involving domestic terrorism and active shooters may, in the end, result in better protecting the American public.
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Appendix B: Law Enforcement Officers Killed Annually in the United States 2001–2010

Type of Weapon, 2001–2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of weapon</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of victim officers</td>
<td>541</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total firearms</td>
<td>498</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handgun</td>
<td>362</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rifle</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shotgun</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of firearm not reported</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knife or other cutting instrument</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bomb</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blunt instrument</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal weapons</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 The deaths of the 72 law enforcement officers that resulted from the events of September 11, 2001, are not included in this table.

Appendix C: Active Shooter Incidents Annually in the U.S. Between 2000–2017

Quick Look: 250 Active Shooter Incidents in the United States From 2000 - 2017

Incidents Per Year

Appendix D: Convergence of Factors Contributing to the Militarization of Police

(a) Refers to Bass’ (1985) principles of transformational leadership in its entirety. (b) Notes Kotter’s (1996) principles of change management in its entirety. (c) Notes Bronfenbrenner’s (1979) human development ecology. (d) Notes learning and teaching epistemologies as argued by Dewey (1938).
Appendix E: Study Participant Criterion

Participant police officer groups. Police officers who have no prior military service. Prior or currently serving military veterans who are active police officers.
Appendix F: Topical Interview Question Guide

Research Questions

1. What are police officer perceptions of the militarization of police?
2. What do a sample of police officers perceive as the outcome of militarization within law enforcement operations?

Topical Interview Guide

Interview 1

1. What was it about law enforcement that motivated you to enter the profession?
2. Was there any one particular experience that led you to making your decision to become a police officer?
3. Do you think a particular type of trait or personality type is necessary to become a police officer? If yes, why?
4. Do you remember how police officers were thought of in your neighborhood growing up? Please elaborate.
5. Did you have any negative encounters with the police growing up?
   a. Interesting, you mentioned a negative encounter. Did the encounter affect your eventual decision to become a police officer?
   b. Can you elaborate?
6. Growing up, did you have any important experiences in solving problems that may have shaped your thinking about life? If so, what were they?
7. What other interests did you pursue growing up that you think might have played a role in your decision process toward becoming a police officer?
8. Is anyone else in your family in law enforcement or the military?
9. Have you ever been in the military?
   a. If so, was it prior to becoming a police officer?
   b. What rank?
   c. Did you receive any specialized training?
10. As a military veteran, did you interact with police officers prior to your entry into law enforcement? In what capacity?
11. Do you think leaving the military and transitioning to law enforcement life is a sound career choice? Could you explain?
12. Did you have any experience with weapons or firearms prior to becoming a police officer?

13. Did you receive any firearms or tactical training prior to becoming a police officer?

14. What is your understanding of the phrase “militarization of police”?

15. If you believe that the police are militarized, can you explain what you mean by this?

16. What are some examples of police taking a more militarized approach in the work they do?

17. If police are not militarized, would you generally agree that police are influenced by the military? Can you be more specific?

18. Given this “militarization of police” phrase we are talking about, do you think the police are viewed more like soldiers today? Why do you think this is the case?

19. Much of the discussion of the militarization of police centers on the ways police officers appear to be dressed as soldiers wearing BDUs and tactical vests. What do you think about the uniforms and equipment police officers wear? Is there some functionality to the uniforms and equipment? Please elaborate.

20. Do you think the militarization label is a negative one for police officers?
   a. If yes, do you think this can be viewed as a threat to the public?
   b. Can you provide a specific example of this?
   c. If not, you see this as something positive for law enforcement? Please elaborate.

21. When the discussion is about the militarization of police, the term *warrior mindset* is often mentioned. What does this term mean to you as a law enforcement officer?

22. When I asked you about your perception of the militarization of police, you mentioned the phrase *officer safety*. Can you explain this term in greater detail?

23. Is ensuring your safety and the safety of the other police officers you work with something that takes up a lot of your attention as part of your work? Please explain.

24. Do you think the public understands what goes into training to ensure your safety as a police officer?

25. What do you think may be influencing the public views when the militarization of police is the topic?

26. Do you think the national media may contribute to keeping the militarization discussion in the minds of the public?

**Interview 2**
27. You are a certified police officer authorized to perform law enforcement functions, is that correct?

28. Generally speaking, do you feel basic academy training prepares you for the traditional armed threats you face in your job such as suspects involved in robberies, aggravated batteries, etc.? If not, please explain.

29. Are you trained to react to threats in your work environment? Please elaborate.

30. Do you have additional advanced training in firearms or tactics beyond that which you received at the police academy?

31. Are you currently or have you been a police instructor in any high-liability categories such as firearms or defensive tactics?

32. Could you list some typical weapons your agency offers training for entry-level police officers?

33. Are there armed situations you face today where you feel your issued weapons are not sufficient to handle the level of threat you are expected to handle? Could you explain?

34. Do you think the nature of the threats the police have to face has changed? For example, do you think the subject of active shooters or other mass casualty situations has changed your work? Can you elaborate on this further?

35. Have you been on calls for service and chosen to arm yourself with your issued rifle? If yes, could you explain the circumstances?

36. What is your perception of how the AR-15 or M4 rifle has been integrated into law enforcement training? Do you think it is useful?

37. Do you feel that the active shooter phenomenon, for example, has placed fire/rescue personnel in even further danger as they respond to these types of calls? Could you explain?

38. a. Earlier you stated you are a military veteran. Are you familiar with the military’s combat medical protocols such as Tactical Combat Casualty Care? Are you also familiar with the civilian version of casualty care called Tactical Emergency Medical Support or TEMS?
   b. Earlier you said you were not a veteran. How did you become aware of this method of emergency medical care?

39. Do you think there may be times when lessons learned on the battlefield in terms of treating gunshot wounds or other very serious injuries could be of benefit in certain law enforcement situations? Could you explain?
40. Are you familiar with the Rescue Task Force model used in treating casualties in, for example, an active shooter event?
   a. Could you tell me more about that?
   b. Is there another model or term used now that applies to this type of training?

41. Have you observed where police officers who are military veterans have contributed to explaining rescue techniques used in mass casualty events or contributed in some way to officers learning the concepts involved? Has it been helpful?

42. Are you involved or have you attended any advanced training outside of your law enforcement agency such as martial arts, someone’s firearm’s training course, or some sanctioned association events that you think may contribute to developing your safety skills? Were any of them military instructors?

43. Is there any specific instance in your day-to-day duties that prompted you to acquire more advanced training in handling threats to your safety as a police officer?

44. Do you think the terrorist attacks on 9/11 changed law enforcement in some way? Could you elaborate?

45. If something like the San Bernardino or Orlando mass casualty attacks occurred here, would your agency be prepared to handle the situation?

46. Does your agency have a training protocol and equipment in place to handle a terrorist or mass casualty situation? Please elaborate.

47. If a domestic or foreign terrorist attack were to occur in your jurisdiction today, would your agency respond to the incident?

48. Do you think the specialized vehicles and equipment that tactical teams use are effective in handling the armed threats you face as police officers?
   a. Do you think any of the newer equipment like your carbine is what has been termed militarized?
   b. What does this mean to you?

49. If your agency continued to train and use resources that addressed problems you faced before 9/11 happened, how do you think the same resources would have measured up against the armed threats you face today?

50. Do you think it’s necessary for police officers to consider training beyond the traditional training that police academies offered years ago such as introducing newer, more advanced weapons or tactics in the field?
   a. Does it matter to you where an officer goes to get advanced training so long as it is authorized?
   b. Could you explain this further?
51. Are you involved in the Homeland Security part of your agency? If yes, in what capacity?

52. Has having a Homeland Security policy/section within your agency allowed you to keep in step with best practices in protecting the public from terrorism? If yes, can you elaborate?

53. If you are involved in any of the Department of Homeland Security’s grant funding program for All-Hazards events, what is your decision-making process? Do you evaluate what your needs are, then participate in the grant process as the other local, state, and federal partner agencies do?

54. When competing for grant project equipment, do you consider a piece of equipment as military-oriented or as a piece of equipment that, given its capability, you believe will fit into your agency’s response plan?

55. Has participation in the RDSTF or UASI grant process improved your agency’s capabilities should you respond to a situation like this? Could you explain?

56. Would you ordinarily train on your own to prepare for armed threats, or reach out to your peers and train together, or wait until your agency leadership makes a more formal announcement about their thoughts on training updates?

57. When involved in firearms training, is your preference to shoot alone or with someone?

58. Do you feel you are able to achieve and improve more when training with your peers than receiving instruction, for example like classroom handouts handed down from supervisors? Could you explain further?

59. What motivates you to train and get better: one of your peers, or someone outside law enforcement?

60. Do you believe that a military veteran’s experience may be useful in your training, depending on the circumstances? Can you elaborate?

61. Does training with a veteran who has experience in use-of-force situations in places outside law enforcement help you develop strategies or motivate you to train even more?

62. In your law enforcement training addressing offenders who are heavily armed, do you feel you’ve acquired the necessary experience with your weapons and tactical training to handle situations like these? Can you describe this in more detail, just in a general way?

63. Are you interested in tactics, techniques, or practices you could use to survive threats to your safety in your job? How do you handle this learning process?

64. Do you think the situational or environmental dangers you face as a police officer directly affect your judgment and decision-making?
   a. In what ways, specifically?
b. If yes, does the way you perceive dangers have a major influence on the decisions, strategies, or tactics you will use to ensure your safety?

65. In terms of a threat like an active shooter, do you feel that you respond directly to the situational environment and make adjustments, or do you react to the offender’s actions and not as much to the environment, or is it a little of both? Can you elaborate?

66. Generally speaking, do you find problem-solving more effective when you’re working with somebody to solve officer safety problems at the firing range or, for instance, in defensive tactics at a place designed for that specific training rather than in places where you can’t practice and work out the problems, like in an office environment?

67. Do you feel like you learn through modeling the actions of someone who is good at what they do, like shooting or tactics, for example?

68. Without identifying anyone in particular, is there someone in your circle of professional contacts who may influence you in terms of your approach to your day-to-day duties in law enforcement? Is this person a veteran?

69. During training, do you share your thoughts, ideas, and techniques on how to improve on a strategy, tactic, or procedure with your peers, and then arrive at some sort of consensus?

70. How does change take place in your agency? Is there a formalized process?

71. Do you follow up on these recommended changes with your chain of command?

72. Does this accurately describe the beginning of the policy process, where problems are solved, then reduced to a formal procedure or protocol that others will follow at some point?

73. Has it been your experience that, when changing a strategy involved in law enforcement operations, you and your peers have sufficient input in creating a new strategy? Could you elaborate?

74. If you’ve been involved in changing or modifying a tactical procedure, for example, do you consider expertise outside of law enforcement as a source of information? If so, please elaborate.

75. Does change in your agency occur as a result of directives initiated by supervisors or command staff during a scheduled meeting?

76. Do you feel it’s necessary to have your ideas adopted into agency policy before any real change begins to occur? If not, can you elaborate?

77. Can you recall a recent change in tactical procedure, strategy, or practice that has taken hold within your agency and is likely to or has become permanent? Please elaborate.
78. Has your agency changed a law enforcement protocol to address a recent incident involving an injury to a police officer? Please explain.

79. How would you describe what your agency’s training culture is? For example, is it progressive and embrace changes in training, or does it tend to do things in a particular way for a long time?

80. Is your agency open to new ideas in handling the threats you face on the street? If yes, can you elaborate?

81. Is there an issue you feel is officer safety-related that should get immediate attention in terms of training and it hasn’t thus far?

82. How difficult is it to modify your agency policies regarding weapons and tactical protocols? Please elaborate.

83. Does your agency support your continued training outside what is offered by your employer?

84. Have you ever used training you’ve received in the military to improve a technique or protocol in your law enforcement agency? Please explain.

Interview 3

85. Do you believe policing has changed due to particular events in recent history?

86. Which events are impactful for you?
   a. I noticed you didn’t mention 9/11. Do you think policing is changed since then?
   b. Can you elaborate?

87. Do you see parallels in military training when compared to law enforcement that could benefit police in certain situations? Can you elaborate?

88. With a moment to reflect upon the training you’ve received over the years, do you believe military training and/or equipment can be applied to policing in certain situations?

89. In your view, has military-style training changed policing?
   a. Has this affected your job?
   b. In what ways?

90. We talked about the “warrior mindset” phrase earlier. When you consider your training, career experiences, and influences, does this phrase have any more meaning to you now?

91. In your view, has the law helped police prepare for terrorist threats? Please elaborate.

92. Since your agency has a Homeland Security section, would you say that it has helped your agency acquire training and equipment to combat terrorism? Please elaborate.
93. Do you consider your issued M4 rifle and the training that went with it the same as militarized training, or is it a piece of equipment and training you might use to handle an armed threat? Without getting into specific tactics, please elaborate.

94. Would you attempt to change a technique or piece of equipment you have been using if you felt strongly about a recent training experience that appeared to work better for the problem? Please explain.

95. Have you changed any techniques or protocols as a result of the influence of the training you’ve received from a police trainer who has served in the military? Please explain.

96. When training with a police instructor who has served in the military, do you perceive the instructor as having a greater degree of credibility in firearms or tactics than a trainer who is not a veteran? Why or why not?

97. Do you feel comfortable sharing techniques with a veteran who is a member of your agency? If so, do you feel that your peer having a military background may have a unique input into the techniques you might consider using? Please explain.

98. Do you see a difference at times between what is mandated by policy versus what appears to be better in practice when a technique or protocol is tested during training to determine whether it works or not?
   a. Please explain.
   b. How do you resolve this?

99. Does your agency training culture and the attitudes surrounding whether or not some technique or procedure is working have a lot to do with whether it reflects what you and your peers consider important in officer safety practices? Can you think of an example?
## Appendix G: Participant Demographics

### G1: Demographics for Participants from Smaller Law Enforcement Agency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Officer</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>≤10 yrs</th>
<th>≥11 yrs</th>
<th>Military</th>
<th>Assignment</th>
<th>Supervisor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carl</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>Spec. Operations</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>AfA</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>Patrol</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Randy</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>Patrol</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leslie</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>Investigations</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


### G2: Demographics for Participants from Medium Law Enforcement Agency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Officer</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>≤10 yrs</th>
<th>≥11 yrs</th>
<th>Military</th>
<th>Assignment</th>
<th>Supervisor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Griffin</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>Investigations</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colt</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>Training</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamie</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>Investigations</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garrett</td>
<td>ArA</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>Spec. Operations</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### G3: Demographics for Participants from Larger Law Enforcement Agency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Officer</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>≤10 yrs</th>
<th>≥11 yrs</th>
<th>Military</th>
<th>Assignment</th>
<th>Supervisor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dayna</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>Community Affairs</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirk</td>
<td>AfA</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>Investigations</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ross</td>
<td>AI</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>Investigations</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris</td>
<td>AsA</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>Patrol</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix H: Participant Recruitment and Informed Consent

H1: Academic Study Participant Request Recruitment

Your participation in an academic study is of interest and, when completed, it will become a part of original research and documented in the academic literature. By way of introduction, my name is Rick Parker, a retired assistant chief of the ------------. Since my retirement, I have been pursuing my EdD and am writing about a topic of interest approved by the ----------. Your insights in my topic, the militarization of police, I believe would prove beneficial to research.

The pool of participants involved in this study consists of currently serving police officers, with one group having prior military service and the other group having none. I would like to interview you regarding your perceptions of the militarization of police phenomenon. If you choose to do so, your participation is completely voluntary and has already been approved (on-duty) by -------.

I am currently working with the ----------, which is why you are being contacted, given your personal and professional background. ---------- will work with me to coordinate an interview schedule that best works for you.

If you choose to participate, I will supply you with an informed consent form which will more formally outline the research rules of the ---------- with which I must comply to ensure research validity and the procedures used to protect your anonymity as a result of involvement in this study. You will be given a copy of this form for your personal records.

I hope you consider this opportunity and look forward to hearing from you.
H2: Informed Consent Form


My name is Rick Parker. I am a doctoral candidate in the Department of Education and Human Services at the University of North Florida. One of the requirements for obtaining a doctorate degree is the completion of an original research study. As part of the degree, I am required to make observations and conduct interviews about a topic of interest approved by the department. I have chosen to study the militarization of police and must conduct some interviews to gain a better understanding of this phenomenon. I believe that your insights would prove beneficial to my study.

The purpose of this study is to produce research that makes an original contribution to professional practice. Specifically, your comments of the phenomenon I am investigating are of interest. Although there are no direct benefits to or compensation for taking part in this study, others may benefit from the information learned from the results of this study. There does not appear to be any foreseeable risks or discomfort to you as a result of your participation in this research study.

Your participation in this study is completely voluntary. You may decline to answer any questions and may stop the interview at any time. Any refusal to participate on your part will involve no penalty or loss of benefits to which you would otherwise be entitled.

Your responses will be treated confidentially and will only be attributed in the paper using generic titles or a pseudonym of your choice. You may also specify how you wish your responses to be attributed. This consent form will be transcribed and scanned into a final document and kept in a secure database at the University of North Florida, accessible only by
password, to ensure its confidentiality. Upon completion of the research, all of the original consent forms and interview/notes and transcripts will be destroyed and discarded.

Please note that by consenting to participate in this study by signing below, you attest that you are at least 18 years of age.

I, _______________________, consent to be interviewed by Rick Parker for the purpose stated above. I understand that all information provided is intended only for use in this research project. I further understand that my identity will be kept confidential and that all documents pertaining to the interview, including this consent form, will be destroyed at the completion of the study.

If you would prefer, your signature is not required on this document if you believe that your signature may compromise your confidentiality and it is the only thing linking you to this research study; your preferences will be honored.

Dr. Matthew Ohlson, Associate Professor of Educational Leadership in the Department of Education and Human Services at the University of North Florida will oversee this research. He may be reached at (904) 620-5271.

Dr. John Kantner, Assistant Vice President for Research of the UNF Institutional Review Board, may be reached at (904) 620-2455 or irb@unf.edu for any questions regarding your rights as a research subject.

_____________________   _________         ___________________          ___________
Participant signature  Date              Principal Researcher       Date
## Appendix I: NVivo Auto-Coding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Officer</th>
<th>Transcript Pages</th>
<th>NVivo Codes</th>
<th>NVivo References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carl</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Randy</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leslie</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Griffin</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colt</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamie</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garrett</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dayna</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirk</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ross</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>272</strong></td>
<td><strong>1549</strong></td>
<td><strong>3782</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Appendix J: Primary Themes Derived from Data Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Themes</th>
<th>Files</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Broad Social Change and Varying Public Mores in the U.S.</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planned Change and the Militarization of Police</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utility of Military-Style Uniforms and Equipment in Police Operations</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tactics and Practices Closely Shared Between Police and Veterans</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflection – Consequences of Terrorism, Police Misconduct, and the</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Realities of Unconventional Violence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix K: Participant Comments

K1: Theme 1: Broad Social Change and Varying Public Mores in the U.S.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-Theme</th>
<th>Participant Quotes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prejudice</td>
<td>“So now you’ve got an integrated society where, again, simply because you’re wearing, you know, an outfit that would indicate you’re a Muslim or something to that nature doesn’t mean that you’re a terrorist. But we have terrorist cells that live and learn in this country and then attack this country. So, you’ve gotta be ever-vigilant for see-something-say-something.” -Officer Carl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effect of perception of differing cultures</td>
<td>“And what I typically get is, you know, it’s just the way our society is, sometimes the African-Americans will think that I should be looking out for them, and I say, ‘I’m here to make sure nothing happened. I don’t specifically owe you a favor or anything. I’m here to make sure a crime wasn’t committed and that everybody’s being treated, you know, fairly and impartially and everything is being taken care of.” -Officer Michael</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“There’s actually – and I’m sure it’s been around forever – but there’s actually terrorists in our country and they’re real. And it- whether they’re Arab, Muslim, Jewish, whoever they are. White, black, it doesn’t matter. A terrorist doesn’t, you know, stick with a race or gender or anything like that.” -Officer Garrett</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Media</td>
<td>“I think that the rhetoric that’s been pushed is so negative, and now you’re seeing more and more with social media – it’s hurt us so bad….And then, now people, I think, in general, are more apt to do things like that. They find it funny, it goes on Facebook, it gets national recognition. These people are on there harassing deputies and having deputies walk away from them. It makes everybody a lot more dangerous.” -Officer Leslie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effect on public’s perception of law enforcement</td>
<td>“Well, to an extent, it’s always what you see in front of you whenever you have a law enforcement interaction, and so a lot of people are going to develop their own opinions, but media – the pictures or videos and the circumstances- Are you gonna see most of the things that are reported on media?” -Officer Griffin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“I think the liberal media demonizes police. They report without all the facts. It’s too opinionated. If they would just report the facts, I think people could make their own conclusions, but I do think that they are trying to promote, maybe, a fear of police becoming too militarized to where people feel like they should be scared of us instead of trusting us.” -Officer Dayna</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### K2: Theme 2: Planned Change and the Militarization of Police

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-Theme</th>
<th>Participant Quotes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Procedure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ease or difficulty in changing policies</td>
<td>“Change really takes place when somebody feels the pain in their ass to get it changed.” -Officer Carl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Usually policy follows, and everything that I'm thinking of is- You know, we realize we're doing something different and so we're going to have to set the new tone, maybe create a standard operating procedure for that new policy, which eventually might turn into a policy change.” -Officer Griffin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“It depends on what kind of change it is. As far as, I think, academia or, you know, policy and procedures or whatever it might be, yeah, it's going to be a more formal route. But over here, we have the ability to, let's say, implement things that maybe aren't written down. And we can pass that on to people. So we can make the change here, mainly geared towards tactics and gun fighting and stuff like that.” -Officer Colt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Say it's a new policy comes out or new procedures of how they're handling things that usually gets decided- the third floor and then it gets passed down, 'This is why,' as opposed to, like, 'We may not agree with it, we don't have a say and we'll offer opinions.' It's just 'Here's the new rule.' No, not necessarily, because we just know that's the way it is, and there's no- I hate to say it, but there'd be no point in bringing it up because they've already made a decision.” -Officer Ross</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Yes, yes, yes. We do have that opportunity.” -Officer Chris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value in input from different backgrounds</td>
<td>“Yeah. Typically, it'll start out with an idea. And then you get someone or a group of us who will try to see how it works, put the plan into action, and then evaluate it. And then, at that point, it's like, 'Hey. Here's this great idea we have; we're submitting how we've assessed it and analyzed it, and here's the pros and cons.'” -Officer Michael</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“I mean, they are trained for the possibility of things going bad, probably, more than law enforcement is. You know what I mean? We're kind of put out there on the streets and stuff like that and things go bad and we adjust it, but I think military is trained pregame. You know?” -Officer Leslie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“I'd say it's just as useful as having somebody who came from another agency. Every person comes with their own background knowledge and experiences to bring to the table.” -Officer Griffin</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


“Once again, I think it depends on what it is. I mean, we’re not going to be making—excuse me— influencing commanders on administrative stuff at the main building over there, but we have a lot of influence on tactics.” -Officer Colt

“Yes. I’ve been helped by them before. At the firing range and I’ve seen some tips and some other things that they provided in our scenarios that we do with the SWAT team and stuff like that.” -Officer Ross

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Communication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Presence/effectiveness of productive discourse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“I think we’ve got some good people in leadership that have put their egos aside and recognize, like, that there’s a bigger picture out there.” -Officer Dayna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Yeah, we give feedback kind of like an after-action brief.” -Officer Chris</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**K3: Theme 3: Utility of Military-Style Uniforms and Equipment in Police Operations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-Theme</th>
<th>Participant Quotes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Warrior Mindset</td>
<td>“For me, the warrior mindset means they never say no, never give up. It applies specific to when officers are attacked or shot or injured on duty that you don’t quit fighting for your life; even though you may lose your life, you continue to fight. That’s really the only thing that applies to…. Cops don’t want to be soldiers.” -Officer Carl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Necessity for self-preservation</td>
<td>“I believe the warrior mindset, when I do hear it, is that warriors are the ones who go into harm’s way every day, just like I used to ask my soldiers to go on very, very dangerous missions every day. I would go with them from time to time, but as a leader, I knew I had to send them in harm’s way just like this. I have deputies who work for me; every call that I send them to, I know it could be potentially harmful to them.” -Officer Michael</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“I think it’s important to have a warrior mindset. We have mindset classes here for our new hires that we have come on. Then comes in and gives a mindset class. We try to make sure they understand that this is the real deal. You could die just coming to work. So, I mean, you're a target just sitting in traffic, unlike anybody else – Joe Blow plumber man going home, sitting in traffic – he don't have to worry about somebody just putting bullet holes in his car just because he's driving a marked patrol car.” -Officer Colt

“That you're going to make it out of whatever situation you’re in. You’re gonna live, you’re gonna survive, you’re going to take
care of business, you’re gonna- You’re helping someone else.” - Officer Jamie

“To me, it’s- What I was told or shown or talked to about before, a while back, was, it’s like flipping a light switch in your head or in your heart, and there’s a time where you have to flip that switch when either you’re about to go into a house and rescue somebody, or you’re about to run into a burning house trying to save somebody, or you’re talking to a citizen and all of a sudden they get very hostile, and after we’re talking just like me and you are, trying to get information, if they start balling up their fists or they start reaching in their pocket for something, and then that’s when you have to flip that switch and have that mindset of, ‘I’m gonna win this fight, not you.’” - Officer Garrett

“To me, the warrior mindset is something that you have, and you either have it or you don’t. Like, you’re either willing on duty, off duty, no matter where you are, what you have with you, that you are going to address the problem or the threat to protect yourself and other people, and I don’t know that you can teach that.” - Officer Dayna

“Well, a warrior is a tad bit different than a soldier. A warrior mindset is, one, somebody that has to always be prepared. Somebody has to always be ready. Somebody that- someone that’s- I’m trying to think of what’s the best way to put it. A warrior is when someone who’s self-motivated, someone who is a natural leader, so to speak, somebody who is going to take action, and they’re gonna make sure that whatever needs to be done is gonna get done.” - Officer Kirk

“We’re warriors; we’re wolves and we’re protecting the sheepdog. So, yes, we view ourselves kind of, I would say, in correlation with military, but of course with a completely opposite mission – with a domestic mission versus an overseas mission...Warrior mindset, to me- What it would mean is the willingness, the ability to fight for those that cannot. Stand up for those that are oppressed.” - Officer Chris

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Self-Defense</th>
<th>Value in access to semi-automatic rifles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| “For me, it’s a more precise shot. Even at close range. But again, if you- we’re very rural so we may go out to a guy who’s held up on a two-acre lot and it’s 400 yards from the road to his house and there’s nothing to hide behind, so you need a rifle with the ability to reach out that far in the event he starts shooting back.” - Officer Carl
| “I think it’s great. I think it’s truly has benefit. It has, I think, statistically has been proven to be a benefit. Unfortunately, our enemy is arming themselves better, so we have to match that or surpass it.” - Officer Michael |
“Absolutely, yes. We always want to be, you know, one up, if we can. So if there’s a suspect, or whatever call we’re going to, has a pistol, we’re obviously gonna bring a rifle. And that’s the highest-grade weapon that we’re issued, so we’re obviously gonna bring that.” -Officer Randy

“Oh yeah, absolutely. And our county- We’re very fortunate to have the trainers that we do, that have integrated – you know, especially in our active shooter trainings with that, because they’re going to be required to do, really, the long guns in an active shooter situation, and what you’re going into.” -Officer Leslie

“Well, it’s safety, accuracy. The ability to hit what you’re aiming at, at a little bit longer range, which is going to protect me better and anybody else. And if I have to enter into a gun battle with the suspect, that I’m not endangering the public as much as that person might be.” -Officer Griffin

“I’m very biased when it comes to a long gun. A lot of people we have come through in-service – they’ll touch that rifle once a year. They’re not proficient with it. They’d much rather try to take a 50-yard shot down a hallway with a handgun – and they can’t barely pass the qualification anyway – than deploy a rifle. I’m completely comfortable with my rifle. I would take it anywhere.” -Officer Colt

“I see it as a help to me in law enforcement because I don’t believe that we receive the same training as the military with that weapon.” -Officer Jamie

“I think it’s a great tool. Distance, little bit greater firepower, more accuracy.” -Officer Garrett

“Well, a handgun’s only good accurately – for most patrol officers – what, five to seven yards? So a rifle allows us more of a safer distance – more accuracy on a longer shot. It’s a beautiful tool.” -Officer Dayna

“Well first off, being a Marine, it was the M16. That weapon was like an extension of your arm. That’s the only weapon that- The first weapon I learned how to use and became perfected in. And now over to the military, you have to kind of try to match the, so to speak, the enemy’s weapon. You got somebody shooting at you 50 yards away, a shotgun ain’t gonna do it. You need the AR.” -Officer Kirk
“I think it’s a great tool to have as a police officer. I feel confidence to go into a bad situation. If a person has a high-powered rifle as well or they’re like- it’s a standoff and, you know, most people on the streets have rifles now, and so it makes me feel- ‘cause I’m confident in it, I know what I can do.” -Officer Ross

“Yes. They validate, and accuracy.” -Officer Chris

“Value in training involving tourniquets

“Oh well, we have one of our guys, --------, he’s in the military – EOD, if I’m not mistaken – in the military out at -------- and he’s a medic. And that’s all he has- I mean, he’s, you know, the tactics side, obviously, too, but his sole job is medics and he’s very, very smart when it comes to that, so that knowledge – passing that down to our deputies, I mean- I can remember when I was on patrol, he came into one of our briefings and taught everyone how to put a tourniquet on and how to utilize it – just simple stuff.” -Officer Randy

“Oh, absolutely. Yeah, well we had- obviously we had, after -------- was shot, for us all to get tourniquets. And then we all got go bags, and then that’s when he’s actually- I don’t know what branch of the military he’s in, but he’s the one who actually came in and trained us. There’s a guy who works here who’s medically- he’s a medical combat whatever, and so he trained all of us. And the guy who was shot in --------, that’s how he was- ended up being saved by --------. But the reason was because of the training that the deputy had received, he was able to, really, save his life.” -Officer Leslie

“Well, because of the possible injuries we could be facing, it’s very important; because of the possible injuries the public could be facing, it’s also very important. And there are a lot of very serious non-gunshot-related injuries that are very appropriate for a tourniquet. Actually, we just started – I want to say within the last year – issuing belt pouches for those tourniquets. So, in addition to having it strapped to something or in your car, a lot of our deputies actually are carrying that all the time.” -Officer Griffin

“We’re actually fortunate enough now: Somebody had the good idea to put tourniquets on us. All patrol officers have tourniquets on their duty belts. So why not only have a tourniquet for yourself if you get injured? You know, and I think there was scenarios where they used them on civilians, which is great. Not only did you save- you could have saved your life, but you save someone else’s life, not in a SWAT situation. Maybe it was a car crash or someone was shot. But, you know, why can’t we have that full capability now? Is it gonna take- How many more cops is it gonna take to get killed because we didn’t have certain
equipment for somebody to do that?” -Officer Garrett

“Well, you know, we've got the tourniquet now that's been issued- Yeah. Real nice tourniquet, and I've seen some good videos of officers that have been able to use them, which is amazing. There is a bleed stop – it's a powder, I think, that you put in- I haven't been issued any yet, but I've thought about even buying it to keep it at home.… We also carry the AEDs.” -Officer Dayna

“I'm not sure if it's issued in the academy. I see it on a lot of officers' gun belts…One, you're gonna learn how to quickly apply a tourniquet, when to apply a tourniquet, how to apply pressure on a wound. If you have a person down – you have several people there – how to get them out of the line of fire, so those type of things.” -Officer Kirk

“Yes, we do. So all officers are issued a tourniquet, and a tourniquet is- we can either use it- It's mainly for us when we get shot- Right, so it's mainly for us when we get shot. But if you- Of course, if you encounter someone that's injured – doesn't even have to be shot; stabbing, a lost limb – with my officers, I put tourniquets on for citizens as well for that immediate medical treatment…Yes. My officer put on a- They responded to a crash with injuries – motorcyclist. And the motorcyclist's left leg was severed after the crash from the- pretty much the knee-down. So the officer put the tourniquet as high on the leg as possible and he actually- the doctor at the hospital said if this tourniquet wasn't on, he probably would've bled out.” -Officer Chris

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Self-Efficacy</th>
<th>Importance of confidence in abilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“You need the ability to go out there and, one, talk to people to find out what's going on, what the needs of any situation are, and then have the presence of confidence to safely perform the job task, whatever it might be.” -Officer Griffin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“I'm not a great firearm person, like, I'm not the best shooter, but I know I could shoot good with that because I can hit 50 yards and it gives me confidence that I'm not gonna miss.” -Officer Ross</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### K4: Theme 4: Tactics and Practices Closely Shared Between Police and Veterans

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-Theme</th>
<th>Participant Quotes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Reciprocal Training Value**<br>**Interest in training with others of differing backgrounds** | “The guy that teaches our combat medic stuff is a combat medic. Two of them. We have two combat medics on staff who are police officers…. They’re still in. They’re reserve.” -Officer Carl

“‘Yes, we have a couple actual combat life savers that work here at the agency and conduct training regularly.’” -Officer Michael

“Well we do it all the time if we got some downtime. ‘Hey you wanna go shoot?’ ‘Yeah, come on, let’s go.’” -Officer Colt

“Yes. I’ve been helped by them before…At the firing range and I’ve seen some tips and some other things that they provided in our scenarios that we do with the SWAT team and stuff like that.” -Officer Ross

“Absolutely. Absolutely. The veteran – especially those veterans that are- were in combat arms in the past – they bring a wealth of knowledge out to our young officers here. Even though they’re new themselves to law enforcement, they have that background that they can share.” -Officer Chris |
| **Modeling**<br>**Value in learning through observing others** | “Yes, I take a lot of tools from other people’s toolboxes and make it mine.” -Officer Michael

“I think so. You get value from that. It’s beneficial.” -Officer Jamie

“Yes. We learn a lot not just from doing it, but… Does this feel right? Does this work? Is this- not faster, but is this more accurate? Is this safer? You know, when you do something, you see, whether it’s in person or you see it online, and you try it yourself in a safe environment – on a range, per se – and if you’re, you know, you’ve done the same thing for so long, are you doing what he’s showing you better? You know, he or she showing you better, or does it not work? You know, trying to validate what you’ve seen someone do.” -Officer Garrett |
"Most definitely, most definitely… One, you get to see what he’s doing and not doing. Then, you try to talk to him and pick his brain and figure out, ‘What are you thinking when you’re going through this? Why did you make this decision?’ There are a few sergeants who are on their way out who are extremely tactical. Never been in the military, but they just picked it up over the years because they’ve done a lot of different trainings, and they are extremely good. So, you watch what they do, and you just kind of pick their brains.” -Officer Kirk

---

**Problem Solving**

*Identifying issues or attributes that contribute toward solutions*

“So, if you’ve got an active shooter, for example in a school, you really have to be familiar with the layout of the school, where the friendlies are, how the classrooms are laid out, and at the same time, kind of get a general idea of where the assailant is, and you have to approach- you have to make your approach based on the environment and you have to gauge your encounter based on his actions.” -Officer Carl

“There is an area in -----. And they have buildings that are set up and they set up different scenarios. So I know, as a unit- One of my units, we go out there and we train. And I think that there are some sergeants who are skilled in those particular areas.” -Officer Kirk

---

**Threat-Driven Evaluation**

*Tendency to respond to situational environment or to offender’s actions*

“A little bit of both. Like the environment of a school, you know. The designs can be completely different and they will influence how you go in.” -Officer Michael

“For me and my training and my agency and my team, we would respond directly to the threat and make adjustments there – unless situation dictates where we’re, you know, on the way and then something changes to make adjustments then.” -Officer Garrett

“No, I think you do both. Yeah, you’re going to have to go on his- but it’s going to be a big thing of what you’re walking into. Are you in a preschool or are you in a mall? You know, it depends on the situation.” - Officer Leslie

“I’d say it’s a little of both, because his actions are gonna determine your actions on targets, so. Our big thing, too, is if there’s five of us responding to the school, my big thing is, every one of us is going to go to a different breach point because you want to try to collapse that structure down as quickly as possible. I’d much rather run by myself than run with two or three guys.” - Officer Colt

“I can see it being a little bit of both where- It’s him. I say ‘him’ being the attacker.” -Officer Dayna
“I think it’s gotta be a balance of both. So of course you would- Of course, your objective is to locate and neutralize the threat, but you’ve also got to recognize if it turns into a barricaded suspect now.” -Officer Chris
## K5: Theme 5: Reflection – Consequences of Terrorism, Police Misconduct, and the Realities of Unconventional Violence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-Theme</th>
<th>Participant Quotes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Option 1</strong></td>
<td><strong>Option 2</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officer Safety</td>
<td><strong>Option 3</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danger to officers and civilians</td>
<td>“Well, I think the biggest thing that gets on my radar is the actual officer deaths. I got the app on my phone that pops up when an officer has been killed, and kind of lessons learned – of seeing what went wrong for that officer, and is there something I can learn from there?” -Officer Griffin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“I mean, you have to protect yourself while surviving, while helping, while, you know, getting work done.” -Officer Jamie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Either it’s increasing- The threats to police are increasing or we’re just hearing more of it from the news, so I don’t have- I don’t research. I don’t know the numbers before, but you just hear a lot about it, so I feel that it is increasing.” -Officer Chris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racial Profiling</td>
<td><strong>Option 4</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior race-based practices and contemporary policing</td>
<td>“Well, we have the Trayvon Martin shooting. You have Rodney King- All those different incidences. Zimmerman.” -Officer Randy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Here’s an example: I think 30 years ago, had we had an officer-involved shooting, we would’ve- we’re very protective of our crime scene, our information, our evidence. And I feel like the ---- ------- in particular is very good about, ‘Here’s the picture of the gun the suspect had.’ Like, go ahead and getting in front of any civil unrest over it. And so I think that’s one of the ways that we’ve changed.” -Officer Dayna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“The first thing: the public. I think the public, one- And I think it’s split down the middle. You have half of the people that really appreciate what we do. They understand that it’s a tough job; they understand that we have families, also. Then you have the other half that think that all police officers are out just profiling certain people. All police officers are dirty, all police officers are- You know, they pull you over for your tag light being out, they gonna draw a gun on you and they gonna try to find some kinda way to put you in jail.” -Officer Kirk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Media</td>
<td><strong>Option 5</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effect on policing practices</td>
<td>“I worry more for- because of the videos and all those kinds of things and social media aspect of everything and the media in general. I think it makes deputies – especially new deputies – pause. I think it makes them- They’re considering the video instead of knowing they’re doing the right thing and just trusting their instinct on it. It makes them pause and I think it’s going to end up with a lot of them hurt.” -Officer Leslie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military Equipment/Training</td>
<td>“Yeah, but it’s not all tactics.” -Officer Carl</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Relevance in law enforcement operations

“Long guns, trauma care.” -Officer Michael

“Oh, the military, I mean, that’s top-notch tactics, and that’s basically the best tactics you can get, so any kind of military training as far as tactics on how they clear rooms or how they respond to active shooters.” -Officer Randy

“I mean, they are trained for the possibility of things going bad, probably, more than law enforcement is. You know what I mean? We’re kind of put out there on the streets and stuff like that and things go bad and we adjust it, but I think the military is trained pregame. You know?” -Officer Leslie

“I mean, we’ve changed tactics completely because of it.” -Officer Colt

“I see it as helping me in law enforcement because I don’t believe that we receive the same training as the military with weapons.” -Officer Jamie

“I think that law enforcement across the country realized this is a weapon of choice in the military and is very effective, that they need to transfer that over because what most people don’t really realize- A lot of people on the street that are not good people have these kind of weapons that they get from off of the black market. And you have to compete on the street with these guys because even though you may go to the range and you’re accurate with your handgun, it doesn’t compare to a long gun, so you need to- long gun for long gun.” -Officer Kirk

“I think it all starts with basic- You know, starts with the academy. I think it’s a great way to- because I didn’t have any military training, but I learned basic structure and command and how to respect and how to work your way up and different- the structure within the agency, procedures.” -Officer Ross

“Tactics – that’s probably the biggest thing.” -Officer Chris
### Appendix L: Taxonomic Analysis of Learning Environment Preferences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Included Term</th>
<th>Participant Quotes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hands-on</strong></td>
<td>“You know, for me, a non-millennial, hands-on is the only way. I'm not smart enough to do it the other way.” - Officer Carl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Oh yeah. No, we'd rather be on the range. Yeah, I like the hands-on aspect of doing things.” - Officer Leslie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“I'm practical app. I'm practical app. Hands-on for me. I'mma see it on the screen, see it in the classroom.” - Officer Kirk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Obviously, the hands-on, physical-type experiences.” - Officer Ross</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Practical</strong></td>
<td>“Of course it's practical, like most everyone else, but I also believe in the importance of a classroom.” - Officer Chris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“I'm practical app. I'm practical app. Hands-on for me. I'mma see it on the screen, see it in the classroom.” - Officer Kirk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Doing it; handle business</strong></td>
<td>“There's room for both, but I think, for me, in my particular style, doing it.” - Officer Griffin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“There's a place for- It depends. If I'm talking SWAT guys? Yeah, we're going to go straight to the range and we'll go handle business. If we are training guardians like we did last- a couple weeks ago, we should have had more classroom because I think we made some assumptions with those guys that, you know, that they could at least somewhat handle a gun and we were wrong, so we probably went a little too fast with them.” - Officer Colt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Effusiveness</strong></td>
<td>“Oh, my gosh. The range, the range, the range.” - Officer Dayna</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix M: Taxonomic Analysis Diagram: Similarities Across Law Enforcement Agencies – Finding Solutions Through Collaboration

Adapted from Spradley’s (1997) taxonomic analysis discussion in The Ethnographic Interview. Included terms: hands-on taken from interviews with participant police officers #Carl, Randy, Leslie, and Kirk in response to questions regarding their preferred approach to problem solving. Solution acquisition between actors is a cover term for the larger knowledge category of problem solving. Copyright 1979 by Holt, Rinehart and Winston. Used with permission.
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