

Police Rhetorics and Rhetorical Self-Awareness, and Their Contributions to Cultural Contexts of
Policing in the Higher Education Campus Setting

By
Jason Lee Sugg
May, 2025

Director of Dissertation: Matthew Cox, PhD

Major Department: English

ABSTRACT

It is widely accepted that the notion of occupational cultures exists in various forms. Arguably, highly organized professions and workplaces are some of the most encultured spaces in terms of contextual occupational cultures. Not least among them is the policing profession. Inclusive to notions of occupational culture is the idea that occupational culture exists in a manner that is driven by discourses, contexts, understandings, and meanings that are relevant to those who occupy those occupational spaces. The purpose of this qualitative study, backgrounded by a cultural rhetorics lens, is to explore and articulate the notion of “police rhetorics” as a particularized discourse practice amongst police officers and police agencies. This study also seeks to determine police officer rhetorical self-awareness levels and conclude contributory factors of police rhetorics and rhetorical self-awareness to the contextual understanding of policing in the higher education setting. Because campus policing is relatively understudied this study focuses on campus police officers currently employed in the University of North Carolina (UNC) System, of which there are 17 separate institutions, and more than 450

police officers employed. The study consists of one-on-one interviews with currently employed campus police officers of varying years of experience and varying levels of leadership roles.

The results largely indicate a high level of recognition amongst the officers of police as well as a high level of rhetorical self-awareness. The results also indicate a general high-level understanding of how their rhetorical positionality impacts the cultural contextual understanding of the police role on a campus of higher education. Takeaways from the study include discussion and conclusions made about police officers' roles and recognition of their rhetorical discursive practices, and self-recognition of the impacts of their roles in how policing is contextualized in a campus community's cultural perspectives. Cultural perspectives and understanding are impacted by police interactions, behaviors, and discourse, and influences how policing is understood in that community. Conversely, cultural contexts of policing inform police interactions, behaviors, and discourse. The resulting exchange of perception and rhetorical impacts is supported by cultural rhetorics application in that cultural rhetorics recognizes that rhetoric is culture and culture is rhetoric.

Police Rhetorics and Rhetorical Self-Awareness, and Their Contributions to Cultural Contexts of
Policing in the Campus Setting

A Dissertation

Presented to the Faculty of the Department of English
East Carolina University

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree
Doctor of Philosophy in Rhetoric, Writing, and Professional Communication

by

Jason Lee Sugg

May, 2025

Director of Dissertation: Matthew Cox, PhD

Dissertation Committee Members:

Wendy Sharer, PhD

Nicole Caswell, PhD

Huiling Ding, PhD

© Jason Lee Sugg, 2025

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First, I thank my family for having the grace to tolerate my busy schedule and to understand my desire to see my academic pursuits to fruition. I also thank my dissertation committee, the ECU English Department and its faculty and staff, and my fellow students for being kind and interested in my work. I thank my professional colleagues, many of whom are career-long colleagues. Finally, I am thankful for ECU for creating space where I can thrive both professionally and academically, and enjoy the support of everyone acknowledged here, and for many others who are not. In many cases, I have been given gifts of time, interest, and understanding, and I could not have asked for anything better during this journey.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iii
LIST OF TABLES	vii
CHAPTER 1: ANSWERING A CALL TO CULTURAL RHETORICS & CIVIC APPLICATION	1
1.1: Introduction to Chapter One	1
1.2: Deliberate Ethnography, The Cultural Rhetorics Backdrop, & The Research Questions	2
Deliberate Ethnography	2
The Cultural Rhetorics Backdrop	3
Research Questions	10
1.3: Answering Cultural Rhetorics' Call to Civic Application.....	15
1.4: Defining Police Rhetorics.....	20
1.5: A Cultural Rhetorics Lens to Uncover Police Rhetorical Contributions.....	22
1.6: Overview of the Six Chapters.....	26
CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW: CULTURAL RHETORICS, CAMPUS POLICE CULTURE, & POLICING HIGHER EDUCATION CAMPUSES.....	30
2.1: Introduction to Chapter Two.....	30
2.2: Cultural Rhetorics: Meaning.....	31
2.3: Cultural Dynamics of Campus Policing	38
Essentialism	45
Artifacts.....	50
Discourse Conventions	52
2.4: Policing Campuses of Higher Education	55
CHAPTER 3: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY, DATA COLLECTION METHODS, & STUDY PARTICIPANTS	63
3.1: Introduction to Chapter Three.....	63
3.2: Research Methodology & Data Collection Methods Rationale.....	63
3.3: Methodology	66
The Ethnographic Element: Participant Observer	71

3.4: Methods	73
3.5: Study Participants	80
Individual Interviews with Campus Police Administrators	80
Focus Groups with Campus Police Officers	82
Focus Group Challenges: Coordination & Lack of Anonymity	83
CHAPTER 4: RESEARCH FINDINGS.....	85
4.1: Introduction to Chapter Four	85
4.2: Presumptions & Anticipated Findings	86
4.3: Interview Questions & Key Responses	89
Question 1	90
Question 2	96
Question 3	102
Question 4	107
Question 5	111
Question 6	114
Question 7	119
Question 8	122
CHAPTER 5: CONTRIBUTIONS OF POLICE RHETORICS & RHETORICAL SELF-AWARENESS TO CULTURAL CONTEXTS OF POLICING IN THE HIGHER EDUCATION CAMPUS SETTING	127
5.1: Introduction to Chapter Five.....	127
5.2: Central Themes: Police Rhetorics, Rhetorical Self-Awareness, Identity, & Legitimacy	129
5.3: Contributing Police Rhetorics.....	132
Articulating Police Rhetorics	134
Police Rhetorics Impactfulness.....	136
Essentialism	138
Artifacts.....	140
Discourse Conventions	146

5.4: Police Rhetorical Self-Awareness	151
5.5: The Campus Police Identity.....	154
Communicating Organizational Identity.....	156
5.6: Legitimacy	162
5.7: Conclusions.....	167
CHAPTER 6: SPEAKING TO MY PROFESSION.....	170
6.1: Introduction to Chapter Six.....	170
6.2: Deliberate Conversations: Cultural Rhetorics and Rhetorical Self-Awareness..	171
6.3: Operationalizing Cultural Rhetorics: Cultural Intelligence	174
6.4: Operationalizing Rhetorical Self-Awareness: Emotional Intelligence	177
6.5: Beware of Environmental Rhetorical Decay	182
REFERENCES	186
APPENDIX A: Question 1 Responses	194
APPENDIX B: Question 2 Responses.....	198
APPENDIX C: Question 3 Responses.....	202
APPENDIX D: Question 4 Responses	205
APPENDIX E: Question 5 Responses.....	208
APPENDIX F: Question 6 Responses	211
APPENDIX G: Question 7 Responses	215
APPENDIX H: Question 8 Responses	218
APPENDIX I: Institutional Review Board Exemption	222

LIST OF TABLES

1. TABLE 1: Interview Questions and Context.....	76, 89
2. TABLE 2: Q1 Primary Themes and Prevalence.....	94
3. TABLE 3: Q2 Primary Themes and Prevalence.....	96
4. TABLE 4: Q3 Primary Themes and Prevalence.....	103
5. TABLE 5: Q4 Primary Themes and Prevalence.....	109
6. TABLE 6: Q5 Primary Themes and Prevalence.....	112
7. TABLE 7: Q6 Primary Themes and Prevalence.....	116
8. TABLE 8: Q7 Primary Themes and Prevalence.....	120
9. TABLE 9: Q8 Primary Themes and Prevalence.....	125

CHAPTER ONE

ANSWERING A CALL TO CULTURAL RHETORICS & CIVIC APPLICATION

1.1 Introduction to Chapter One

With national attention and many associated questions regularly being focused on policing and its various results and considering the implications of how police interact with various communities, particularly communities of color, efforts are continuously made to understand the characteristics that often are associated with policing, such as certain discourse styles and behaviors, and not least of all attitudes toward marginalized communities.

Acknowledging the important work already developed surrounding police culture and organizations, the dominant notions of policing and power balances – for its good and its bad – cannot be solely challenged by strictly looking at police organizations, their organizational cultures, or the codifications relevant to policing practices, policies, or procedures.

For as much attention that is placed on policing nationwide and the relationships that police and their communities have, it is critical to explore beyond the practical policing functions that impact communities. Philosophical, cultural, contextual, rhetorical, and theoretical contributions and factors of police and police agencies are often understudied or are measured as a background for the front-facing, practical implications of policing actions. Decidedly, the front-facing, practical implications of police discourse and behaviors are likely the most visible, positive or negative, for police and their audiences. Broader cultural exploration beyond organizational or professional barriers are in order. This means exploring cultural contexts and implications that traverse organizational walls and boundaries, as well as exploring broader cultural contexts of how we, as communities, mediate and construct our understandings of what policing means or looks like. In particular, exploring, in some ways, how police officers see their

roles, interactions, and rhetorical impacts are recurring themes within this research. These themes will be explored for their relationship to the cultural contexts of what the function of police, and indeed police officers, contributes to how that function is understood in higher education campus communities.

Chapter One provides an overview of cultural rhetorics, which is the backdrop perspective being offered within this study and provides a deeper explanation of the research questions and why the author is interested in exploring those questions. Chapter One also explains that this study is being conducted, in part, as a call to apply cultural rhetorics as a perspective to more civic applications, particularly within topics where meaning and understanding of ways and perceptions are often culturally significant. A definition of “Police Rhetorics” is offered in Chapter One as well. Additionally, how cultural rhetorics as a perspective is used to uncover contextual contributions of police rhetoric and rhetorical self-awareness is offered to the audience.

1.2 Deliberate Ethnography, The Cultural Rhetorics Backdrop, & The Research Questions

Deliberate Ethnography

I occasionally lean on my own more than 26 years’ experience in campus policing in the State of North Carolina to add context throughout this study. Many of those years have been in an administrative capacity, and now as of October 2023 as a police chief at East Carolina University, a large constituent university of the University of North Carolina System. I also have part-time, small town municipal experience. Because of my past and current positionality, I am intentionally inserting myself into some of this work to help provide additional context where it may be necessary. I am fully aware that my positionality makes me an “insider” as a campus police officer and administrator, however I value my contextual contribution as something that

my positionality allows me to dig deeper on as opposed to someone who does not have the intimate police background that I have. As such, there are no industry secrets to be divulged, only - in my view - valuable professional insight combined with an academic desire to apply new lenses to an old and ongoing topic; the police and community relationship and navigating the societal function of policing in a campus space.

The Cultural Rhetorics Backdrop

A popular perception of rhetoric is often historically and contemporarily associated or “synonymous with trickery, pandering, and relentless persuasion” (Murphy, 2022, p. 12). While that historical implication may be applicable to the police/community relationship in some fashion – at least in relentless persuasion [to cooperate] – it is not the purpose of this research to demonstrate the community/police relationship in that manner. Nonetheless, the association of rhetoric with this description of persuasion, particularly because it includes a rather practical (the policing field itself) lens, must be acknowledged, because it exists in the context of policing. However, the perception of rhetoric as persuasion, or more deviously perceived as trickery, is too narrow a view for cultural rhetorics. Cultural rhetorics locates rhetoric in culture and views aspects of culture-as-rhetoric as well. Albaladejo (2016) explains this in the light of broader communication beyond the spoken word, noting that all communicative practices become “cultural if accepted by the community of producers and receivers of texts and mainly if texts are communicated in such a way that they achieve an institutional nature and are considered as a part of the activities of society” (pp. 17-18). Thus, cultural rhetorics works to distance rhetoric from a narrow view of persuasion - and perhaps trickery - and to a broader space where rhetoric and culture can work together to navigate and mediate contextual and culturally contextual meaning. In this way, rhetoric is understood not strictly as a process of persuasion as it is a process of

learning and understanding contexts, especially in how those processes are supported by communicative means. Rather, the purpose here is to explore cultural rhetorics as a source for developing contextual understanding of what policing means in a higher education campus environment. In other words, how is policing understood, culturally speaking, in a higher education campus community? The [often] nationally televised uptick in campus protests and other demonstrations that were seen in 2024, for example, perhaps heightens the argument for applying more focus on campus police, their respective rhetorics, and the rhetorical-to-actual impacts of how policing in the campus environment are contextualized with the campus culture. In terms of practical function, campus policing is conceptually no different than municipal policing.

In the State of North Carolina, which is the setting of this study, campus police and municipal/county law enforcement attend the same police academies, are certified by the same governing bodies, require the same training, and must meet all other qualifications that all other police must meet to be certified in North Carolina. They use the same hiring practices, policies and procedures, the same accreditations (for those agencies that are accredited), and the same equipment. Campus police officers may transfer between agencies for employment under the same certifications and non-campus police officers may transfer to campus police departments.

The differences are found often, generally speaking, in service types and frequency, geographical jurisdiction, and the demographics of the communities just by the nature of who generally makes up campus populations. While some of these differences may be great in comparison between campus and non-campus agencies, in other cases the differences between agencies may not be as great, as different agencies all serve various populations and geographies. The remaining differences are largely not differences at all, but are rooted in perceptions,

assumptions, or simple lack of knowledge of the campus police role or event existence in some cases. Campuses of higher education are often thought of in contexts of learning and education and their various support services for those missions. They are often not considered as communities that often require many of the same services that are found in a municipality. This study posits that cultural rhetorics is an effective, and likely heretofore under-used, perspective for such an exploration into police/community cultural considerations.

Speaking primarily of Western rhetorical traditions in the same vein that I am focusing on Western policing, Herndl (2011) offers that while the colloquial inference of rhetoric suggests deception, it is “best understood as the study of the connections between persuasion and communication in any given setting” (p. 439). Burke (1969) defined rhetoric as “the use of language as a symbolic means of inducing cooperation in beings that by nature respond to symbols” (p. 43). Further, Burke urged the consideration that the use of language impacts broad social relations and may reframe how we as society conceive our reality (Roundtree & Roundtree, 2024), not only as a practical space but also as a culturally contextual one. Therefore, “rhetoric” exists when people hold differing beliefs or understandings and must negotiate the “most true position” (Herndl et al, 2011, p. 439), requiring some communicative action of the differing beliefs in order to locate some sort of shared understanding. Like many other matters, the subject of policing and police often foster differing or even divisive viewpoints about the purpose and desired results of policing as a societal function. The function of policing is most often viewed through a lens of practical application. That is, how and why policing takes place, the practical outcomes/results of policing, and popular depictions and idealistic views that bolster *what* police do and look like. The policing profession is very practice-based, often characterized by practical and tangible results of crime prevention, reduction, or resolution. While those

practical applications have real and rhetorical implications, the practical lens limits the exploration of the cultural contexts of what policing means and how it is understood within a community. In other words, rhetoric by itself may offer some degree of explanation for understanding policing from a practical view, but it does not offer a deeper view into the cultural and social contextualization of what police and policing mean culturally. For this reason, a cultural rhetorics lens will provide a broader exploration of how communities, including police officers themselves, contextualize and understand the police role.

Scholars of cultural rhetorics seek, through investigation, to understand meaning-making processes within cultural communities, whether those communities are digital, geographical, or even context-bound such as workplace communities (Bratta & Powell, 2016). In all cases, the notion of culture is driven by characteristics of shared beliefs and contextual communication. Bratta and Powell (2016) note that cultural rhetorics scholars “argue for more situated practice in which the peculiarity of rhetorical practices within specific cultural communities sheds light on the myriad of ways that culture and rhetoric emerge” (n.p.). Taking this statement further, at the point of contact where cultural rhetorics contextual spheres rub against one another, one may study the rhetorical practices in which communities observe embodied or discursive practices and create meaning from those points of contact. Therefore, as Albaladejo (2016) suggests, it is “necessary to examine the constitution of rhetoric and its components in order to be aware of the role of culture in rhetoric” (p. 19). Everyday experiences offer collective practices that accumulate knowledge and are equally attributed to how communities observe, react, and solidify social and organized community activity, such as concepts of policing. Policing and police are remembered as not only day-to-day events, but also as historical events and practices. Remembering is a conscious act. On this, Albaladejo (2016) notes:

...rhetorical discourse (or rhetorical speech) can be considered as a cultural product, as a cultural construction, which is oriented to an interpretation characterized by perlocutionary influences, i.e., influences on receivers (hearers, but also readers). This contributes to an intersubjective consciousness in society about the cultural function of discourses and rhetoric. This consciousness is decisive for rhetoric to become ingrained in the wide cultural realm of society (p. 18).

On the point of consciousness, conscious remembrance can become unconscious context, and begs the question of at what point does the conscious become unconscious? That conscious remembrance may become unconscious context when the meaning becomes – positively or negatively – essentialized or embodied for us culturally.

In defining culture and its relevant characteristics within society, it is important to note that communication, by whatever means and mediums, shapes those cultural structures and meanings. Further, “rhetoric tries to connect producers and receivers *in the realm of society* (emphasis added)” (Albaladejo, 2016, p. 19). Rhetoric is indeed a very cultural thing. For the cultural rhetorician, Powell et al (2014) explains the call to study cultural rhetorics as such:

For us, it is this persistent focus on the how—the practices of meaning-making that create, negotiate and maintain those structures – that equals a focus on rhetorics. In other words, rhetoric is not so much about "things" as it is about "actions." This orientation towards actions, then, teaches us how particular practices—ways of thinking, ways of problem solving, ways of being in the world—are valued (or not) within specific cultural systems and/or communities. We believe studying those power relationships is central to the project of studying rhetorics (p. 6).

Not unlike other cultural rhetorics scholarship, applying a cultural rhetorics lens to the policing profession and relevant professional culture, as is done here, can follow other cultural rhetorics models, such as “decolonization, relations, constellation, and story” (Bratta & Powell, 2016, n.p.), all of which are applicable in using a cultural rhetorics lens to articulate police organizational culture and the cultural perspectives in which we value and view policing as a necessary societal function. Indeed, cultural rhetorics is not only applicable as a lens to explore

policing as a societal function, but this lens is arguably critical to use to view, explore, and talk about policing as part of the broader community culture in how we conceptualize, contextualize, and solidify our understanding of police. Particularly with police and community, Powell et al.'s (2014) idea that studying power relationships is essential to studying rhetorics is an important notion that could arguably be central to nearly any conversation about cultural contexts of policing within communities.

A cultural rhetorics lens must view conversations about power, especially rhetorical power, in how cultural contexts and meaning are derived and molded. Cultural rhetoricians see the cultural rhetorics orientation as “distinctive in the discipline of rhetoric studies where human practices and makings are often reduced to texts, or to textual objects, in a way that elides both their makers and the systems of power in which they were produced” (Powell et al., 2014, p. 6). While this research is not directly intended to dive deep into the historical development and development of power of police in the United States, this is an appropriate place to acknowledge that the police, generally speaking, wield substantial cultural and practical power in society; up to and including use of force and the use of deadly force, as well as often controlling information and narratives, including image interpretation and contextualization. Notions of power must be acknowledged when studying the nature of policing. There are intimate, both codified and socio-cultural, power constructs that permeate the relationship between a police organization and the community that it serves.

At the local, state, and federal legislative levels, police are empowered with various authorities that non-police citizens are not, which includes using legally acceptable levels of force up to including taking a life, taking people into custody with probable cause for the commission of a crime, or even detaining someone temporarily under certain circumstances.

Beyond those basic authorities, the burgeoning integration of technology over the past several decades only increases the power inequity between police and community. Technologies such as security cameras, automated license plate readers, artificial intelligence, and facial recognition are only a few examples. While these technologies are increasingly implemented with the good intent of better safety and solving crimes, there are unavoidable conversations about how police collect, store, and use information about the community to include people and places. That is a power that must be mediated and monitored not only through legal means, but also through socio-cultural ones. While the power of technology and data collection is not a part of this research, it is nonetheless notable enough that it must be noted within discussions of power. Our cultural notions of what policing means transition well beyond the community level and can be argued to be culturally relevant even on a national level. Cobos et al. (2018) noted that these terms of cultural rhetorics have been described as the “interplay between relations of power and systems of communication” (p. 4). This interplay between relations of power and systems of communication may be applied to police rhetorics in like terms.

This study co-locates police-as-culture and rhetoric through the lens of cultural rhetorics. In co-locating culture with rhetoric, “scholars often locate culture in terms of language, identity, custom, religion, or other forms of social organization and/or distribution” (Cobos et al, 2018, p. 3). The vast majority of these being applicable to organizational settings, particularly ones with observable, often historical cultural characteristics that are not only impactful inward-facing for police organizations but are also outward-facing and impactful for the public, and manifests through the distribution of systemic power, identity, institutionalization, and public interaction. Thus, while substantial research has been done on police organizational culture, this study’s contribution intends to move beyond the notion of police or police organizational culture. My

contribution seeks to provide a more-narrowed, definable lens of police rhetorics through which the culturally rhetorical positionality, power, and discourse of police can be explored to understand its impacts beyond the walls of organizations.

Organizational culture is already largely accepted as an articulable phenomenon (Cochran & Bromley, 2003) – a premise this study accepts. Since there is broad agreement on the existence of police culture as well, it follows that a basis then for developing the notion of police rhetorics using a cultural rhetorics framework is a logical contribution to the field. However, the purpose is to take an additional step to explore the cultural development of police officers and to explore their consciousness of their own rhetoric through their own eyes, which is largely sourced from a cultural phenomenon associated with policing performance. For example, this study explores how police officers articulate their own rhetoric in action. This discussion adds scholarship gained directly from officers and their vision of their own rhetoric and rhetorical self-awareness.

Research Questions

The purpose of this study is to answer three primary research questions. The first question is can “police rhetorics” be defined and articulated as an appreciable system of discourse and culture? The context of this question includes its associated characteristics and implications be articulated as recognizable not only to communities, but also observable by the police officers. That is, the systemic way police officers communicate (rhetorically and functionally), behave, and interact: all within the spaces of laws, policies, training, processes, community, artifacts (tools) and even professional group conformity to cultural depictions and identifications about police discourse. Police officers are the communicators who engage in this particularized system of discourse and communication and may provide legitimate input into the

development, use, and projection of police discourse to influence cultural contexts of what “policing” means. It is also police officers themselves, especially those who work in a higher education campus environment, who appear to be under-targeted for research.

The second question being explored is, to what level (if any) are campus police officers rhetorically self-aware of their discourse and its implications for cultural contexts what policing means to the campus community? Asked another way, are officers self-aware of their police language, texts, and other discursive practices – performance, embodiment, essentialism, and material rhetorics – and their propensity to create meaning and socially-contextualized understanding of the concepts of police and the functions of policing? This research discusses the notion of cultural perspectives of what police officers do; and it is common for campus police officers to be contrasted against their municipal counterparts. Often, that contrast is done in the context of tasks and duties. In this case, the tasks and duties may be the perceived crime-fighting duties often associated with municipal police versus a very service-oriented context of campus police. However what is not common is pursuing the input of campus police officers themselves to assess how they detect and evaluate their own discourse within that context of service and working on campus.

The third and final question that this study responds to is how do police rhetorics and police rhetorical self-awareness contribute to cultural contexts of policing in the higher education campus setting? The results of the research into these questions drive the argument of why police rhetorics, when defined and articulated, may be usefully studied as situated rhetorics in order to not only develop knowledge about policing concepts and contexts, but also to challenge dominant policing discourses and perspectives in the pursuit of answers of police/community contextual understanding. This follows Miller’s (1984) argument that two concerns of rhetorical

theory must be made clear: to make the genre a classifying concept, and then to ensure that the concept is rhetorically sound, thus grounding a genre in “situated rhetorical action” (p. 154).

These concepts align with police discourse and the relationships that policing has culturally and practically within a community because of policing’s generally highly situated contexts and actions that inevitably involve community members and groups.

The topic of campus police – that is, policing in communities of higher education and generally employed by the university – is under-studied (Wada, Patten & Candela, 2010; Wilson & Wilson, 2015; Patten et al, 2016) in comparison to municipal police. Some reasons for the lack of research of campus police are that campuses are often assumed to be somewhat freer from criminal activity, however some campus police researchers (Wada, Patten & Candela, 2010; Wilson & Wilson, 2015) argue that campus police are still fighting for greater legitimization. This argument may indicate that campus police, in comparison to “traditional” or municipal police, are often under the research radar. This consideration is also very interesting considering that police, in general, are often lumped together by society, and often by rhetorical impacts including discourse and visual appearance. Further, when most people interact with police, they are likely interacting with non-campus police unless they interact with a campus community, including passing through.

This research, then, provides an additional opportunity to explore an area that will benefit from both academic and professional contribution. For example, academic research can urge police to consider deeper self-reflection into their rhetorical postures, contributions, and power. The police professional is terribly practice-based and results-based. Certainly it is also based in theoretical matters, however the application of “policing” as a function of law-and-order regulation is most often seen through the lens of practicality and evidence-based results. What

this research may offer is that deeper self-reflection that is arguably helped by bridging an academic and professional (practical) relationship to explore police rhetorics and rhetorical self-awareness. Conversely, reflecting solely from a professional perspective that is greatly rooted in practical application and results, like the policing profession, will arguably not afford the deeper self-reflection that can be aided by that bridge, and may continue to focus on the practical interplay of police rhetorics. The occasion to conduct this research is especially inviting because of the opportunity to use cultural rhetorics as a methodological inquiry to study an environment (campuses) that is often held as culturally diverse, culturally rich, and culturally progressive and malleable with rich, diverse perspectives and ideas. That environment, matched with studying a police profession that is often viewed as rigid, traditional, and essentialized in behavior and discourse, makes for an interesting pairing that provides fruitful discussion about cultural contexts and rhetorical contributions.

This study leans on cultural rhetorics relevant questions in order to respond to the research questions. It is important to have conversations not just about community perceptions and recognitions about police, but also from the under-studied police officer perspective. For example, are campus police officers aware of their own discourse, rhetorical positionality, and influence on cultural contexts of policing in a campus environment? This study also explores how culture orders discourse, both for police, and the police/community relationship. Additionally, this study seeks to expose cultural implications of knowledge and visions of what policing means contextually and the cultural interpretations of policing in a campus environment. This is especially relevant when noting that some research (Jacobsen, 2014; Wilson & Wilson, 2015; Patten et al, 2016; Allen, 2020) shows either explicitly or vicariously that many university students cannot strongly articulate what the campus police role is in comparison to municipal

police. This suggests a disconnect between what may be essentialized (unconscious) cultural contexts of how “policing” is understood in a “regular” community versus a university community. In fact, Wada, Patten, and Candela (2010) noted that the “identification of CP [campus police] as ‘real cops’ appears to be more of an intuitively based idea not based in empirical fact” (p. 117).

Functionally speaking, campus and municipal police departments are quite the same; the greatest differences exist only in their respective missions and communities they serve. This is not unlike the differences between two cities and their respective police agencies. Other research (Wilson & Wilson, 2015; Youstin & Kopp, 2020) alludes to the non-empirical bases of perception of “real” police because of the perception of service-based policing (campus) versus legalistic policing (municipal), which causes me to be more curious about a campus community’s cultural context of what policing means for them. However, a statistical analysis of service-based versus legalistic policing could be explored to include evaluating police service calls in terms of frequency, nature, and type (i.e.: service calls versus criminal complaints). There would likely be some appreciable differences between campus police and municipal police statistics within all of those factors. While previous research has demonstrated this disconnect of understanding campus policing versus municipal policing, there does not appear to be much research on the cultural contexts of *how* and *why* communities understand policing in the manner in which they do. An important point of research such as this, particularly where ethnography can be implicated, is to try to discern how policing as a recognized concept is developed culturally when measured against other factors; factors such as media depictions, policies, and procedures, lived experience, and of course the varieties of rhetoric that may be found within the policing profession.

1.3 Answering Cultural Rhetorics' Call to Civic Application

This study responds to Cobos et al. 's (2018) call for future work “on the stakes and scope of cultural rhetorics as a term and as an analytic...” (Cobos et al., 2018, p. 13). Within this call, Cobos et al (2018) asks for additional explicit research “on the roles and uses of cultural rhetorics outside of scholarly contexts” (Cobos et al., 2018, p. 13). This is an opportunity to respond to Cobos et al.’s call and use their cultural rhetorics framework as an analytic into the level of self-awareness of police rhetorical positionality. Additionally, police researchers and scholars Sunshine and Tyler (2003) suggest developing various avenues of police research, noting that “an important task for future research is to develop and examine a broader range of instrumental issues that might potentially be important to people in their evaluations of the police” (Sunshine & Tyler, 2003, p. 535). Using a cultural rhetorics lens is a step in a new direction for police socio-cultural research that goes beyond organizational culture research and stretches the boundaries beyond organizational walls and into the community where policing as a function of society must be recognized by all.

The idea of “policing,” in whatever practical form it may take, arguably permeates nearly every community across the world. It is likely seen in more codified manners most of the time, but the concept is probably nearly universally understood in any community on earth. In the United States, police services are extended to virtually every corner of the country, and therefore our concept of policing is largely exposed to us early and often throughout our lifetimes. Our relationship to our cultural contexts of policing, the police themselves, and the problems that are associated with it are regularly at the front of local and national conversations. Cobos et al (2018) note within their call that:

Matters of civic engagement and public advocacy are important to rhetorical study and inquiry, and cultural rhetorics can offer insightful and relevant

approaches for interrogating how larger histories and organizational and systemic structures impact everyday practices and the interventions imagined and employed therein. It is our hope that our expanded, yet provisional interfaces, précising definitions, and personal and projected trajectories have helped to craft a space to inspire such work (p. 13).

Speaking directly to the importance of the rhetorical study and inquiry of civic engagement and public advocacy and considering contemporary policing practices and the problematization of such practices, defining a concept of police rhetorics – following a framework of cultural rhetorics – not only answers the call from Cobos et al (2018), but contributes to a perspective that can be used to study the specifics of civic and cultural engagement between police and public.

Eble and Gaillet (2004) advocate for service learning to be engaged within pedagogical efforts in the academic setting, which places public concerns at the feet of students by design. The goal is to engage students in public concern as they develop via their academic curriculum, which fosters civic involvement with the intent to support the development of community intellectuals. Eble and Gaillet (2004) note the sometimes-confusing idea of community, commenting that, “We tend to think of community in terms of the civic community or university community, but businesses, corporations, and organizations are all communities in themselves, and they, in turn, serve many other communities” (p. 351). Following Eble and Gaillet (2004), service learning through active participation in organized service can also be applied to professional/social services that exist and are offered to the community, such as policing. This can be accomplished by police agencies and officers engaging with community members beyond practical contact. After all, police officers are not strictly police officers, even though that identity does seem to take on a life of its own. They are still community members who can successfully apply their educational experience to the community in which they work, serve, and help foster better understood cultural contexts of policing. Further, they can also accept the

educational experiences of others within the community and experience others' intellectual contributions and perspectives.

Police officers often wear many hats, including that of students. While many police officers certainly attend higher education and gain academic training and experiences, the police academy is nearly completely based in practical application and outcomes. Such an environment – a practice-based learning environment – is ripe for the engagement of service learning that Eble and Gaillet advocate for, which is at least partly accomplished “through acting rhetorically in specific situations for specific purposes” (Eble & Gaillet, 2004, p. 352). The engagement in service learning for police officers and the community will result in a similar end as service learning in the academic pedagogy, which is that officers can to so the community, businesses, and organizations not only “equipped to question community constructions and engage in rhetorical practices” (Eble & Gaillet, 2004, p. 353), but also actually aid the community in doing the same. For example, many police agencies offer formal “citizen police academies” where citizens can attend and learn from and with police agencies about their work, the community, and various projects. Co-education between the police and public could also be informal, however those efforts would likely have to be initiated by police at opportune times, with deliberate intent to engage with community members. Examples of this can be found in the data within this research as police officers describe some of their personal efforts.

The result of such efforts aids in the development of “community intellectuals” (Farmer, 2002, p. 204), which is a not solely relegated to traditional concepts of the public sphere, such as politics or policy, but includes “work routinely performed in our neighborhoods and communities, communities, the varied intellectual contributions of teachers and students, researchers and informed citizens, and (by extension) volunteers, literacy workers, community

activists...” (Farmer, 2002, p. 204). Eble and Gaillet (2004) note that “The term ‘community intellectual’ also emphasizes the need for professionals to participate in rhetorical engagement within their own local communities, to get their hands dirty (so to speak) through active participation in local communities” (p. 342). Eble and Gaillet’s (2004) emphasis on what community intellectualism requires here is no less than what many communities and police departments alike often advocate for - that police officers engage within their own local communities. While community and police engagement are often successful, it is also often driven by practical natures and desired outcomes. It may be that rhetorical engagement is what is lacking, or at least lacking in terms of acknowledging the rhetorical nature regularly found in police and community engagement.

While Farmer (2002) and Eble and Gaillet (2004) advocate from the perspective of orienting academic students’ efforts toward community service-learning, the idea of the community intellectual extends beyond and into other literacies and projects. Farmer (2002) suggests this extension of the community intellectual will blend various academic aspects such as “course readings, secondary research, primary observational data, and more, and, at the same time, give representation to vernacular and community voices” (p. 205). The result of such designed community interconnectivity is “to contextualize service-learning within the large literatures of rhetoric, composition studies, and critical theory...” (Farmer, 2002, p. 206), to which one may add *community culture literacies*, especially those relating to things social, cultural, and political such as policing and how policing is contextualized within the community. Thus, my understanding of community intellectual as it relates to policing is not a notion where the police are “educating” the community about policing per se, but rather a relationship of mutual education of the broader community, its culture, and its understanding of the services and

views of that community, which includes the functions of policing and the organizations responsible for those professional services. The critical notion for police here is, as Eble and Gaillet (2004) suggest, that they participate in rhetorical engagement with their communities. In fact, they already do whether they are intentional about it or not. Through these co-educational efforts where intellectual partnerships exist, significant themes, both acute and chronic, may be identified and locate the meaning and significance of those themes. Through interactions in the style of community intellectuals, contexts and understanding may be shared to illuminate connections and disconnects, rather than leave it to perception, misconception, or outdated or misinformation. Therefore, if police agencies and officers are not intentional about community intellect and education as it pertains to police services and duties, then they certainly should be, because they are and may not recognize it.

Not to be exclusively used as a lens to explore the organizational culture of the policing profession, which has been well-researched, police rhetorics should also be developed as a lens supported by cultural rhetorics to explore the ever evolving, and often contentious, relationship between the policing profession and the public at large in the United States. Further, the idea of police rhetorics as a narrow lens should include the exploration of the interconnectivity of police culture and rhetoric in a similar fashion that cultural rhetorics posits that rhetoric is a culturally located practice and study. A contemporary context of rhetoric within cultural rhetorics co-locates both culture and rhetoric as a source of context and meaning that may drive discourses and, by consequence, power structures. This study uses The Cultural Rhetorics Theory Lab's (2011) definition of culture as a "system of practices, both physical and discursive, that help build and sustain communities" (p. 1). In this study, it is similarly argued that the policing systems of practices, physical and discursive, likewise help build and sustain police rhetoric, its

contexts, communications, interactions, expectations, worldviews, evolutions, and particularly its relationships with the community that is being policed.

1.4 Defining Police Rhetorics

For the purposes of this research, police rhetorics is defined as *the systems of symbols, discourses, and practices, either actual, essentialized, or rhetorical, commonly associated with the policing profession and which locate meaning and understanding within policing contexts*. This definition, coupled with rhetorical self-awareness for police officers, that is, police officers' awareness level of their own rhetorical influence, sets the backdrop for this research and informs the data collection methods that solicited the data being discussed in this paper, and the conclusion being offered from that data and discussion. Further, such a project meets the call for contributing to public advocacy by exposing and challenging problems associated with the policing field that are derived from and can be attributed to, both historically and contemporarily, cultural rhetorical positionality. Lindquist (2002) demonstrates such a cultural rhetorics view, noting that the people included in Lindquist's (2002) research "practice argument not only to identify themselves socially but also to participate in the invention of public belief, it becomes necessary to map some of the social processes through which cultural realities are invented, affirmed, and revised" (p. 4). Likewise, this study seeks to locate identity in both policing and police officers but also explore broader cultural contexts that include social and civic processes through which cultural realities are created, affirmed, revised, and ultimately passed down.

The goals of cultural rhetorics align with this study's desire to define more intimately the idea of police rhetorics, and to accomplish precisely what Riley Mukavetz (2014) suggested what cultural rhetorics scholars do, which is "investigate meaning making as it is situated within a specific cultural community, whether it is a tribal community, digital community, an archive, or

a group of craftswomen (p. 110). Cultural rhetorics can uncover and disrupt dominant narratives, but also build bridges for sociopolitical change through teaching, language, and discourse (The C.R. Theory Lab, 2011, p. 2). These goals include creating or expanding space for historically marginalized groups and reconceptualizing culture within a located space (The C.R. Theory Lab, 2011, p. 2). Work toward these goals include intellectual work, however this study argues that police rhetorics is comprised of both intellectual work and a substantial amount of praxis because the policing field is largely based on practical applications. As such, the goals of cultural rhetorics as a theoretical framework align with the concept of police rhetorics as a lens to study police culture and its interconnected rhetoric. Cultural rhetorics focuses on cultural communication and analyzes how people interact within their cultural knowledge to create meaning. Thus, cultural rhetorics emphasizes relationships between people, communication of ideas and concepts, and even how power dynamics inform those relationships. The theoretical framework that backgrounds this research is that police and society contribute to the cultural contextual understanding of what “policing” means to our communities. For police, police rhetorics - that is, police systems of discourse - is a contributory factor to the way society communicates and understands what policing looks like perhaps as much as citizens' experiences, media depictions, or other factors contribute to how society understands the role of policing.

Further, this study explores making dominant police narratives more visible, to expose their rhetorical power as they exist in both cultural and historical frames with the intent to contribute scholarship toward improving the cultural expectations and knowledge of policing. The importance of such a project is to narrow the field of view onto the practice of university campus policing and the rhetorical and practical power implications of the civic relationship

between the police and the public in a campus setting. My hope is to contribute to a vein of discourse that recognizes previous work in this area but also points toward new cultural rhetorics-driven perspectives that can be effectively attached to studying the policing field and that field's associated characteristics. Beyond this goal, to change cultural perspectives, such as police culture, new cultural characteristics must be mediated into accepted cultural contexts. However, before actual cultural change can begin, the current and historical cultural contexts and characteristics must first be explored and understood beyond organizational or "industry" frameworks. Going beyond organizational or industry frameworks, in my view, means transitioning to a cultural rhetorical view of community and its recognition of policing.

1.5 A Cultural Rhetorics Lens to Uncover Police Rhetorical Context Contributions

Following the path of a cultural rhetorics framework, the purpose here is to articulate and bring development to the concept of *police rhetorics* as rhetorical notion that can be used to explore – specifically – the culture, language, communications, semiotics, practices, positionality, and power of police as a profession. Just as cultural rhetorics theorizes how rhetoric and culture are interweaved by focusing on discursive practices (The C.R. Theory Lab, 2011, p. 1), police rhetorics theorizes how police rhetoric and culture are interconnected through a focus on the processes by which police language, texts, and other discursive practices – performance, embodiment, essentialism, and material rhetorics – create meaning and socially-contextualized understanding of "policing." It is not so much a question of proving the existence of the notion of police rhetorics, rather it is investing in the effort to articulate, define, and locate police rhetorics, connected to but also not always framed by organizational structure.

To illustrate that organizational culture is not strictly framed by organizational structures and codifications, Faber (2002) relates the importance of the social functions in that they "are

networks and relations that provide continuity across the community. Thus, the term ‘culture,’ according to this perspective loosely identifies regularized, performed functions that hold a group of people together” (p. 26). The social, therefore, aids in the creation, mediation, and maintenance of not only organizational identity and image, but also of cultural identity and images. The creation of identity and image includes the creation, mediation, and use of artifacts (tools) of transmitting meaning or creating products that convey meaning or support already contextualized knowledge. If organizational members interpret that identity and shape their own identity as part of that larger [organizational] construct (Faber, 2002), then it can be questioned if police organizations do the same in reverse, and shape their identities based on the broader cultural identities of the community. Within this vein of socio-cultural identification, Seawright (2017) suggests that police officers are not agents themselves, rather they occupy a position of agency that is afforded to them by social and cultural structures in which they work and live (p. 10).

Deeper exploration of police culture is aided by the notion that policing as we know it in the United States, was originally intended to not be so extricated from the community itself. It was intended to be civic based. Policing in the United States was allegedly modeled after that of England, in which one of the guiding principles was that the policing function was an extension of the community. Peel’s nine principles of policing were allegedly devised the advent of modern policing around 1829 (Williams, 2003; Lentz & Chaires, 2007; Loader, 2014) in England, clearly indicated the police/community connection. The seventh principle even states as such, noting:

...police, at all times, should maintain a relationship with the public that gives reality to the historic tradition that the police are the public and the public are the police; the police being only members of the public who are paid to give full-time

attention to duties which are incumbent on every citizen in the interests of community welfare and existence (Williams, 2003, p. 100).

The success of policing was measured by one thing – the absence of crime as the indicator of success. The concepts of the Peelian Principles are still taught and cited today in many modern police organizations, especially noting the Principles' relevance to various other community policing programs.

Ironically, while the Peelian Principles are cited today, Williams (2003) suggests that policing in the U.S. took a much different path since 1829 and diverged from Peel's Principles largely due to political influence and control. Despite originally being "encouraged to respect informal expectations of the area" (Williams, 2003, p. 101) in which they worked, political influences helped speed up a divergence from principles that were followable, thus diverging from the cultural concept of police and community being one in the same. Rather than preventing crime, policing began to turn to other social functions and a lack of formality increased power imbalances between police power and community power (Williams, 2003). Consequently, reform efforts often focused on institutionalizing, professionalizing, or codifying policing rather than crime prevention efforts that were tied to joint police/community efforts (Williams, 2003, p. 102).

Williams (2003) makes a critical point on the differences between historic policing in England and the U.S, noting there is some credence to the argument that policing in England involved "policing a homogeneous society with widely shared expectations which led to their stability and acceptance" (p. 103), and "conversely, the American force's instability was the result of a heterogeneous society with few shared expectations" (p. 103). However, Lentz and Chaires (2007) noted, conversely, that "The society of Peel's time was one of competing political, social, economic, religious, and even cultural interests and groups which would have

each viewed the police quite differently” (p. 78). This argument is impactful and culturally relevant for the second of Peel’s nine principles, which states “The ability of the police to perform their duties is dependent upon public approval of police actions” (Williams, 2003, p. 108). Here is the impact of cultural rhetorics in mediating contextual meaning of policing expectations, driven by the original, perhaps a bit utopian, civic intent of policing, yet arguably derailed to some extent.

The civic intent of policing is precisely the point that Loader (2014) is making when he suggested that the Peelian Principles – those principles which modern, Anglo-American policing are purported to be based upon – should essentially be updated and be made relevant again. Loader (2014) argues that these principles are often largely decorative and must be made functional. This study seeks to help develop that exploration of police culture – not of organizational culture – that is intertwined with a broader cultural outlook as it is an organizational expectation. It is an outlook that can be framed by a cultural rhetorics methodology that not only explores organizational influences, but also socio-cultural ones.

Given that cultural rhetorics acknowledges that rhetoric is culture and vice versa and acknowledging that police culture exists as a mutually appreciable example of occupational culture phenomena, it follows, then, that police culture is arguably both rhetorically sound and grounded in situational rhetorical contexts and formulated situated action. Because cultural rhetoric hinges on the social, this argument is both important to and supported by the social perspective as a lens and as an approach to research. In particular, Thralls and Blyler (2004) point out social perspective approaches – social constructivist, ideologic, and paralogic, for example – that offer an overlay of cultural rhetorics as investigative approaches to police culture and police rhetorics in the context of broader community knowledge and discourse conventions.

In the social perspective, language and culture are closely aligned in that “they share a belief in the importance of the communal” (Thralls & Blyler, 2004, p. 125). Each of these social perspectives contributes to a broader discussion about how knowledge is developed communally, interpreted, and ultimately accepted as culturally relevant. This is important to both scholarly and practical explorations of policing to set out to understand how policing concepts and police rhetoric are culturally recognized, legitimized, and accepted, rejected, or reformed. These topics will be explored in Chapter Two beginning with a literature review of cultural rhetorics, followed by campus police specific characteristics including organizational and professional culture, police discourse, imagery, and meaning, as well as policing within higher education campus spaces.

1.6 An Overview of the Six Chapters

In the following chapters, cultural rhetorics is used as a perspective to explore the concept of “police rhetorics,” and explore campus police officers’ rhetorical self-awareness relevant to their perceived roles within the campus community. The research question, broadly speaking, is to articulate, through discernable police rhetorics and rhetorical self-awareness, police contributions to the cultural contexts of policing the higher education campus setting. This articulation will be backgrounded by a cultural rhetorics lens, supported by defining, articulation, and application police rhetorics, and articulating police rhetorical self-awareness - thus contributing those elements’ contributions to the cultural contexts of policing in that campus setting.

Chapter Two reviews literature relating to cultural rhetorics, cultural dynamics of campus police, and the function of campus policing with the intent to not only connect to previous research, but also to highlight how this study will contribute to existing research in a meaningful

way. Here, the focus of cultural rhetorics is explored through the voices and articulations of cultural rhetorics scholars with the intent of laying a foundational groundwork of the importance of exploring cultural rhetorics and applying that lends to contemporary civic matters. Then, the cultural dynamics of campus policing is explored through a review of existing literature to frame existing police “culture” and police culture in a higher education setting. Chapter Two also reviews existing literature on the function of policing in a higher education campus setting, often drawing comparisons and contrasts to municipal policing.

Chapter Three explains the research methodology and methods, the rationale for using the selected methodology, the research method, and describes the participants of the study. A primary contention of the rationale is to contribute research to an existing field of research about police, police culture, and cultural rhetorics, while offering something that adds a new dynamic – crossing cultural rhetorics with policing. Chapter Three also articulates the goal of the study, which is to use the data to help inject cultural rhetorics into a very practical world – the police profession – and create additional understanding of how communities and police alike use cultural rhetorics to help create contexts of what policing means for that community.

Chapter Four presents the research findings based on the method results, which is presented from data collected from individual interviews of campus police officers employed at various constituent universities of the University of North Carolina (UNC) System. In this chapter, the data collection process, rationale, and hypotheses are established and revisited with more context. The data is also broken down into contextual discussion relating to the various responses from the study participants and separated by survey questions and relevant responses. The data, while discussed contextually in Chapter Four, is complemented by Appendices,

correlating to the survey questions and providing full study responses, which complement the contextual discussion found in this chapter.

Chapter Five discusses the implications of the research data relevant to cultural rhetorics, campus cultural contexts of policing, and the conclusion of what police rhetorics and rhetorical self-awareness contribute to cultural contexts of understanding what policing means in the campus setting. The discussion and conclusions of Chapter Five are based on the survey data collected and discussed in Chapter Four, as well as occasions of ethnographic assistance from the author. In this chapter, “police rhetorics” are broken down into a two-step process of defining and articulating in order to give substance to that concept. Police essentialism and legitimacy are also discussed as it relates to cultural recognition of the meaning of police and policing. Chapter Five also includes discussion and conclusions about the role and implications of Technical and Professional Communication (TPC) in facilitating police rhetorics and rhetorical self-awareness within cultural contextualization of campus-focused policing functions.

Chapter Six is the closing chapter and consists largely of a message from the author to the policing profession of the importance of cultural contextual considerations for campus police. This chapter will be discernibly ethnographic, incorporating the author’s participant observer lens, yet blending both academic and practical perspectives generated from this study grounded in both the author’s professional and academic experiences that apply to police discourse, rhetorics, and rhetorical influence. As the author, I view my position as floating sometimes between two worlds. On the one hand, I am decidedly interested in the academic pathways and benefits that this sort of research may produce. On the other hand, I am also decidedly ingrained as a member of the policing profession and I have a vested professional interest in these - and other - conversations about policing, whether it is about policy and procedure, relationships, or

the socio-cultural goings on surrounding police and policing. I view this ethnographic perspective as one that is unavoidable. Therefore, that perspective should not only be openly acknowledged but also openly embraced as an aiding tool to support front-end and back-end discussions of police rhetorics, police rhetorical self-awareness, and the subsequent impacts of those notions on the cultural contextualization of what policing means in the higher education campus community. I acknowledge my own participation in the subject in which I am studying. Indeed it is unavoidable and should be openly used as an aid to offer professional experience and contexts to the fact that I am a member of the group that I am studying. My professional perspective will be referenced occasionally throughout this research because of that unavoidable role. Rather than trying to keep that role outside of this research, I choose to lean on it openly to the extent that I may aid the discussion of the research, data, and implications found here. That is the benefit of using ethnography. I can assist the discussion; not sway but rather add necessary context as a clear “insider.”

Perhaps unsurprisingly, my own experience largely aligns with the data collected within this research as well as other research cited within this research project. This is particularly the case in the data collected and cited research where perceptions of campus police and police rhetorics are concerned. Even now, as I am still employed in my police role, I can generally perceive the rhetorical impact that my presence and discourse have on other people and situations. Under some circumstances, I can even predict it based on previous experience in which I was able to understand and contextualize my rhetorical impacts.

CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW: CULTURAL RHETORICS, CULTURAL DYNAMICS OF CAMPUS POLICING, & POLICING CAMPUSES OF HIGHER EDUCATION

2.1 Introduction to Chapter Two

One of the central ideas of cultural rhetorics is that culturally located context and experience drive the meaning of language, imagery, situational context, and perspective. While Chapter One provides an introduction and overview of cultural rhetorics, Chapter Two offers a more intentional literature review relating to the meaning-making of cultural rhetorics, cultural dynamics of campus police, and the function of campus policing with the intent to not only connect to previous research, but also to highlight how this study will contribute to existing research in a meaningful way. Much work has been done in cultural rhetorics in many areas, however cultural rhetorics has not explicitly been applied to police agencies and police officer research. Therefore, Chapter Two seeks to establish a connection to prior cultural rhetorics work, and apply that lens to a more civic application, just as Cobos et al. (2018) called for.

The focus of cultural rhetorics in Chapter Two is explored through the voices and articulations of cultural rhetorics scholars with the intent of laying a foundational groundwork of the importance of exploring cultural rhetorics and applying that lends to contemporary civic matters, including policing. Then, the cultural dynamics of campus policing is explored through a review of existing literature to frame existing police “culture” and police culture in a higher education setting, often drawing comparisons and contrasts to municipal policing, which will demonstrate a gap in understanding the campus police role, particularly for students.. Finally, the historical dynamics of police identities, campus police identities, and perceived police and campus roles are explored in this chapter. All of these explorations are built onto Chapter One by laying an additional layer of groundwork for this research, a layer that connects cultural rhetorics

more closely with cultural dynamics of campus police and contextualized perceptions of the policing profession.

2.2 Cultural Rhetorics: Meaning-Making

Cultural rhetorics is centered on the notion that “rhetoric has been and will always be a culturally located practice and study” (The C.R. Theory Lab, 2011, p. 1). Albaladejo (2016) notes that “there are many definitions of rhetoric, and despite their differences, all of them share the idea of communication influencing receivers” (p. 17). Powell et al (2014) suggest that generally, cultural rhetorics scholars recognize the term “rhetorics” as referring “*Both* to the study of meaning-making systems and to the practices that constitute those systems. The systems and the practices can't be separated from each other, much like the ways we say culture and people can't be separated” (p. 5). Therefore, cultural rhetorics focuses on the interconnectivity of language, texts, and other discursive practices such as performative and embodied rhetorics, and how they create meaning and contexts (The C.R. Theory Lab, 2011, P. 1) found in culturally relevant spaces. These rhetorics are created via everyday practices that “constitute cultural rhetorics (Powell et al, 2014, p. 5). When it comes to cultural and contextual understanding of police and the police function, it is necessary to drill down beyond a general consideration of cultural rhetorics, which is what Chapter Two aims to do by intermingling Cultural Rhetorics characteristics with policing to make a case for using the Cultural Rhetorics lens to explore the cultural and civic nature of understanding and assigning meaning to policing.

It is the policing systems, practices, and impacts from the campus police perspective that this study explores. Cultural rhetorics offers campus police a new lens through which to explore the campus police contribution to how policing is contextualized within campus community culture. Exploring from an academic perspective is helpful, however the aim of this research is to

add a campus police, ethnographically aided, perspective to the cultural rhetorics academic conversation. That is a perspective that has not been explored to any substantial extent for campus police nor contributed research into campus police or cultural rhetorics genres. This offers the possibility of a new perspective for campus police and cultural rhetorics scholars alike. The fact is that police officers and police work are often viewed deeply through practical outcomes, even when subscribing to community policing philosophies. Community policing, while considering partnerships between police and community members, are still often viewed by the expectations and practical outcomes that those efforts produce, generally around issues of solving various community ills. Therefore, there is arguably a research and conversation gap about police and community cultural contexts that could benefit from using a lens such as cultural rhetorics. For a campus community, often characterized in a multi-cultural context and with a large young adult population, cultural rhetorics offers campus police a perspective to explore their cultural connections to the campus community in addition to their practical and collaborative ones. Novotny et al (2021) expound on these everyday practices which constitute cultural rhetorics in a multi-cultural space – which certainly should be important for police agencies – noting that cultural rhetorics is “built upon understanding meaning-making as situated in specific cultural contexts and/or communities and then engaging with decolonial methodologies to create space for those multiple knowledges to exist” (p. 111). For police agencies, this would mean engaging in inclusive methods to recognize the various, culturally located spaces in which multiple knowledges and experiences exist and helping create space for them to be acknowledged.

Fountain, in *Rhetoric in the Flesh* (2014) emphasizes the rhetorical importance of corporeality, which focuses on the cultural and social significance of the physical body,

questioning the role of the body in physical and visual display through medical practitioner training. Yet, Fountain (2014) focuses on the rhetorical power of anatomy as “multimodal displays, medical and institutional discourses, and rhetorical and embodied practices” (pp. 2-3). For the social concept of policing, subtracting the medical discourse perhaps, all else applies. Some professions, such as police in particular, are greatly defined by visual images and bodily displays symbolizing not only a representation of what they do, but who they are. They are police by function and police as people, and they are often exemplified by their appearance, discourse, and by the non-human tools they use in their jobs. All of these contribute to cultural contexts of how these contexts are communicated to society and contextualized culturally into understanding what policing means, which is a major attribute of the cultural rhetorics lens. The community, at least in part, receives some sort of technical training through rhetorical displays from police and from other community members who engage with police in the variety of services that are encountered. These encounters are certainly bodily displays when one considers the rhetorical power of police images such as uniforms, badges, patches, vehicles, and other visual artifacts. Even the visuals alone evoke a very rhetorical power that serves to inform or even reinforce cultural meaning of those institutional and bodily images. Therefore, police communicative displays, whether official or unofficial, have an ingrained effect on our collective image of police officers and policing. These contributed to police rhetorics and police rhetorical self-awareness in how they added to the contextualization of policing in a campus environment.

Traditionally, police officers have been instructed that officer presence is the lowest level of force that can be applied on a use of force continuum. That means that the visual presence of police is assumed to deter or alter at least some level of behavior or at least to prevent an escalation. Therefore, police officers are aware of the impacts of their police “bodies” on others,

even though they are not instructed explicitly that their presence is rhetorical. In fact, as many times as I have reviewed and instructed about police officer use of force, the word “rhetorical” has never been uttered in those trainings that I can recall. The knowledge of police officers about the rhetorical influence of their own bodies combined with the often-predisposed cultural context of how policing is understood in society is an important backdrop to many of the inquiries that this research is searching for. This is especially true because this research, in part, seeks to evaluate campus police officers' rhetorical self-awareness of how their presence, discourse, and behavior influence how policing is contextualized in the higher education campus setting.

Importantly, cultural rhetorics “recognizes and honors the cultural specificity of *all* rhetorical practices/productions” (Bratta & Powell, 2016, n.p.). Albaladejo (2016), in relation to culture and rhetoric, suggests that all practices of communications are resolved to be cultural “if accepted by the community of producers and receivers of texts and mainly if texts are communicated in such a way that they achieve an institutional nature and are considered as a part of the activities of society” (pp. 17-18). Within cultural rhetorics exists the scholarly push for “re-orienting rhetoric studies to be more attuned to the cultural circumstances of rhetorical production/practice” (Bratta & Powell, 2016, n.p.) with the notion that the cultural rhetoric scholar connects the study of that production/practice with the community which lives it (Bratta & Powell, 2016). Powell et al (2014) further these notions, stating that “All cultural practices are built, shaped, and dismantled based on the encounters people have with one another within and across particular systems of shared belief. In other words, people make things (texts, baskets, performances), people make relationships, people make culture” (p. 5). These commentaries on cultural rhetorics may be applied to spaces, including campus communities, and may also be applied to how we contextualized and understand what “policing” looks like for those

communities, which naturally includes police officers. Speaking directly to communicative production and practice, Albaladejo (2016) suggests that a society's communication techniques help form our collective knowledge and "are stored within the cultural heritage that shapes and defines the culture of this society. Rhetoric is configured as a discipline in order to be able to serve in the teaching and learning of communication" (p. 18). Police agencies and officers have substantial rhetorical power, in addition to real, codified sociopolitical power.

Bratta and Powell (2016) further note that much of the work in cultural rhetorics is engaged with decolonization (from a cultural perspective), and this notion of decolonization can be transferred onto specific cultural perspectives – such as organizational or professional cultures – and the connectivity of that culture to broader cultural contexts. This is particularly the case with professional cultures – such as policing – that are *intended* to be part of the community in which it exists, thus partaking in the creation of and contextualization of cultural rhetoric. Cultural rhetorics views decolonization as uncoupling from the effects of being subjected to perspectives from a position of power and thus "call attention to colonial systems of power, challenge the rhetoric of modernity, and make space for multiple knowledge systems by reclaiming the power to control their own representation" (Novotny et al, 2021, p. 111).

This study uses a related view in the context of work being done in the policing profession – communities laboring under the traditional, historical, codified, real and cultural, power of policing and policing organizations. In other words, it is the state of policing being done *to* a community versus policing being done *with* a community. In fact, readers will see examples of the difficulty of uncoupling from a traditional view of policing (the people and function) within this research. These examples will manifest during discussion of research and discussion that demonstrates that campus communities often struggle uncoupling their

encultured, traditional understanding of policing as a function when compared with policing in a campus environment. This point is illuminated by Albaladejo's (2016) comment that culture is a characteristic that maintains a "very active role in rhetorical discourse and its communication, and in this way culture works as a link between producers and receivers, connecting them in order to achieve the aims of discourse" (p. 19).

The act of constellating, or relating connections emanating from experiences and encounters, is important for cultural rhetorics because constellating reveals the connections and helps to uncover experiences that contribute to the development of culturally shared beliefs. The act of constellating may walk hand in hand with cultural contexts, but it is not a stretch even for practical application of how we understand policing in our communities in the U.S. This is especially the case when noting that constellating relates to making connections from experiences and encounters, especially in very practical encounters which occur thousands of times daily in the police profession across the United States. This is true when one considers the Community Policing Model, which is based on the idea that the police and community are working together to solve not only crime problems but also address social problems. Specifically, the philosophy of Community Policing and its associated policing models are characterized by deliberate, often programmatic processes of shared problem-solving, often driven by improving environmental or social conditions, which in turn are anticipated to help reduce crime. Skogan (2008) notes that when an agency is committed to a community policing philosophy, they open themselves to external input and find that social disorder is a primary concern for their communities. Police must have an "organizational strategy in place that enables police to respond to these concerns is a requirement, if they are going to continue to meaningfully engage the public" (Skogan, 2008, p. 46). Thus, a community policing philosophy

is not defined so much by the programs that are created, but by deliberately connecting with the community to learn about their shared concerns and building responses around that community relationship. However, this may be an area where police are losing philosophical consideration because of a lack of consideration of cultural rhetorics. Because policing is so based on tangible, practical results, even community policing programs can get lost in focusing on practical results at the expense of the developing shared cultural contexts and constellating relationships.

Whether referring to broader cultural beliefs, or more nuanced cultural contexts such as how we contextualized and understand what policing looks like, Bratta and Powell (2016) explain the important role of constellating as:

The practice of constellating not only provides a material metaphor for honoring all of those relationships but also helps create sustainable frames for specific rhetorical practices. Constellative practice emphasizes the degree to which knowledge is *never* built by individuals but is, instead, accumulated through collective practices within specific communities. These collective practices, then, are what *create* the community; they hold the community together over time even when many of them are no longer practiced day-to-day but are, instead, *remembered* as day-to-day events (n.p.).

Powell et al (2014) articulates the meaningfulness of envisioning a concept of constellating verses “intersecting,” where intersection “implies a linear arrangement in which a subject stands at the nexus of straight lines that only cross at one point” (p. 5). Powell et al (2014) importantly goes on to note that this linearity “imposes ideas about causality or origins, both of which are generally also obscuring many of the other meaningful relationships between places, spaces, events, people, and communities. And it traps subjects who are literally held in place, skewered by multiple discourses” (p. 5). Conversely, the vision of a constellation affords space and connection for *all* of the relevant practices that support meaning-making efforts and outcomes and allows those practices to be valued. Thus, one is afforded multiple ways to experience and connect to various discourses concurrently, as well as balance shifting discourses and meaning

without being bounded by a linear concept of meaning or culture-origin. Perhaps stated in another way, a constellation concept affords different viewpoints to be experienced simultaneously in the hopes of generating greater understanding and contextual meaning.

2.3 Cultural Dynamics of Campus Policing

There is no shortage of scholarship in police organizational culture. That scholarship, while thorough, also often focuses on the organizational culture as the pivot point of the culture within the profession. While this study does not disagree with that notion, there is room to contribute more to the scholarship surrounding police culture by using cultural rhetorics to look deeper into culture that is not solely derived from within police organizations but also derived from society in general outside the organization. Essentialist views of police, formal and informal police artifacts, and police discourse conventions all contribute to a recognizable police-associated culture. Essentialist views of police are characterized by an established general sociocultural perception of what police do and look like. This view has been established over time and is boosted by popular media depictions of police and police behavior, helping to form a readily available vision of police in one's mind. Formal and informal police artifacts, that is, the tools, language, vision cues, and other items contribute to that encultured vision of police. Police communication, such as vernacularized industry language and writing, both formal and informal, serve to foster organizational culture and informal culture amongst police and community perceptions of *how* police engage.

This study leans on Paoline (2003) to illustrate the value of using cultural rhetorics to look deeper into police culture that is not strictly organizational, but perhaps more organic in social terms. Paoline (2003) noted that, "As police forces continue to diversify and as community policing becomes part of the philosophy of policing, both of which penetrate police culture, one

should expect even more cultural variation” (p. 209). Paoline (2003) also noted that future research maps may show that “police culture is best understood as a filtering process that is mediated through the organization and within by rank and style” (p. 209). This is because, according to Paoline’s (2003) police culture model, occupational culture feeds organizations, which feeds [police] ranks within the organization, which in turn feeds into styles of coping with organizational culture (p. 209). If that is accurate, then the impetus for any cultural change would consequently filter through mediation within the organization. Paoline (2003) notes that such a cultural model described above still relies on the traditional police organization phenomenon of homogeneity not only in race and gender, but also attitudes, values, and norms (p. 209). Such a phenomenon results in an “unusually high degree of social cohesiveness” (Frewin, Stephens & Tuffin, 2006, p. 243) among police officers through a quick and powerful process of socialization, which is supported by officers’ active roles of environmental interpretation (Frewin, Stephens & Tuffin, 2006). This is a direct nod to the enculturation of police officers within a police culture, but also the mediation of police culture in the broader community culture.

Such a cultural model just described is an accurate description within the policing profession and often hardened by traditional and historical structures in police organizations, there is also the opportunity to add more directly to Paoline’s (2003) model and flip it somewhat using cultural rhetorics in order to disrupt that hardened, dominant organizational culture. Rather than professional culture influencing organizations, then ranks, then culture, a model in which an increasingly diverse, external culture within an increasingly diverse profession can penetrate and influence ranks, then influence organizations, then influence professional culture may be worth consideration. Organizational change may be more often initiated strategically, albeit over time,

from the “bottom” rather than acutely from a change in leadership at the top. Arguably the strategic change option is likely to take better root in the long term and be less contentious.

Consider also that the homogeneity in the policing field is arguably not the largest culprit of solidifying police culture, especially in a diversified/diversifying field. Conti (2009) notes that there is a “common misconception of police culture as overly homogeneous by focusing on ritual, an element of every culture—homogeneous or otherwise” (p. 412). Rather, Conti (2009) suggests an adherence to orders of interactions that are encultured and re-encultured into the police officer to maintain that authority within the profession and maintain social power structures. This seems to support a triangulation of police rhetorics in essentialism, codification, and discourse pointing to a rhetorical positioning that is less based in homogeneity and more based in socialization. The social transition is a focus of Wada, Patten, and Candela (2010). Wada, Patten, and Candela (2010) framed their campus police research on Arnold van Gennep’s theory of liminality in which one experiences separation [from a social group], transition [liminality] toward a new social group, and ultimately incorporation into the new social group. In the police officer context, Wada, Patten, and Candela (2010) suggest this process of socialization into the policing group is accurate of both municipal police officers and campus police officers, arguing that:

Recruits enter the police academy with the intention of changing their social standing from a civilian to police officer. Through the transition stage, the police academy places these recruits into a position where they are no longer civilians, but not yet police officers. Thus, they are certainly in the transitionary or liminal stage. Finally, as the recruits depart the academy, they are reintegrated back into the community as police officers, thus completing the stage of incorporation (p. 118).

Where Wada, Patten, and Candela (2010) argue there is a divergence between municipal officers and campus officers is in the perception of legitimacy; perhaps essentialized/unconscious

legitimacy. While municipal officers may integrate into the community with a new social standing as an officer as a legitimized law enforcement authority, campus police officers integrate with the new social standing, however the perception of legitimized law enforcement authority is left in a liminal state “in which they are neither civilians nor fully accepted as ‘real’ cops” (Wada, Patten, & Candela, 2010, p. 118). The irony in this is that both campus police and municipal and county police are positions that are occupied by the same people. They often cross over into both worlds and move freely between various types of law enforcement. They quite literally attend the same police academies and have the same vested authorities. In the case of North Carolina, all police officers are sworn and certified by the identical certifying body. Therefore the perception of legitimacy is not based on *who* is employed in these roles, rather legitimacy is perceived based on the culturally contextualized function of these roles. While municipal (traditional) policing is often the policing that is idealized as what “police” do, campus police are often more service-oriented while also accomplishing more infrequent elements of what is idealized of municipal police, responding to and resolving crime and disorder.

What the authors mean by “new social standing” is the transition from “civilian” to police officer, or stated another way, a transition from non-police officer to police officer that is assumed through police officer recruit training within the appropriate training academy. However, Wada, Patten, and Candela (2010) suggest that campus police officers, because they are often not accepted as “real” police, often reside in a liminal phase of social transition from civilian to police officer. My own experience causes me to partially disagree with this assessment, particularly Wada, Patten, and Candela’s (2010) suggestions that people seek to become police officers with the *intention* of changing their social status. Further campus police are largely viewed with legitimacy over the past two decades or so. I argue, anecdotally and from

an ethnographic perspective, that critical incidents on school campuses have heightened that element of campus police being viewed as legitimate. The argument that police officers somehow shed their civilian status for a police status is somewhat dehumanizing. In fairness, police officers are not the only professions who experience this perceived social status change through some process of professionalization. Consider also professors, doctors, attorneys, military personnel, or teachers, etc. Yet, police officers are in fact, even when not on the job, viewed as police officers. In North Carolina at least, police officers who are even off-duty and within their jurisdiction, have legal authority to act in their police officer capacity. It can be argued that the police social status is largely unavoidable, even if the social status is only perceived.

Where legitimacy is impacted for Wada, Patten, and Candela (2010) is confusion between campus police training and their primary functions, noting that campus police are trained as municipal officers, but their primary roles are prevention and service. This is not a new perception of campus police officers as the same outlook was noted by Bordner and Peterson (1983) in their research into campus policing in the early 1980s. Many similar themes were noted in their data from campus police officers at that time, who universally noted the difficulty in breaking stereotypes of campus police not being legitimate police. This notion is addressed in the research and perhaps speaks more to how campus versus municipal police is viewed in terms of their roles within their community rather than the individuals who occupy those roles. After much consideration and leaning on my own experience, Wada, Patten, and Candela (2010) are correct about their assertions of campus police functions largely being crime prevention and service driven.

There is undoubtedly a high degree of socialization within the policing professions, yet disagreement can be found with Wada, Patten, and Candela's (2010) characterization that police officer candidates enter into the police academy with the *intention* of changing their social status. The notion that police officer candidates shedding their "civilian" status while transitioning to police officer status seems a bit dehumanizing and relegates them to a rather strict, automaton-like, police officer identity. In my nearly 26 years in the profession, I never met anyone who wanted to be a police officer as a means to change their social status; other reasons, yes; social status change, no. Indeed, it is not logical for someone to seek to change to a social standing that is regularly disliked, criticized broadly, admonished (yes, and also appreciated), and often on the lower end of salary markets for the purposes of changing social status.

There is an argument that police recruits are attracted to the police profession through characteristics that are often associated with police culture; a crime-fighter image, some tendency toward a "macho" culture, and a distinction between police and non-police groups (Debbaut & De Kimpe, 2023). All of these translate into a social standing characterized by increased power. My experience in recruitment and hiring has largely not aligned with these characteristics as being commonly manifested motivations for people to want to become police officers, however I acknowledge that they exist. I also recognize that my role in recruitment and hiring police officers has largely been isolated to campus police and not municipal police, and perceptual distinctions have historically been drawn between campus police (as mostly service providers) and municipal police (as mostly crime fighters). Encouragingly, Debbaut and De Kimpe (2023) note that more recent research has found more positive characteristics of police viewing their own legitimacy as protecting vulnerable populations and being mediators who are more open to reform and more diversity of police officer candidates (pp. 694-695). My own

experience aligns with the more recent research noted by Debbaut and De Kimpe (2023) in that, contemporarily speaking, many who are interested in becoming police officers are often driven less by ideas of personal power or authority and more by interests of a challenging job, problem-solving, and diversity of work tasks. However, I concede that it is a fair argument to say that historically, many people seeking to become police officers may have been driven by ideas of increasing their social and legal power or being in a position of authority that may come with perceived higher prestige..

The police profession identity is doubly applied; self-applied and applied by the community, but it is not solely applied in the professional sense, but also in the social sense. The crux of my disagreement with this notion is that Wada, Patten, and Candela (2010) speak of this almost with a certain amount of finality of “separating themselves from their original social standing (as civilians) to become police officers” (p. 118); almost with an inference that some metamorphosis from civilian to police officer [social] standing is perceived as permanent. Like other professions, however perhaps arguably stronger in the policing field, police officers are often identified by what they do professionally rather than who they are individually. Arguably then, any change in social standing based on one’s status as a police officer is not an intention, rather it is an effect of becoming a police officer by profession, but a civilian status is not separated except where our culture separates it from police officers. At least in terms of legal standing, police officers are civilians as much as they are police officers.

While there can be disagreement with the notion of social standing change as a primary reason that people become police officers, one can appreciate the connection between the social perception of policing, socializing how we understand and view that profession and concept, and enculturate it into our contextual understanding of what policing means to us. Further, and

particular to campus police officers, Wada, Patten, and Candela (2010) note that campus police officers are often, at least socially, placed in a liminal state in comparison to municipal police officers; partly because of the lack of knowledge about their police status, but also likely because of the service-heavy work that they perform in contrast to traditional portrayals of police officers in media and culture. Additionally, that liminal status is likely also a little more solidified by the perception that campuses are often relatively crime-free zones, which is clearly a misperception.

In the broader notion of police rhetoric and culture, a distinction may be drawn between the discussion of occupational culture and police culture. A discussion of occupational culture suggests a discussion of narrower topics of occupations, workplaces, and the formal and informal cultural goings-on within those spaces. Using a cultural rhetorics lens, police rhetorics is much more encompassing beyond occupational space and is intertwined with broader culture and communities, particularly when overlaying onto public matters such as advocacy and civic engagement. Consequently, one may hesitate to use the word “subculture” when referring to police culture like other scholars (Britz, 1997; Herbert, 1998; Waddington, 1999; Rose & Unnithan, 2015; Ganapathy & Cheong, 2016) do for their purposes. Policing certainly has distinct cultural characteristics aligned with occupational frames that set it apart from broader culture, however one may also see police culture so distinctly as a subculture when looking through a cultural rhetorics lens and where broader cultural implications are at play. Admittedly, it’s complicated. For a profession that supposedly, at least traditionally, has been philosophically associated with being one with the community, police officers are often socially distinct – some self-imposed and some audience-imposed – and much of that imposition creates a distinct cultural divide between what is police and what is not police.

Essentialism

Essentialism is inherently rhetorical. Essentialism matters for studying police rhetorics and police rhetorical self-awareness because of the culturally and socially ascribed characteristics to police officers and police work. That is, police symbols, visual references, discourse, and tasks associated with what policing “mean” to people. Those characteristics, and others, often are essentialized into an idealized contextual view of what policing is “supposed” to look like. In the most direct illustration of this, one may close their eyes and imagine an image of a police officer, or police related topics, and that person will likely have idealized images that would be remarkably similar to what other people imagine. Newman and Knobe (2017) noted that essentialism relates to the psychological recognition of a concept that is not solely represented by observable features. In other words, people often recognize something, a physical thing, or an idea for example, in “terms of a deeper ‘essence’ that is not readily observed” (Newman & Knobe, 2017, p. 585) by the traditional senses such as sight, sounds, and touch. The “essence” of something then becomes recognizable by associating its characteristics with certain ideals, values, or other [often] culturally assigned notions. Knowledge that is culturally mediated and established is difficult to remediate.

Aside from physical or biological, Newman and Knobe (2017) point out that essentialist views also extend to concepts or social categories such as race, gender, religion, and so on (p. 586). Thus, the assignment of an “essence” of something is often not scientifically derived, rather that essence is assigned by more abstract ideas and values that imply or drive contextual understandings of what that “thing” means to us. This phenomenon is akin to what Foucault, according to Bawarshi (2000) called the “author-function,” where in the absence of an [actual] author, we ascribe the author-function that can exist independent of a real writer and be identified with the work that the text (or other discourse) is associated with (pp. 336-337).

Essentialist views ascribe a police author-function to police discourse conventions because those discourse conventions are associated with the work (policing) of the discourse.

Consider now the attributes of what society ascribes to the policing profession – the symbolisms, language, behaviors, and other observable phenomena. Consider also what our culture, including media depictions, tell us what police work “looks like.” Society often tells us what policing looks like, is “supposed” to look like, or what behaviors are associated with policing. In other words, people are often predisposed to a cultural conception of what police officers looks like, behave like, and what artifacts are associated with that work. Some of this can be traced to popular culture in media and television. Consider for example how “cop shows” have evolved from the 1960s to the present in how they depict police officers. One could associate “police essentialism” with what Newman and Knobe (2017) call Platonic essentialism. This type of essentialism connects to judgements about values, contexts, or other features that are associated with something, a profession for example, and cause people to “believe that what binds together the different features of the category is the fact that they are all ways of embodying the same deeper value” (Newman & Knobe, 2017, p. 588). The result is an associative property categorization of that “thing” based on often unobserved, abstract characteristics that evolve into observable ones that feed realization.

Notably, Newman and Knobe (2017) make a distinction within Platonic essentialism; that the “value judgement that plays a role in Platonic essentialism appears to be specifically a judgement of trueness rather than goodness” (p. 589). Stated another way, the characteristics associated with an “essence” are derived not from whether the features are good but rather if they are true, which ascribes a deeper value about the thing being essentialized. This value judgement about what is “true” about police can be observed. For example, I have witnessed some people,

often on social media, associate “bad” or “racist” police officers as true characteristics associated with all police officers, even though this profoundly unwarranted.

One need not necessarily have an encounter with police to culturally form such a concept of police or policing. Jacobsen (2014) noted such a police-knowledge concept being developed by vicarious views of police legitimacy, stating that one’s compliance with police “can also be shaped by their vicarious experiences with law enforcement officials” (p. 313). Those encounters, according to Jacobsen (2014) may be “as influential on individuals’ perceptions and behaviors as personal encounters” (p. 313) because of their propensity to be internalized by the individual. Such an idea also conjures up questions of other forms of vicarious experiences with police, such as social media, television and movies, or other platforms that may project police rhetorics. All of these “encounters” with police rhetorics, directly or vicariously, situate themselves within social perspective concepts of community-driven knowledge, including relevant power structures. Thus, if communities are bodies of shared beliefs, those beliefs are “internalized by community members as ways of organizing experience existing before and mediating understanding” (Johnson-Eilola & Selber, 2004, p. 136).

Campus policing may be at a disadvantage when it comes to contextual knowledge of policing in campus communities because of a lack of factual knowledge about that particular service as demonstrated by Bordner and Peterson (1983), Wada, Patten, and Candela (2010), Jacobsen (2015), Wilson and Wilson (2015), and Patten et al. (2016). Research has consistently shown that campus communities often struggle when asked their level of knowledge about their police organizations such as training requirements, certification requirements, and the tasks that police officers conduct in that community. Wada, Patten, and Candela (2010) noted that prior research often focused on campus police technical proficiency or measurement of satisfaction

with service or effectiveness, as opposed to perception of legitimacy. This suggests a disconnect between the community's general belief in their own knowledge about what municipal policing looks like versus what it looks like in a campus setting. A void of accurate knowledge will likely be filled with social or perceptual knowledge and that social or perceptual knowledge will be internalized as concrete over time. This is a consideration that has been noted in campus police research over time. Bordner and Peterson (1983) noted this in their research. Their campus police research participants commented at that time about the lack of awareness of what campus police do or don't do.

One of Bordner and Peterson's (1983) interview participants made a direct correlation to essentialist views of what police do, noting that "In the city the community already knows who you are and what you can do – they grow up knowing what your function is and what your powers are" (Bordner & Peterson, 1983, p. 67). In other words, this campus police participant recognized that the police officer function is socialized in the contexts of municipal (traditional) or "city" police, suggesting that when people learn about police officers and the policing functions, they do so through idealizing policing from a traditional policing perspective (municipal policing) as opposed to campus or other types of policing. Just in North Carolina for example, there are private/company police (including large shopping malls), railroad police, hospital police departments, and others that are not employed by local, state, or federal authorities. They must go through the same certification processes as municipal and campus police. Jacobsen (2015) put it square in the perception of police legitimacy by noting the understudy of "college students' perceptions of the legitimacy of campus police officers and how officers' actions serve to enhance or diminish this perceived legitimacy at institutions of higher education" (p. 310). This idea supports the argument that campus police face challenges with

perceptions of legitimacy historically when compared with municipal police. Perceived police legitimacy is connected to essentialist views of what police are legitimately empowered to do, and that idealistic view is more often connected to traditional (municipal/county) police agencies and employees more so than campus ones.

Artifacts

Artifacts, for police, are the tangible tools for police that either aid or even initiate police discourse and responses, including non-verbal communication, and influence perception and understanding of the police role. They drive police behaviors, contexts, and discourse, regardless of their codified status. Codification here refers to artifacts such as policies, procedures, laws and legal statutes, regulations, tools, and official means of communication, among other documentable characteristics. Artifacts, in the context of this research, are any elements, official or unofficial, that are associated or perceived to be associated with police culture and rhetoric or are associated with the cultural contexts of who police officers are, how they carry on, and what they do within that police role. Discussion of artifacts for police is important because of the strong association with artifacts with the police profession. Some items, such as vehicles, uniforms and equipment, badges, and many other items are inextricably linked to police and police officers. They are also routinely and widely depicted in popular media and television alike. The artifacts, and indeed the depictions themselves, carry substantial sociocultural contexts and associations of being “police.” Unlike informal cultural contexts, codified artifacts drive police rhetoric as a matter of system, hierarchy, and classification. They drive “official” actions that are generally backed by some established, accepted legal or otherwise “standard” practice of operation. Similarly, informal artifacts influence cultural characteristics of organizational culture and may be amplified in a more stringently hierarchical field, such as the policing field. Informal

or unofficial artifacts, such as social and cultural ones, are often brought into the organization by its members and mediated within. These types of artifacts may include characteristics, some even stereotypical, such as slang or vernacularized language, unofficial communications, social relationships, “unwritten” rules of police behavior (not to be construed as negative necessarily) or “ways of doing things” on the job that are often contextualized or mediated within police groups.

Paoline (2003) noted the increasing diversification of policing, which brings with it new social and cultural artifacts into the policing field. The social and cultural perspectives that are attached to individuals can be attached to organizations or groups as well. Mariano and Awazu (2017) suggest that artifacts are the result of the co-creation of information mediated through sociocultural interaction. This information is then contributed to organizations in the form of recognized artifacts, which is important to better understand how these processes help define organizational culture or subculture at distinct levels of organization. Within the field of policing, cultural recognitions and contexts are both inter- and intra-organizational, transcending all levels of organizations and physical and geographical boundaries. To put it another way, police officers often easily recognize other police officers and their police culture regardless of geography, organizational affiliation, or geography. Recognition comes regularly in the form of nonhuman actants – essentialism, codifications, and discourse for example.

These artifacts, sociocultural and technical, are the things that are brought into the boundaries of mediation. Sociocultural learning occurs within these boundaries and people look for means to connect across social and cultural boundaries to avoid fragmentation (Akkerman & Bakker, 2011, p. 132). Akkerman and Bakker (2011) elaborate on this by commenting:

Whether we speak of learning as the change from novice to expert in a particular domain or as the development from legitimate peripheral participation to being a

full member of a particular community the boundary of the domain or community is constitutive of what counts as expertise or as central participation. When we consider learning in terms of identity development, a key question is the distinction between what is part of me versus what is not (yet) part of me (p. 132).

When sociocultural artifacts meet within these boundaries they are negotiated for meaning by others resulting in collective knowledge and contextual understanding over time. Police officers want to assimilate as quickly as possible with fellow police officers to become part of the “team” and, just as Akkerman and Bakker suggest, to avoid fragmenting from the group. Officers who struggle in this area in an extreme manner, although rare, find it difficult to recover because of differences in perspectives that they were unwilling to mediate within the policing culture.

Sociocultural artifacts participate in boundary crossings, in which sociocultural meanings cross paths and by their nature often function as mediators for “intersecting identities and practices” (Akkerman & Bakker, 2011, p. 132). It is at the boundaries of sociocultural perspectives where cultural artifacts meet and may undergo processes of mediation and understanding as their respective meanings take shape amongst organizational members (Star & Griesemer, 1989). Culture is a factor of organizational effectiveness and suggests that membership carries much of the organizational influence development and drives cultural communication which in turn influences effectiveness. Organization culture is tied to organization communication and translated to organization effectiveness. The more widely spread the culture, the more that communication is observed (Gochhayat et al, 2017). This aids in explaining why police officers are more readily open to communicate with other police officers regardless of geography. They generally recognize, more often than not, a shared, both formal and informal, police culture.

Discourse Conventions

The manner and contexts in which police officers and police agencies communicate amongst themselves, but particularly the manner in which police communicate with the broader public in a service and civic capacity are police discourse conventions. Organizational, professional, and other jargonistic commonalities are found amongst the “copspeak” that is often associated with police officers. This includes the formal and informal manners of speaking with codes and contexts. This also includes other discourses associated with various police culture-driven, communicative expectations such as the discourse of emotions. If police culture demands certain expectations of emotional display amongst police officer, then naturally that display would be frame by contextual language (Frewin, Stephens, & Tuffin, 2006, p. 244).

Further, analysis of such communications is important because it “enhances knowledge of the ways that specific organizational culture construct, reproduce, and maintain their identities, both internally and externally” (Frewin, Stephens & Tuffin, 2006, p. 244). Notably, a social constructionist view of a discourse of emotions suggests that they are constituted via cultural practices and have identifiable social functions (Frewin, Stephens & Tuffin, 2006, p. 246). This notion supports contributing to using a cultural rhetorics approach to explore the discourse practices (among other cultural characteristics) of police rhetorics rather than leaning more heavily on the organizational or professional (as in the field) culture lens.

The relationship between the police and community is often characterized by the power of identity and politics. Discourse conventions are among the characteristics of power and identity, particularly from an ideological social perspective. Discourses and their respective narratives are often the critical points in which relationships emerge between individuals and groups. Andrus (2019) commented that:

Narratives are sites in which individuals create relationships between themselves and others, oriented around a set of unfolding events. Narrative is a motivated, engaged

retelling of prior or anticipated events produced in interaction with others, in a particular context stocked with constraints and affordances. In the process of telling stories, identities emerge (p.636).

Within these narratives one may find the cultural rhetorics necessary to not only articulate culturally negotiated knowledge, but perhaps also the keys to begin to change narratives, particularly where dominant narratives can start to be challenged by confronting the “old” and traditional with the “new” and dynamic.

Like other professional groups, the policing organizations have their own brand of socio-cultural characteristics, such as its discourse and use of written and spoken, jargonistic language – a type of “copspeak,” if you will. Copspeak is a manner of speaking or writing that is characterized by particular words, phrases, and linguistic structures such as nominalization and passive voice that are common to and often associated with police discourse conventions. Considering that police organizations are traditionally para-militaristic in organizational structure, function, and appearance, it comes as no surprise that the discourse found in such an environment would follow suit. This style of discourse is part of the police “figured world” (Gee, 2014), from which many police officers’ discursive expectations derive and fostered to be rooted in part of that identity.

Gee’s (2014) notion of the figured world suggests that often individuals tend to have preconceived notions of what discourse looks like or how it is supposed to work. In other words, people may go into a discourse situation with a generalized idea or expectation of what that discourse will look like based on prefabricated notions built on experience or sociocultural expectations. That expectation may be impacted by the audience, the setting, or the topics, or perhaps some other factor like cultural understanding, history, or experience. These preconceived notions of discourse are formulated from “experiences we have had, but, crucially, as these

experiences are guided, shaped, and normed by the social and cultural groups to which we belong” (Gee, 2014, p.95). This is not different for police officers. In addition to experience, the figured world of police officers largely comes from occupational enculturation, which includes the development and expression of explicit socio-cultural artifacts such as symbols, policies, practices, and vernacular, as well as implicit ones such as experiences, beliefs, and social influences that serve to help mediate social context and understanding.

Gee’s (2014) figured world concept can be associated with social perspective notions of ideology, particularly on the assumptions of what ideology is when related to discourse. Van Dijk (2007) suggests, similarly to Gee’s (2014) figured world concept, that ideology assumes a socially shared belief system among social actors in that they “consist of social representations that define the social identity of a group, that is, its shared beliefs about its fundamental conditions and ways of existence and reproduction” (p.116). Van Dijk stretches the concept of the figured world and overlays it onto a broader group in the form of ideological preconceptions of discourse. Fairclough (2003) argues that there is a dialectical relationship between what social groups do and what they represent. Further, culture exists and is represented by language enacted by discourses (Fairclough, 2003; Gee, 2014) that encompass identities, genres, and styles. Hence, if ideological and cultural characteristics are socially derived, they then are gradually acquired overtime through processes of socialization or, as may be suggested the case of the policing profession, through the processes of enculturation, in which ideologies thus “organize and ground the social representations shared by the members of the (ideological) groups” (Fairclough, 2003, p.117).

2.4 Policing Campuses of Higher Education

Current scholarship on campus policing appears to reveal a gap in the cultural contextual understanding of what policing in different communities is perceived to be. For example, numerous scholars (Wada, Patten, & Candela, 2010; Jacobsen, 2015; Wilson & Wilson, 2015); Patten et al, 2016; Aiello, 2020; Youstin & Kopp, 2020; and Allen, 2021) noted the difference between survey/interview answers about municipal policing versus campus policing. Responses indicated that generally speaking, people felt they knew municipal [traditional] policing training requirements and associated tasks, however in regard to campus policing, the answers were much less likely to indicate either a practical or contextual vision of what policing looked like for a campus community, even though the training requirements, associated tasks, and legal affordances were *identical*. The differences in policing perceptions between municipal and campus policing are not contemporary perceptions; research even in the early 1980s demonstrated similar perceptions (Bordner & Peterson, 1983). Anecdotally, I am surprised to see how little police literature and knowledge about campus policing seems to have changed over time. The data from this study often reflects previous research data on perception and knowledge of campus police from Bordner and Peterson (1983) up through Allen (2021). That research generally suggests that the campus police audience often isn't fully aware of what campus police do in contrast to municipal police.

Understandably, Sloan and Lanier (2022) noted that “one could argue that compared to municipal police, the campus police are better positioned to implement community policing” (p. 271). While Sloan and Lanier (2022) argue that this is based on the notion that campus agencies had relied more heavily on proactive crime-prevention approaches (p. 271), it is important keep in mind that campus agencies are also more service-oriented due to the prevalence of service-type activities rather than the prevalence of criminal activity and law enforcement response. This

places campus police officers in more direct contact with their primary audience: students, faculty, and staff members. To give some context of how campus police roles versus municipal police are perceived, we must also look at *how* campus police generally “police” their communities, which is more often than not a model that aligns with Community Oriented Policing (community policing). This policing philosophy is supported by the argument that campus communities may be in more need of service-oriented policing and emergency preparedness rather than more strictly law enforcement aligned philosophies. Basham (2020) noted “since 9/11 and the Virginia Tech massacre, emergency preparedness in all forms, weather, criminal or accidental, has taken priority in campus law enforcement (p. 750). This is because of community policing’s propensity to provide a “holistic response, considering community needs and invite community participation in identifying perceived risks and expectations of their law enforcement agency” (Basham, 2020, p. 750).

The Community Oriented Policing Model, resulting from criticisms of traditional, often reactionary, policing models designed to prevent crime through enforcement and the risk of being caught, is the prevalent model in campus settings (Sloan & Lanier, 2022). Community policing represents a philosophical change of the policing role, a change in which police organizations take proactive, collaborative actions with the community in order to find broader, perhaps more palatable solutions rather than strictly relying on enforcement. The desired result is certainly greater cooperation with policing efforts and better relationships with police officers, but also greater acceptance of policing efforts supported by increased perception of legitimacy.

Part of the uniqueness of the role of the police in campus environments coupled with the uniqueness of campus communities is the role of the Community Oriented Policing Model. This is a model that has taken shape since the 1980s and is often characterized by “a closer degree of

cooperation between police and community members in finding ways to mutually deal with crime” (Bromley, 2022, p. 285). Bromley (2022) suggests that community-oriented efforts, as was also independently articulated by many of the interviewees, that reorienting operations was important for police officers to rely “less on motorized patrol and more on face-to-face interaction with citizens” (p. 265). In other words, police officers must get out of the cars and get out in the community to actively apply the philosophical concepts of community policing.

Community policing carries with it the characteristics of collaborating with community members to locate problem solving approaches through collaboration. To illustrate how this model is applied in practical terms, my own police organization has a number of references to community policing or community involvement in both policies and the five-year strategic plan. In fact, one policy, General Order 1000-10 Residence Hall Liaison Officer Program, states the following:

The East Carolina University Police Department is dedicated to the concept of Community Oriented Policing. The success of that philosophy is contingent upon trust between the police department and the public. Such trust can only be gained through constant communication between the public and the police. The Residence Hall Liaison Officer Program is one of several programs dedicated to facilitating open lines of communication and a means to address community concerns (ECU Police, G.O. 1000-10, 2023, p. 1).

That particular policing philosophy is not only conceptualized in policies and plans but is directly translated into practical application.

Bromley (2022) notes – accurately in my experience – that campus police have historically served a unique role in campus environments, leading the notion that “not only are the campus police expected to provide professional law enforcement services, they also routinely interact with law-abiding campus community members such as students, staff, and faculty” (Bromley, 2022, pp. 285-286). One must consider that the continual development of at least the

largest universities in the U.S., often constitute characteristics routinely found in municipalities such as residential areas, medical facilities, social characteristics, shopping and dining, business functions, athletics venues, and even daycare centers and public-school partnerships. The largest campuses will have tens of thousands of people moving through that campus on a daily basis (Bromley, 2022, p. 284). It follows that these developments have also pushed the expectation that many campuses have developed full-service police departments to match the development of our university campuses and their respective community characteristics. Bromley (2022) points out what is generally understood about Community Oriented Policing:

While policing inevitably involves negative contacts between officers and the public (e.g. traffic stops, stopping citizens on suspicion, or issuing orders to desist), COP seeks to offset these negative contacts as much as possible with positive contacts between officers and citizens (p. 267).

This point is independently noted by several interview participants in this study. It was encouraging to see that the majority of the police officers and administrators that were interviewed commented specifically on their preference for face-to-face or other interpersonal connection with the community. These responses indicated a prominent level of awareness of police rhetorical influence as well as rhetorical self-awareness in ethos-building.

Scholars of police culture and related topics in policing have suggested that policing in campus communities is generally understudied in relation to other areas that are generally viewed as more traditional – specifically municipal policing or policing in urban settings. Some of the topics relevant to campus policing that have been researched are often related to those perceptions of policing in a campus setting compared to a municipal one. Audience knowledge of campus policing within that comparison to municipal policing, along with perceptions of the legitimacy of campus policing have come under the eye of scholars. Wada, Patten, and Candela (2010), Jacobsen (2015), Wilson and Wilson (2015), Patten et al (2016), Aiello (2020), Youstin

& Kopp (2020, and Allen (2021), all explored the perception of legitimacy of campus policing with similar results – students often dismiss campus policing legitimacy because they are not viewed as “real” police. This position is echoed by Jacobsen (2015) who noted that for various reasons, including lower instances of crime on campus and a relatively short-term population, students will likely not have personal interaction with campus police, also impacting perceptions of legitimacy and a lack of knowledge of campus policing contexts. It is probable that students have never encountered a *campus police department* until arriving on a campus that is served by one. However, they may have encountered their own local police, either directly or vicariously through social or cultural interaction. Thus, it comes as no surprise to me that students may not immediately connect cultural contexts of how they know policing in the traditional [municipal] sense, versus contexts in a campus setting.

Jacobsen (2015) calls for further research “that investigates how students in the context of the college campus—whether rural, suburban, or urban—engage the police in a manner that is similar to or different from individuals in other types of communities,” (pp. 327-328) suggesting a comparative (to municipal) process. Allen (2020) makes a similar call to comparative research to improve “research, theory, and policing” (p. 102). While these calls have value and noted that previous research compares campus policing to municipal policing, researching via cultural rhetorics methodology a comparative approach may be supported by exploring campus policing culture in relation to broader cultural contexts of that campus community in itself. Further, exploring that cultural setting for its own context may be of even more value for this project because the goal is to get at both the cultural and police rhetorics of this particular community.

Also, notably, there appears to be little research of campus police officers themselves. Of the scholars cited in this dissertation, only Bordner and Peterson (1983) and Wilson and Wilson

(2015) interviewed and gathered data from campus police officers. Nearly all other data collected was from students, or staff and faculty to a lesser extent. This presents an opportunity to lean into research that may collect data from campus community members, but also from campus police officers themselves from across a spectrum of diverse universities. Like Wilson and Wilson (2015), the value of such data will provide valuable insight into campus police officers' self-perceptions, cultural contexts, police rhetoric, and their relationship to broader notions of cultural rhetorics of policing in campus settings.

One particularly influential area of campus policing is the relationship with, and the contextual perception of policing, by marginalized communities and communities of color. The racial climate in campus settings (Ancis, Sedlacek & Mohr, 2000; Reid & Radhakrishnan, 2003; Rankin & Reason, 2005; Fischer, 2009; Mwangi et al, 2018) is a continual area of scholarship and study. The general finding is that people of color do feel marginalized not just institutionally, but also socially. Unsurprisingly, Sunshine and Tyler (2003) also noted the well-known gaps in views on police by different racial and ethnic groups. Grasping those social and cultural perspectives is critical because “understanding what it is about police behavior that the public finds problematic is important to accurately address the needs of citizens as well as to enable the police to function effectively” (p. 516). Although this subject – racial and ethnic perspectives on policing – is not the focus of this research, it is clearly a major factor in cultural contexts of policing and must be acknowledged for the role that it plays and is an area that is ripe for additional research.

Considering the generally strained relationship between police and communities of color nationwide, police rhetorics may impact different communities differently and the cultural contexts of how policing is understood in different communities is likely to be quite different as

well. If campuses are expected to recognize, appreciate, and even foster diversity in people and in ideas, then it follows that campus communities, including their police officers, should expect cultural contexts of policing that are equally as diverse and equally as worthy as being mediated and heard in that space.

CHAPTER THREE

RESEACH METHODOLOGY, DATA COLLECTION METHODS, & STUDY PARTICIPANTS

3.1 Introduction to Chapter Three

Chapter Three seeks to explain the rationale behind the research methodology, the data collection methods, and to provide information about the study participants. Chapter Three is intended to provide a backdrop for how the research was conducted and how the participant group was identified, as well as to articulate why their backgrounds are important to this research. Importantly, Chapter Three also offers discussion about the author's own participation within the field that is being studied: campus policing. This ethnographic element of participant observer is unavoidable for the author; however, it arguably lends value to the research being conducted as the author is able to provide context to a wide audience about the research findings.

3.2 Research Methodology and Data Collection Methods Rationale

The rationale of the methodology and methods is that the data gathered will provide deeper insight into cultural rhetorics, police culture, and how that culture is contextualized in the broader community cultural contexts of what policing in the campus community looks like. Such qualitative work will also afford a deeper exploration of police rhetorical self-awareness, discourse conventions, and their rhetorical impacts on a community audience. Several scholars (Wada, Patten & Candela, 2010; Jacobsen, 2015; Wilson and Wilson, 2015; Patten et al, 2016; Aiello, 2020; Youstin & Kopp, 2020; Allen, 2021) have demonstrated that substantial research has been characterized by comparing campus to municipal policing to elicit what community members know, or think they know, about similarities and differences between those police officers, often surveying members of campus communities such as students, staff, and faculty. Focusing on campus communities to elicit data to determine how those communities (while

recalling the demographics and characteristics noted above) engage and develop their contexts of culturally shared knowledge of what policing means, will contribute to previous scholarship on campus policing. The authors noted above, among others, have contributed a great deal to conversations about campus policing and campus community perspectives about *the audience's* perceptions of campus policing. Rarely have campus police officers been interviewed to evaluate their knowledge, experiences, self-perception of their roles, or their self-perception of their influence and impacts on how policing is understood in their – the campus – community.

One factor of the rationale for this research is the hope to do something different, and simultaneously do something that adds value to existing research. That “something different” is partly supported by studying and interviewing campus police officers to offer insight into their police rhetorics and rhetorical self-awareness, and how they contribute to the overall cultural contexts of policing in a campus environment. This research seeks to do just that, as the study participants are campus police officers employed within the University of North Carolina System. These agencies and officers carry with them their own discourses, experiences, concepts of rhetorical power, and sociopolitical and sociocultural relationships with their campus communities. Police officers are part of that community and research on police organizational culture is rich enough, however it seems that campus police officers are rarely engaged in conversations about campus policing, their behaviors, and any self-reflection they have about their community roles. My goal is to gauge if these campus police officers demonstrate recognition of their “police rhetorics,” and also to gauge any demonstrable level of rhetorical self-awareness. Further, there is a desire to translate those responses into articulable contributions to how policing in the campus setting is contextualized. The information gathered for this project will aid in evaluating how, culturally speaking, campus communities view the

policing concept in that setting – not just what the community knows or doesn't know, but how their contexts are impacted by police rhetorics and how they build relationships and knowledge about policing.

In light of the earlier suggestion of a cultural contextual disconnect between policing in a campus environment and a non-campus environment, this study seeks to support viable answers as to “why” this is the case from a cultural perspective from the police point of view. My argument, like previous research indicates, is that many people are culturally tempered to have certain conceptual understandings of what “policing” is, which is fed by a variety of sources that are relevant to essentialist views of police agencies, police officers, and “policing” as a function. However, curiosity exists within this study as to the role that police feel they play in how policing in a higher education campus setting is understood. This curiosity is based on cultural rhetorics. If rhetoric is culture and culture is rhetoric, then certainly the members of a campus community (or other community) have cultural influences of how they contextualize different aspects of that community, including police and their policing activities. If true, then those influences will intersect in a campus community where many members are relatively new, relatively transient in a short amount of time, and also generally diverse. However, those concepts are likely challenged when one arrives at a campus environment, creating a gap between one's essentialized view of policing versus a different context of policing that is located within a campus environment. Part of this essentialized view may be challenged by police rhetoric experienced on campus versus other areas of experience such as media depictions or understanding of “traditional” policing found in municipalities. An experience of policing on campus may be impacted by a differentiation between campus cultural experiences from cultural experiences that one brings with them to campus.

It is necessary to revisit that, for the purposes of this research, police rhetorics is defined as the systems of symbols, discourses, and practices, either actual, essentialized, or rhetorical, commonly associated with the policing profession and which locate meaning and understanding within policing contexts. With this definition in mind, several of the interview questions were intended to hopefully draw out responses that could be used to identify police rhetorics within the responses and connect back to the research questions. One example of police rhetorics is articulated in Administrator A's response to Question 1 (Appendix A). Here, Administrator A described the manner in which their police agency communicates as almost mechanical and devoid of "humanity" (Administrator A, Question 1, Appendix A). Administrator A claimed that as relevant to police discourse, noting "we" have struggled with that style of communication (the dehumanized, fact-based). This response ultimately foreshadowed what became generally apparent throughout the research questions and responses; that the participants generally seemed aware of their specific "police" discourse and that it projected some level of impact on their audiences. The fact that these police officers interview participants were aware of their discourse was not unexpected, however the depth to which the officers seemed to understand their discourse and its influence was somewhat unexpected considering we (police) do not regularly talk about police rhetorics - or rhetoric in general - as a topic within the profession.

3.3 Methodology

The methodology being employed here is a cultural rhetorics perspective aided by self-consideration of police discourse and image and rhetorical self-awareness which can be implicated in policing is culturally contextualized in a campus setting. Additionally, the cultural rhetorics methodology will be supported by literature review and an ethnographic perspective from the author, as a participant observer within the profession, to tease out critical qualitative

measures of both police rhetorics and cultural rhetorics and their relevance to rhetorical genre. The ethnographic perspective is intended to be limited and lend contextual support to the rationale for the research, the research itself, and the conclusions drawn from the research. My view of cultural rhetorics holds it as an effective lens through which to explore and develop the notion of police rhetorics as a phenomenon specifically attributed to and projecting from policing and mediating with cultural contexts of understanding policing. This view is helped by Albaladejo's (2016) argument that:

Cultural rhetoric is proposed as a methodological system to study the relationship between culture and rhetoric and to analyze rhetorical discourses, literary works, and texts of other kinds from the point of view of their rhetorical foundations and their perlocutionary force before receivers. It is connected with the cultural dimension of rhetoric and with the rhetorical dimension of culture. It is within the studies in culture, together with semiotics of culture and cultural studies (p. 16).

Further, using cultural rhetorics as the methodology, expanding and elaborating on that notion of police rhetorics, particularly through the methods explained later in this chapter, will contribute to a deeper dialogue of not just police culture, but how that culture fits within broader cultural characteristics of community and the civic engagement and public advocacy that Cobos et al (2018).

Why qualitative methods? If the goal is to dissect policing, particularly in analyzing the civic nature of policing and its cultural and rhetorical positionality, or to analyze what policing in the United States was arguably originally intended to be, qualitative methods will go farther in generating understanding of contextualized knowledge of not solely policing organizations, but also their place within broader cultural contexts. We can quantify many things about policing (some include rhetorical characteristics), such as symbols, language, statistics, and perhaps even perspectives of both police officers and communities like. What is harder to quantify is the contextual histories and development of how we essentialize policing as practice, how we

respond to various police artifacts, and how we recognize police discourse conventions. These are not limited to those employed within police organizations but are equally as fair to be explored rhetorically outside police organizations, which is the broader cultural context.

It is difficult to civically engage with something like policing that is not contextually and culturally understood nor, quite frankly, currently accessible to the public in many ways, particularly for communities of color or other historically marginalized communities. If policing as a concept, an occupation, and as a community practice, is too often inaccessible for civic minded communities, as well as communities of color or marginalized population, then the support of a critical theory lens will be appropriate to seek to reveal power structures. Those power structures can certainly be impacted or even driven by cultural influences, particularly ones that are generally recognized as being deeply ingrained such as in policing (Paoline, 2003; Frewin, Stephens & Tuffin, 2006; Conti, 2009; Rose & Unnithan, 2015). This is equally as true in a campus setting as it is in other, more “traditional” areas of policing such as in municipalities.

As an example of critical theory support for a cultural rhetorics methodology, Habermas’ Theory of Communicative Action may be helpful to assist this methodology as a basis for pointing toward mediation of policing in broader cultural contexts. This theoretical framework recognizes both transactional and transformative mediation where both settlement and relationships can hopefully be realized through revealing assumptions (presuppositions) that accompany discussion (Chilton & Cuzzo, 2005). Chilton and Cuzzo (2005) argue that Habermas’ Communicative Action is concerned with mediation and “coordinating people’s behavior” (p. 326), and we accept our presuppositions to argumentation even when we “deny any relationship with the other” (p. 326). Those presuppositions, in the context of this project, are cultural ones which include more distinct areas such as language, communications, semiotics, practices,

positionality, and power of police as a profession. Each of these contribute to a “police rhetoric” that contributes to a culturally conceptualized (or even realized) understanding of what it means to be “policed” or to have an image of a police identity and the discourse conventions that often characterize that police/community relationship.

The author’s professional positionality and membership within the profession being studied here cannot (and should not) be ignored and is a party to the methodology. It is also intentional and beneficial. I also proclaim no conflicts of interest in that. I know my positionality as a participant in much of the cultural perspective being discussed here. More than 26 years as a police officer and police administrator is a perspective that cannot be tossed aside lightly in lieu of claiming objectivity. Indeed, I do not want to attempt to muffle that perspective, nor do I want to trumpet it so loudly that it drowns out the transdisciplinary lens of cultural rhetorics. However, I must spend time here exposing my positionality by leaning on Murphy (2022), because, as Murphy (2022) concluded:

Positionality matters and should be disclosed in rhetorical ethnography because slipping into a neutral standpoint or becoming an invisible observer is not possible and often serves to conceal or normalize positions that shape what we view and how we choose to interpret and report it (p. 15).

I do not have the convenience of my own biases being necessarily obvious to me or my audience. Therefore, I take the responsibility of making myself rhetorically vulnerable enough to develop myself by collaborating (Murphy, 2022) with other perspectives and contextual understandings of my professional positionality.

Using an ethnographic approach “recognizes that disciplinary experts might have expert knowledge that they struggle to communicate to non-experts” (Murphy, 2022, p. 1). Murphy (2022) argues that this is the case with transdisciplinary rhetoric due to the nature of intending to

reach an interdisciplinary audience, a case which I argue applies to my research here.

Ethnography is rhetorical. Murphy (2022) notes:

The rhetorical tenor of ethnography is due, in part, to the written or graphic nature of the work, and beyond studying cultures, ethnography involves the rhetorical work of documenting research interactions and observations and then representing those to broader audiences and readerships through writing for publication. This suggests another inroad for considering ethnography as appropriate for transdisciplinary scholarship. If ethnography studies culture and the practice of scholarship is itself a culture, then ethnography could be an appropriate method for studying the culture of scholarship” (pp. 3-4).

Murphy’s (2022) description of a blended emic/etic approach seems fitting to my purpose here, where emic refers to an insider cultural perspective and etic refers to a cultural outsider perspective – that is, one who participates in the culture or one who does not. In this case the audience is both. A benefit of the emic perspective is “when analysis a familiar and typically unquestioned concept is viewed in a new light or destabilized by being described using alternative rhetorics” (Murphy, 2022, pp. 5-6). Conversely, the etic approach “emphasizes understanding culture and rhetoric from an external point of view (Murphy, 2022, p. 7). Again, the audience here applies to both.

Murphy (2022) also has this to say about the blended emic/etic approach to ethnographic research:

One further practice I might suggest as a kind of blended emic/etic approach centers on language itself, specifically the in ways transdisciplinary rhetoric engages with etymology as a method for tracing meaning and usage of a term, sometimes to point to changes and in other cases to highlight latent meanings (p. 8).

I suggest this not only applies to language in the way we think about speaking or writing, but also body language, or the usage of artifacts such as policies and procedures, symbols – indeed anything that conveys meaning – and how they are portrayed and observed by an audience.

These things equally highlight latent meanings – particularly contextual meanings derived by cultural forces of how we contextualize policing.

The Ethnographic Element: Participant Observer

Based on my own professional background of being employed in campus policing for many years now, this study provides professional, qualitative attestations and perspectives at moments, in addition to any data extracted from campus police departments and campus communities. My ethnographic contributions - that is my own individual participation as a long-term member of the profession that I am studying - are unavoidable, unignorable for audiences, and yet very intentionally included because they add additional value to the data and contexts of the research. I have unknowingly been a participant observer going on three decades in many of the very aspects of campus police being studied here. This fact affords me membership and participant status in the very group that is being researched. It may also afford me different access than someone who does not have that participant observer background. I am certainly cautious to employ my own experiences in an ethnographic manner in aiding in providing context to the study, background information, and qualified input on conclusions drawn from the data. My positionality as a student and a police professional ensures that I have vested interests in both the academic and professional implications of this study, and that makes the conversation doubly important for me as an author and researcher.

In sum, these articulations of police rhetorics, rhetorical self-awareness, and cultural rhetorics, I hope, will certainly build on previous work that I have done, but more importantly contribute to work which others have painstakingly done as well. Ultimately, I will offer contributory knowledge to a broad slate of areas such as cultural rhetorics, police culture, professional communication, organizational culture, and police/community relations.

Additionally, this work will contribute to modeling cultural rhetorics as an effective tool of inquiry toward civic matters to “offer insightful and relevant approaches for interrogating how larger histories and organizational and systemic structures impact everyday practices and the interventions imagined and employed therein” (Cobos et al, 2018, p. 13). The goal of such a project is to answer the broader question of how aware are campus police officers of their own rhetorical positionality (their “rhetorics,” if you will) and its impact on cultural contexts of policing in a campus environment? I arrived at this police-focused question this way; research about police-community relationships often includes both perspectives of police and citizens, however research is often focused on the perception of actual police behaviors, and not how those exhibiting the behaviors recognize or do not recognize the contextual impacts of their actions, images, discourse, or other means of communicating contexts and meaning. This is an important aspect to explore in order to contribute to a more well-rounded body of research dealing with police and campus police specifically in the case of this study. Further, the aspect of one’s rhetorical self-awareness, that is, the recognition of the impacts of their behavior on people and contexts is a vital component of a cycle of effective discourse when that discourse contributes to how cultural knowledge is mediated and understood.

While some research is police-focused, and it is clear that police are conscious of their *organizational* power and affordances, I haven’t seen research that uses cultural rhetorics as a backdrop to explore the extent to which police rhetorics impacts cultural contexts of policing. Particularly, I explore police officers’ levels of awareness/ignorance of their *rhetorical power of their positions* and how that impacts the cultural understandings of what policing is. While I repeat that I am confident that officers are generally aware of their power, and they understand how their actions may impact community opinions, I am uncertain as to their general level of

knowledge and self-awareness of rhetoric itself, their professional rhetorical positionality, and how that is implicated in deeper cultural contexts of policing within their communities.

Bringing my standpoint to the forefront via an ethnographic lens allows me to recognize my positionality as a human, but also the positionality of my professional self in relation to my academic self and my organizational culture perspectives in relation to community cultural contexts. Nichols (2019) suggests that acknowledging one's own "position and participation in the relationship and creation of meaning" (p. 8) is a likely first step to ethnography. Openly acknowledging my standpoint and the roll that my experiences as a police officer give me relative perspectives that I know others may not have. However, I also understand the challenges of communicating my positionality to a cross-disciplinary audience that is mostly comprised of non-police officers. Additionally, I agree with the notion that managing my own standpoint through ethnography is a challenge in itself, requiring "humility and the willingness to candidly consider what history has brought one to this moment, the motivations and biases one has in moving forward, and most importantly, where one stands in relation to everyone else involved" (Murphy, 2022, p. 10).

3.4 Methods

Qualitative methods are arguably strongly aligned with a cultural rhetorics methodology because they can be deeply contextual. Certainly, there is previous scholarship on police culture that includes both qualitative and quantitative data, however it is often explored through a professional or organizational lens. Using a cultural rhetorics lens, quantification can certainly be an element of data collection, however qualitative methods, such as in-depth interviews with police officers and community members about culture and context, may reveal more than quantitative data about how culture orders discourse about policing. Lindquist (2002) identified

the importance of qualitative data, noting “To study the rhetoric of a given social group is, also, inevitably, to consider how that group establishes relationships between language, culture, and truth. One can hope for only a glimpse of these processes, however, for it is never possible to isolate contiguous streams of meaning into measurable units” (p. 4). Qualitative data would reveal cultural contexts of knowledge, how it is developed and maintained, and how those contexts are captured within a cultural group and translated into rhetoric. Additionally, this method of in-depth interviews to get at cultural rhetorics data can be supplemented by some measured ethnographic efforts on my part considering my background in the policing field.

Further, much scholarship relevant to exploring policing, particularly the interactions of police and community or the manifestation of “bad cop” behavior are often explored from the perspective of communities. While police officers themselves have certainly been interviewed and surveyed, it seems rare that officers have been interviewed about how manifestations of police culture, and the resulting police rhetorics, from the lenses of police officers with the intent to understand what they actually know about their own police culture and rhetorical positionality, and how their rhetorics project from a position of authority. This includes various discourse conventions including symbols, texts, and language, all impacted by behaviors, identity, image, and perceived attitudes.

Exploring policing in campus communities would provide a fertile setting for exploration using a cultural rhetorics methodology. Such communities consist of rich characteristics that would benefit the scholarship proposed here. First, campus communities are generally more diverse, not only in various physical characteristics, but also in perspectives and ideas. Second, these communities are often characterized by people within a limited age demographic of 18-22 years-olds. These communities are also often constituted for shorter periods of time by residence

from broad geographical and biographical backgrounds, thus arguably bringing broader and often-reconstituted perspectives on a wide variety of social issues, including policing.

In terms of specific methods, in-depth interviews with campus police officers are conducted. These interviews include questions about rhetorical self-awareness, image, police behaviors and discourse conventions, and how they articulate their contextual knowledge of policing in a campus setting. The interviews are transcribed with the intent to draw out key perspectives to support conclusions of how police rhetorics impact the campus community's development of their policing knowledge, reactions to police rhetorics and discourse, and what direction those culturally mediated perspectives may go.

Specifically, questions 1 through 5 were intended to locate notions of police rhetorics in the data. These questions sought to triangulate police rhetorics through essentialism, artifacts, and discourse conventions, which help drive organizational identity and associate identity very closely with one's rhetoric. In the case of this research, organizational and professional identity are aligned with one's [police] rhetorics. The results of the interviews within this study appear to locate an identity that is both projected and imposed, sometimes converging, and sometimes diverging. It is broadly apparent that each participant grasped the notion that what they portray, or attempt to portray, does not always align with how they are identified by their audience. Many of the responses also demonstrated attempts to reconcile the divergence between how they were perceived as police officers, and how they wanted to be perceived.

The implication of police officers' and police organizations' own rhetoric is what is desired to be observed in this study. Not only the extent to which it contributed to cultural contexts of what policing "is" for that community, but the level of self-awareness that police officers have of their rhetoric and to what extent it permeates a cultural understanding of the

policing practice. Therefore, this study resolves to ask these questions of the campus police officer interview participant group. In particular, these questions below were included to locate elements of police rhetorics.

TABLE 1: Interview Questions and Context

	Interview Question Text	Question Context
Question 1	What kinds of communications do police organizations and police officers use? Can you share a story of a time that you felt police communication connected really well with the community or perhaps did not go well?	<i>By communication, including symbols, behaviors, and language, the question refers to rhetoric. This relates to police discourse (rhetorics) and how it contributes to community (audience) perception of police rhetorics.</i>
Question 2	Can you recall a story where assumptions about policing (either the people or the function) came into play?	<i>What words or descriptive terms would you use to describe policing? This is relevant to rhetorical self-awareness in how police themselves describe their own experiences related to assumptions about police.</i>
Question 3	Do assumptions about policing influence how police officers try to perform their jobs?	<i>This is relevant to police rhetorics and its impact on the contextual understanding of what policing means to the community and how police think police perceptions impact their performance.</i>
Question 4	Setting aside media portrayals, do the police organizations you're familiar with and their symbols, behaviors, and discourse influence community perception of policing?	<i>This is relevant to both rhetorical self-awareness and police rhetorics of how those two notions may influence community understanding of police.</i>
Question 5	As a law enforcement officer, how do you think policing activities, behaviors, and responses impact how your campus community conceptualizes what policing means to them?	<i>This is relevant to the contextual understanding of what policing means to the community based on police rhetorics impact and also indicates the presence of rhetorical self-awareness.</i>

Question 6	Do you think there are ways in which your background and experiences influence your understanding and concepts of police?	<i>By backgrounds and experiences, the question means cultural development: the experiences and information that influence our perspectives which help inform our understanding of our environment and relationships.</i>
Question 7	As a law enforcement officer, when you think of your relationship with faculty, staff, and students, do you perceive that relationship is mutual in creating understanding of what policing means for the campus?	<i>This is relevant to police rhetorics and its impact on the contextual understanding of what policing means to the community by asking police officers to articulate their own relationships with their audience.</i>
Question 8	Are police and campus populations two communities that are connecting culturally, or are they missing opportunities to connect? From a cultural perspective, how can we connect better?	<i>This is relevant to the contextual understanding of what policing means to the community by asking police officers to consider how cultural understanding of police could be improved from the officers' perspective.</i>

Questions 1 through 5 were selected because of their intention to draw out commentary that applied to police rhetorics; the systems of symbols, discourses, and practices, either actual, essentialized, or rhetorical, commonly associated with the policing profession and which locate meaning and understanding. For example, the reference to communication in Question 1 includes symbols, behaviors, and language through which refers to rhetoric. Question 2 was intended to capture descriptions of policing from an experienced event and to reconcile how that police communication was received by its intended audience. In each case, the questions sought to capture commentary of how the officers felt police rhetorics, whether they consciously acknowledged it or not, both exist as a detectable phenomenon and to measure the officers' awareness of its impacts on the community. Questions 4, 5, and 6 were included to discern elements of rhetorical self-awareness. My interest in these questions was to determine the officers' apparent level of rhetorical self-awareness. That is, how aware do they appear to be

about their performative activities that are associated with their roles as police officers or police administrators? This idea of rhetorical self-awareness relates to the police officers' application of their discourse (police rhetorics) and generates curiosity whether or not they tailor their discourse based on their level of rhetorical self-awareness, impacting the community's contextual understanding of how police interact within a campus community. In other words, how intentional, if at all, are police officers in trying to influence how they are perceived by their campus audience? This would indicate a level of rhetorical self-awareness, and an awareness of their own police rhetorics demonstrated through discourse. This is not to suggest police officers are intentionally deceptive with their behaviors, rather questioning if they are aware of how they impact the cultural understandings of policing on a campus of higher education and how their positionality (from a place of power) can contribute to perceptions. Questions 5, 6, 7, and 8 were included to articulate interviewers' responses to the impacts of police rhetorics and rhetorical self-awareness in the campus community:

The study originally intended to use two interview methods in order to 1) capture an appropriate amount of qualitative data and 2) capture varying levels of experience and perspectives within the UNC System police departments. These two methods were conducting one-on-one interviews with high-level police administrators and interviewing focus groups of police officers from various universities within the UNC System. There are 17 different institutions within the University of North Carolina (UNC) System. Each of these institutions has their own police organizations of varying sizes, in which each employee is publicly accessible. These 17 different police organizations within the UNC System constitute more than 450 police officers, police supervisors, and police administrators whose purpose is to serve their respective university communities and their service or safety needs. My earlier comments about the

potential richness of studying police rhetorics from a cultural rhetorics perspective in a university setting are foundational for seeking to explore this particular group of police employees and their organizations as the potential group from which to collect qualitative data. Not only is the potential data pool substantial, but the 17 constituent institutions are diverse universities across a wide geographical plane and with diverse student bodies as well to include both large and small, state-supported PWI institutions and multiple state-supported HBCUs as well.

Aligning with cultural rhetorics inquiries, relevant questions are explored through that lens. For example, as noted in the introduction, questions that try to get at meaning-making processes in cultural communities, how those processes are understood, and how practices are situated discursively (Cultural Rhetorics Theory Lab, 2017). The result of exploring such questions as they pertain to cultural understandings of policing, will hopefully yield findings that are not only valuable to our understanding of police in the campus setting, but are also valuable as a foundation to challenge dominant narratives that may be in a position to urge toward revitalization or recasting through cultural practices.

The data, that is, the responses to the interview questions, are analyzed qualitatively with respect to the questions, and the contextual intent of the questions relative to the responses to the interview questions designed to locate indications of police rhetorics and rhetorical self-awareness. The content and context of the responses were analyzed to determine their level of indication of 1) police rhetorics (discourse), 2) police officer rhetorical self-awareness, and 3) the indication that those factors contribute to cultural contexts of policing in a higher education campus environment. The detection of police rhetorics was measured quantitatively for context and subject matter responses (see Table 1 above), such as which topics the participants homed in on in their responses. The “who, what, when, where, how, and why” were important to analyzing

the responses, as well as analyzing the participants' level of self-awareness of their role on campus. For each question, primary themes are identified and measured for prevalence among both police administrators and police officers and displayed in tables in Chapter Four. The genre of police rhetorics, exemplified by discourse and demonstrative examples, will be connected by the interview responses along with discernable rhetorical self-awareness among the participants. This study will ideally accomplish an act of opening up a door toward additional scholarly research into police rhetorics, particularly the impacts of police rhetorics from a cultural perspective. Such research is also generally and applicable to the study of not only police culture, but also the nature of policing, including the relationships to community and the notion of civic policing. On this very note, Faber (2002) comments that "Changing a culture disrupts more than just habits and routines; it calls into question why we do certain things, and it disrupts those very rituals that make sense of our experiences" (p. 52). Therefore, research such as this, particularly that which is aided by ideas of cultural rhetorics and police rhetorical self-awareness, will provide valuable insight and results that can foster discussions of policing, both good and bad, and how policing can be improved by challenging dominant discourses through cultural mediation of what it means to "police" our communities.

3.5 Participants

Individual Interviews with Department Administrators

Conducting individual interviews with higher level police administrative officers, such as police chiefs, deputy chiefs, or other high-level administrative officers, would capture data such as perspective from experience and philosophical perspectives. Generally speaking, the officers in these positions are going to be the most experienced officers in each agency, not only in technicality, but also in broader leadership matters and even political or diplomatic perspectives.

They are also going to represent the agency and the institution from a leadership, police philosophy, and agency mission perspective. In other words, they are in positions to observe and drive their respective agencies in terms of positionality, activities, and depth of community interactivity. To conduct the interviews, eight (8) of the 17 constituent institutions within the UNC System were selected to recruit potential interview participants from their respective police departments. The original group included:

- Appalachian State University
- East Carolina University
- Elizabeth City State University
- North Carolina Agriculture and Technology State University
- North Carolina State University
- University of North Carolina - Chapel Hill
- University of North Carolina - Charlotte
- University of North Carolina - Wilmington

This group of universities was selected to identify employed police officers for interviews because the group represents both large and small universities, as well as both PWI and HBCU universities, and they are geographically spread out across the State of North Carolina. Further, these universities represent the greater portion of the police officers employed within the UNC System. They also all include on-campus residential students. The North Carolina School of Science and Math, a UNC System constituent, does not employ police officers.. By selecting half of the universities in the UNC System, which employs more than 450 police officers across the System, it was helpful in keeping the interview groups to a manageable number of interview candidates for this research.

Each interview was conducted via telephone or video conferencing for approximately 30 to 45 minutes. Potential interviewees were identified by public record characteristics of rank (for leadership positionality), years of service, and contact information. 15 potential participants were originally identified for interview requests, resulting in ten agreements to participate and nine

complete individual interviews. A tenth officer was ultimately unable to conduct their interview due to work conflicts that arose, but did originally agree to participate. Five officers did not respond and after one week, I proceeded with planning the interviews. Interview participants are not identified by name, rank, institution, or any other characteristic that may identify them individually. The methods of recruitment, correspondence, data collection, and maintaining participant confidentiality were approved by East Carolina University's University and Medical Center Institutional Review Board (UMCIRB) and the research moved forward. Responding participants ultimately represented six of the original eight selected universities, with employees from two of the original eight universities not returning correspondence.

Focus Groups with Campus Police Officers

Originally, focus groups composed of four to five police officers each were planned to compliment individual interviews. One focus group would have recruited police officers with between one and five years of experience. The second focus group would have recruited police officers with between six and 10 years of experience. The third focus group would have recruited officers with between 10 and 15 years of experience, and the last group would have sought officers who have more than 15 years of experience. Each focus group interview was to be conducted virtually which will allow the inclusion of officers from as many of the UNC System's 17 institutions as possible. By seeking focus groups in this manner, it may have provided a certain amount of appreciable insight into any notable differences in rhetorical or cultural perspectives which may be attributable to experience as a campus police officer. Such data may provide valuable feedback on the level of awareness of one's rhetorical positionality in that role. An interesting aspect of this particular method would be observing the interaction between the various focus group participants in how they respond to questions and discussions

about rhetoric and police culture. Each focus group was designed for approximately 30 to 45 minutes. Ultimately, this format became a challenge of coordination and largely untenable to coordinate participants from so many different institutions.

Focus Group Challenges: Coordination and Lack of Anonymity

During the research process, it was quickly learned that coordinating focus groups for this study was likely not attainable. This was due largely to the challenges of scheduling focus groups composed of four or five officers across 17 state-wide universities or institutions, who also generally work rotating shift schedules as well as Monday through Friday schedules. An attempt was made to coordinate the first of four planned focus groups; however no replies to recruitment were received. While the problems of coordination became apparent, it was also apparent that a lack of anonymity within a focus group would likely not entice participation among a great number of police officers.

I decided to abandon the focus groups because of this substantial coordination challenge, and to only conduct one-on-one interviews with all the interviewees. This resulted in the nine one-on-one interviews. The original breakdown of the officer interviewees intended to be criteria for the focus groups – by years of experience and varied university participants – was retained for the one-on-one interviews and consisted of the following:

- Three participants are police administrators with 25 or more years of experience.
- Two participants are officers with more than ten years of experience.
- Two participants are officers with six to ten years of experience.
- Two participants are officers with five or less years of experience.

In changing the methods approach, which was motivated by the inability to effectively coordinate focus groups as originally intended, something was lost and something gained. Lost was the group dynamic of experiencing a group of police officers digest and navigate questions about police communication, assumptions, and broader cultural impacts of understanding

policing in a campus setting. However, the study arguably gained more openness by allowing interviewees to avoid the possibility of responding in front of other police officers; particularly in front of police officers that the participants may not know personally. Based on personal professional experience, police officers are notorious within our own circles for often being suspicious of questions and may often provide input in front of other police officers when they are confident of a consensus view. Police officers tend to avoid telling [what they may view as] unnecessary filler information as well. These concerns drove the second concern of a lack of anonymity with police officers interviewing as a group.

To illustrate the point of what may have been lost or gained without focus groups included in the study, anecdotally speaking, I attended a professional conference in March of 2024, which was composed of about 150 high-ranking police administrators. The presenter asked the group a question and no one responded. The presenter then made a remark in jest about police officers filling the room and being hesitant to answer questions about their work. Interestingly, the audience was hesitant to respond even in a room full of police officers. Thus, there is confidence that this study may have gained more openness with one-on-one interviews, sealing off various hesitations that may be found in a group discussion with police officers, but it may have been at the cost of observing police officer participants mediate discussion within their focus groups in the heat of an interview. Consequently, focus groups may be a viable future research method to try to observe that discourse mediation within that group setting. This focus group method may capture a dynamic and characteristic of discourse mediation in real time that this research was ultimately unable to capture.

CHAPTER FOUR

RESEARCH FINDINGS

4.1 Introduction to Chapter Four

Chapter Four offers a more detailed analysis of the research data collected in the form of interview responses transcribed from the participants. Chapter Four also offers hypotheses and preliminary discussion related to findings to these hypotheses. The data collection process comprised interviews with nine (9) volunteers who were all asked the same eight (8) questions. Those interviewed ranged from police officers with less than five years of experience up to 23 years of experience, and police administrators between 25 and 30 or more years of experience. Overall, the responses were largely indicative that each participant, regardless of years of policing experience, demonstrated awareness of both the notions of police rhetoric – that is, their own police related discourse – and their rhetorical self-awareness, and how they impacted cultural contextualization of policing within their role and spaces of a higher education campus community.

The interview questions and selected responses that are captured in this chapter provide context to respond to the research questions noted in Chapter One. That is, does the data infer conclusions that police rhetorics are articulable by the police officers interviewed, do the responses indicate any level of police rhetorical self-awareness, and do the responses indicate a positive contribution of police rhetorics and rhetorical self-awareness to the cultural contexts of policing in a campus community? The responses displayed in this chapter, in some cases, have been reduced at times for brevity to isolate specific commentary in order to apply them to the contexts of police rhetorics and rhetorical self-awareness. Full interviewee responses are found

in Appendices A through H, with redactions only made to remove potential interview participant identifiers.

4.2 Presumptions and Anticipated Findings

I developed two general presumptions going into the data collection process. Both of these presumptions were oriented toward an administrators-versus-officers consideration. That is, would police administrators and police officers frame their responses differently based on their role within the community? Part of these presumptions were based on my own experience as a police administrator knowing that, because of my positionality, much of my own experience and expectations revolved less around practical tasks, and more around strategic thinking of broader missions of my own agency and how that agency fits in with my University and community. In my experience, police administrators (as service directors) and police officers (as service providers) often had differently focused viewpoints. Administrators often have broader agency views and goals in comparison to officers who may be more task oriented. The presumptions were also framed by additional curiosity to discern if the participants in the interview would demonstrate a recognition of their police rhetorics and rhetorical self-awareness. I presumed that the participants generally would, to an appreciable degree, demonstrate a recognition of police rhetorics and rhetorical self-awareness, however they would be demonstrated within the contexts of the police officers' responses rather than outright identification of the notion of rhetoric and discourse. In fact, it was anticipated that the word "rhetoric" would not be uttered in the responses from the participants; not because they aren't familiar with the word or concept, rather because that perspective is not openly discussed or considered generally speaking in such a task-oriented profession. Nevertheless, the contributions of police rhetorics and rhetorical self-awareness are important in the cultural contexts of

policing, prompting great curiosity whether or not the interview participants responses identified both police rhetorics and rhetorical self-awareness (as police organizations and/or officers) as impactful for the contextualizing policing in a higher education environment.

The first presumption was that the interview response data would demonstrate contrasting results of recognizing police rhetorics between those officers in higher-ranking, police administrative roles versus officers in lower- or middle-ranking police officers who engaged largely in practical, often individual or team tasks. The second, similarly situated presumption, was that the data would demonstrate a difference between police administrators and police officers in that administrators would indicate a higher level of rhetorical self-awareness than police officers. Specifically, the presumption was such that the administrators that who were interviewed, with their experience beyond practical matters – including matters of political, social, and diplomatic relations implications – to have more recognition and acknowledgement of police rhetoric and rhetorical self-awareness and have keener insight into cultural contexts of policing in the campus setting.

Conversely, police officer participants, especially those with fewer years of experience, were predicted by me - again, based on my own professional experience - to be less aware of police rhetorics (police specific discourse) in general, demonstrate a lower level of rhetorical self-awareness, and to contextualize campus cultural perspectives of policing - that is, to consider campus policing and how it is understood by an academic campus community - to a lesser degree in favor of more practical, tasks associated activities. This expectation is based on the idea that the administrators (like the author) and more experienced police officers, would have accumulated enough community experience, training, and development to be able to better articulate issues of rhetoric, rhetorical self-awareness, and cultural contexts of policing in the

campus setting. Both presumptions were largely wrong in that nearly all interviewees seemed to demonstrate through their responses at least an appreciable level of police rhetorics and rhetorical awareness, and the impacts of police rhetorics and rhetorical self-awareness on the contexts of their policing performance within the campus community. Noting my own incorrect presumptions about the depth and recognition by the participants of topics such as police rhetorics and rhetorical self-awareness is important. It is important because it suggests that even one who has been employed in the policing industry for many years presumes certain pre-disposed police officer outlooks, and further, the results are even more encouraging by suggesting those presumptions are incorrect.

The possible variances in rhetorical self-awareness between the respondents based on their tenure as police officers as well as their roles as administrators versus non-administrators were considered. Generally speaking, higher level administrators are going to be the most experienced and tenured employees. Considering my own positionality, I anticipated that administrative respondents (i.e. police chiefs and deputy police chiefs) would give greater contextualization of police communication impacts because of their roles in handling context, messaging, and generally guiding broader public or community interactions. This anticipation was accurate in that more experienced administrative participants did articulate a broader context, however the variance between administrative participants and non-administrative ones was not substantial. Each respondent appeared to demonstrate a detectable level of rhetorical self-awareness and its impact on their audience. The greatest difference between administrator participants and police officer participants appeared to be that police officers tended to speak more often about interpersonal relationships or interactions with the community versus whole-sale communicative discourse and posturing. For example, the police officers who were

interviewed often spoke of direct conversations with individuals or groups, or interacting during practical contacts. Police administrators spoke of interpersonal communication as well, but also noted efforts at broader, more generalized communication toward the public in an effort to keep up relations, particularly where information sharing was concerned.

4.3 Interview Questions and Key Responses

These questions below in Table 1 were included to locate elements of police rhetorics. This Table is repeated from Chapter Three to provide rationales and intended context for each interview question that was asked.

TABLE 1: Interview Questions and Context

	<i>Interview Question Text</i>	<i>Question Context</i>
<i>Question 1</i>	<i>What kinds of communications do police organizations and police officers use? Can you share a story of a time that you felt police communication connected really well with the community or perhaps did not go well?</i>	<i>By communication, including symbols, behaviors, and language, the question refers to rhetoric. This relates to police discourse (rhetorics) and how it contributes to community (audience) perception of police rhetorics.</i>
<i>Question 2</i>	<i>Can you recall a story where assumptions about policing (either the people or the function) came into play?</i>	<i>What words or descriptive terms would you use to describe policing? This is relevant to rhetorical self-awareness in how police themselves describe their own experiences related to assumptions about police.</i>
<i>Question 3</i>	<i>Do assumptions about policing influence how police officers try to perform their jobs?</i>	<i>This is relevant to police rhetorics and its impact on the contextual understanding of what policing means to the community and how police think police perceptions impact their performance.</i>

Question 4	<i>Setting aside media portrayals, do the police organizations you're familiar with and their symbols, behaviors, and discourse influence community perception of policing?</i>	<i>This is relevant to both rhetorical self-awareness and police rhetorics of how those two notions may influence community understanding of police.</i>
Question 5	<i>As a law enforcement officer, how do you think policing activities, behaviors, and responses impact how your campus community conceptualizes what policing means to them?</i>	<i>This is relevant to the contextual understanding of what policing means to the community based on police rhetorics impact and also indicates the presence of rhetorical self-awareness.</i>
Question 6	<i>Do you think there are ways in which your background and experiences influence your understanding and concepts of police?</i>	<i>By backgrounds and experiences, the question means cultural development: the experiences and information that influence our perspectives which help inform our understanding of our environment and relationships.</i>
Question 7	<i>As a law enforcement officer, when you think of your relationship with faculty, staff, and students, do you perceive that relationship is mutual in creating understanding of what policing means for the campus?</i>	<i>This is relevant to police rhetorics and its impact on the contextual understanding of what policing means to the community by asking police officers to articulate their own relationships with their audience.</i>
Question 8	<i>Are police and campus populations two communities that are connecting culturally, or are they missing opportunities to connect? From a cultural perspective, how can we connect better?</i>	<i>This is relevant to the contextual understanding of what policing means to the community by asking police officers to consider how cultural understanding of police could be improved from the officers' perspective.</i>

Question 1

Q1 is: *What kinds of communications do police organizations and police officers use?*

Can you share a story of a time that you felt police communication connected really well with the community or perhaps did not go well? The first question (Q1; see also Appendix A) saw a great deal of similarity in apparent understanding of the importance of trust building between the

police agency and officers and the audience. This indicated to me that each of the officers interviewed, whether high level or relatively inexperienced in the job, appeared to grasp the need for ethos development as it pertains to rhetorical effectiveness. The goal of Q1 was not necessarily designed to elicit a strict technical response. That is, it was not specifically designed to prompt a list of the actual technical methods in which police organizations and officers communicate such as email, telephone, or social media, for example. Certainly, that was included in the context of the question, however respondents could easily have provided answers that aligned more with concepts of communication such as verbal, written, symbols, or body language. Each of these carry rhetorical characteristics that convey meaning to an audience. Ultimately the goal of Q1 was to explore the implication of rhetoric as demonstrated in communications, whether by communication methods or philosophies (proactive versus reactive, for example), and explore if the answers provided indicated that the officers interviewed appeared to demonstrate an appreciable level of rhetoric recognition. This exploration was based on the answers provided during the interview, particularly the anecdotal component to the second part of Q1, where interviewees were asked to recall a time when police communication worked either well or poorly. It was important to afford respondents an opportunity to tell their own experiences and articulate how they felt their own various methods of discourse (police rhetoric) were received by their audience as those methods originated from them as an officer or from a police agency.

In general, the three administrators and several officers answered the technical part of the question by specifically noting methods and/or platforms from which police organizations and police officers use. For example: social media, various alert messaging systems, emails, and in-person communication. However, a notable difference came after the technical answer. The

responses from the administrators included more contextual discussion about *how* communications were received and perceived more broadly in an almost philosophical perspective, including failures and successes, while officers tended to relate more personal interactions with the community. In particular, the administrators tended to go beyond the technical methods of communication and delve into the context and perceptions of organizational communication efforts, or the lack of, possibly indicating a higher level of agency or profession-based rhetorical self-awareness.

Q1 resulted in two main themes found in the responses. The first theme was large agreement on the importance of interpersonal communication between the police and the community. The second theme was that communication needed to be consistent and regular, and not necessarily reactive or driven by an event. For example, Administrator A responded to Q1 that, "...police in general have always struggled with communicating... we have always struggled with that human part of communication... I hate to say this in the position I'm in, but it's almost like we communicate when we have to" (Appendix A). Administrator A's comment of communicating "when we have to" is associated with both mechanical practices of the police role and a compliance issue. Yet Administrator A acknowledges this is not good practice, arguing that police have to communicate daily with the community, and that communication lends itself to an expected level of police transparency (Appendix A). Police-to-community communication is often framed by safety information, either required by some authority or a practice of the agency. It's also often one-way communication. In these cases, communication of this style often turns into a habit of communicating "when we have to." More social or culturally centered communication relationships require much more dedication and proactiveness on the part of the police [usually]. Both Administrator B and C noted that while communication

problems exist and can be improved, they felt that either face-to-face communication (where possible) or consistent communication seemed to have the most profound positive impact. In fact, nearly every officer who was interviewed referenced some preference to variations of face-to-face interaction with the public, such as presenting programs or just having conversation, as helpful to communicating and building some sort of relationship with the community members.

Eight of the nine respondents (88.8%), when referring to interpersonal communication, also suggested or inferred that this method of communication included elements of building trust or personal relationships. For example, Officer E noted that programming in residence halls allowed them opportunities to connect:

... I would be able to reach out to these kids and have more of a one on one with a lot of them. That communication, it was more about, like, trust building and them seeing me as not just, “Oh that’s Officer [redacted last name] I see every once in a while,” but it’s “Oh that’s [redacted first name] and I can sit and talk to him.” So, that was the biggest form of communication for me as an officer other than just general, “hey how’s is going, how’s the weather,” with people who would stop me going down the street. I think because I was able to build those personal relationships, that’s what led to it working really well (Appendix A).

Similarly, Officer G commented about their preference for interpersonal communication with students, noting that they will try to draw students to them by setting up a table for example, because Officer G understands and acknowledges that “You know as well as I do, a lot of students sort of shy away, especially if they see someone in uniform” (Appendix A). Officer I suggested a similar preference for interpersonal communication, noting their experience:

I had several students and staff come up to me complimenting me on my artwork (tattoos). We would strike up a conversation and would stand there and chat for hours. Once they got to know me, I shared details about our police organization and that we were there to keep peace. Those students and staff thanked me for educating them about what we do (Appendix A).

Each of the responses to Q1 by the police administrators included commentary of their own perceptions of the effectiveness of their communications to their audiences. They indicate a

relatively high level of awareness of the need to have regular communication with their audiences, however each response, very interestingly, simultaneously indicated some level of doubt in the rhetorical effectiveness of their agency communication efforts, with each administrator indicating their need to “do better” in some way or acknowledging their own communication breakdowns. Officer D (9 years’ experience) and Officer E (10 years’ experience) articulated similar contexts as the three tenured administrators in that Officers D and E both noted the need for communication to build trust and relationships and cited specific examples of what they meant.

TABLE 2: Q1 Primary Themes and Prevalence

<i>Q1: What kinds of communications do police organizations and police officers use? Can you share a story of a time when you felt police communication connected really well with the community or perhaps did not go well?</i>		
Identified Primary Themes for Question 1	Prevalence of Themes Among Police Administrators	Prevalence of Themes Among Police Officers
Police rhetorics: Interpersonal communication between police and community	One of three (33.3%) administrators mentioned preferring interpersonal (face-to-face) interactions	Five of six (83.3%) of police officer participants preferred interpersonal contact, particularly in building relationships
Police rhetorics: Need for consistent and regular messaging	Universally acknowledged among police administrators	Less frequent among police officers who gave more examples of individual communication successes

A somewhat notable difference was noted in the roles the participants filled in their agencies. Where police administrators focused on the need for organizational communication to be better, officers more often focused on practical, interpersonal communication tactics that seem to work for them in building connections with people. It was in the role of their positions where context saw the greatest degree of separation for responses to Q1. Where Administrators A, B, and C spoke broadly about police organization communication methods and its reception by the

community at large – organizational ethos development – the officers (D, E, F, G, H, and I) tended to lean on personal communication experiences and ethos-building with groups and individuals (See Appendices for all responses). In both cases – organizational or personal – the notion that ethos development was present in that each respondent acknowledged the importance of communicating to secure faith in the communicator’s character.

The police administrators in particular seemed to pay strong attention to the opportunities of deliberate kairos within their responses about police communications, but the notion of kairos was certainly not lost on the officers although the detection of kairos was found in different contexts between the administrator and officer groups. That is, administrators and officers alike noted taking advantage (or not) of opportunities that arise to strengthen communications, or to increase the impact of communication efforts. Specifically, they mentioned planned and regular communication with the community rather than reactive communication only when something [generally negative] occurs in the area. Where officers may have taken advantage of opportunities to build trust individually, the administrators who were interviewed seemed to largely lean on these organizational kairotic moments and not just take advantage but also hinted at *manufacturing* kairotic moments in order to stay in front of ethos-developing and rhetorical impacts from deliberate communication.

For example, police agencies may take or make opportunities to communicate with the community from an organizational level, especially when it is either/both practically or rhetorically advantageous to have that communicative relationship at that moment. Agencies can manufacture kairotic moments by initiating positive outreach with the community or with local media as a strategy to improve their brand and organizational reputation. Offering programming, partnerships, town hall meetings, or some other collaborative event that invited productive

communicative action are examples of manufacturing kairotic moments where there is a likelihood that the agency may build some sort of positive political, social, or cultural capital. While this may seem somewhat sophistic in some respects, the idea is to take advantage of these moments and build positive capital to balance out when the time comes that some negative moment arises.

Question 2

Question 2 (Q2) invited participants to consider and respond to this question: *Can you recall a story where assumptions about policing (either the people or the function) came into play?* This question sought to collect a response based on the consideration of personal or professional experience where they felt an assumption about policing was impactful. This question is relevant to both police rhetorics and rhetorical self-awareness. The question sought to elicit evidence that the participant has or has not recognized audience assumptions about police behaviors or identity as campus police officers.

Table 3: Q2 Primary Themes and Prevalence

Q2: <i>Can you recall a story where assumptions about policing (either the people or the function) came into play?</i>		
Identified Primary Themes for Question 2	Prevalence of Themes Among Police Administrators	Prevalence of Themes Among Police Officers
Rhetorical self-awareness: Assumptions by others of an archetypical police identity	All three (100%) administrators agreed that people make assumptions about police	All six (100%) officers agreed that people make assumptions about police
Rhetorical self-awareness: Impact of assumptions about police identity	All three (100%) administrators identified an assumed “police identity” impacting the <i>professional field broadly</i> , often using pronouns “we” and “us”	Five of six officers (83.3%) identified an assumed “police identity” and an example, but related <i>individual officer</i> experience. Most frequently used the pronoun “I”

Q2 saw a unanimous response in that each administrator and officer interviewed could articulate when they felt assumptions about policing (either the function or the people) occurred. Some responses were stronger than others with the police administrators generally providing specific examples. These responses largely centered around common themes: people weren't aware campus police were "real" police, media or social media portrayals driving broad-brush assumptions about police, as well as either direct or vicarious experiences in the past informing one's assumptions about police. Each of these areas contribute to cultural contexts of how policing is understood. The three high-level administrator participants interestingly provided three distinct areas of assumptions about police from their experiences: Administrator A commented on police-controlled narratives or access to narratives, Administrator B spoke about "real" police identity, and Administrator C discussed personal or vicarious police experience-driven assumptions.

Administrator A's response to Q2 was partly an extension of their response to Q1 about how police communicate. Administrator A focused on the failures of police when they communicate with the community. In Q2, Administrator A continued that notion of poor communication resulting in a developing narrative by noting "...the fact that narratives are going to be created by individuals when they don't...when they aren't provided the facts; it's going to take on a life of its own. They're going to spread like wildfire" (Appendix B). Administrator B spoke about assumptions of the "real" police identity for campus police officers and how it is common for students to not view those officers as having actual police authority. However, this participant also noted assumptions on the part of police officers in their duties in the campus setting. Administrator B, speaking accurately from my own experience as a police administrator within a campus police department, noted that some officers assume their role is often strictly

law enforcement, sometimes leaving behind the service-oriented notion of the campus community. Administrator B noted the challenge of ensuring that the officers still get out and participate in various community policing aspects such as speaking with citizens, getting out of their police cars, and interacting in the residence halls from time to time.

Administrator B's response supports prior research (Wada, Patten & Candela, 2010; Jacobsen, 2014; Wilson & Wilson, 2015; Patten et al, 2016; Allen, 2020; Youstin & Kopp, 2020) that students often cannot or do not discern the law enforcement role of campus police.

Administrator B commented, "We've had incidents where our students assumed that because we were campus police, it's like we weren't "real police," and they did something and did not get the reaction they thought they were going to get." According to Administrator B, students sometimes find themselves not realizing the campus police authority and if they get arrested, they are somewhat surprised. Administrator B concluded they weren't sure where that assumption [of campus police authority versus municipal] came from (Appendix B).

Administrator B points out that campus police officer may fall victim to assumptions as well, such as assuming that their tasks will largely encompass strict law enforcement, and that officer sometimes have to be reminded that there is, as Wilson and Wilson (2015) and Youstin and Kopp (2020) noted, much service-based policing that takes place in the campus setting.

Administrator C's response included commentary about adversarial views from students, noting that they may bring distrust based on their geographical origin or vicarious experience, noting many students "bring a lot of distrust to the police department based off of where they come from throughout the country. Based on their dealings, or most of the time, their friends' dealings with law enforcement" (Appendix B). Administrator C also commented "They assume we're out to get them. They assume we're out to get them and it's something negative"

(Appendix B). I've noticed throughout my career that when police often are in a space, they are watched or questioned if something happened to prompt a police response. Much of this reaction is rhetorical and is a response to the visible presence, even if a silent presence, of a police officer. Society's recognition of police is often conditioned by the belief that police only show up if something is wrong or something bad happens. Often, when I enter an academic space for an academic purpose and I am in a police uniform, I deliberately make it clear that I am in that space for an academic purpose and not for a police purpose; generally by verbalizing, sometimes jokingly, that I'm there for academic reasons and not police reasons. I am especially intentional in doing this if I'm asking for a specific person to speak with. This action generally seems to put people at ease and dispel assumptions that something is wrong.

The administrator responses all indicate a high-level of rhetorical self-awareness of how police behaviors and cultural understandings impact how one may assume police or police officers are "supposed" to be or may even serve as accepted "predictors" of how police will respond to the community. The officer responses often revolved around the individual experience or even individual vicarious experience with police and the assumptions about police activity or behaviors that are born from those experiences or vicarious experiences. Every officer, with the exception of Officer D, related a story or commentary to this point. Officer F cited negative media portrayal, noting that "media can project police in a negative way, so of course when you come on scene, they automatically assume that you're going to draw your weapon or things like that" (Appendix B).

Officer G suggested that their physical appearance (as a police officer) may cause some to assume they have a strict attitude:

I'm never really, like, very rigid unless I have to be you know what I'm saying?
But you can look at me, you're probably thinking, "hey this guy here, he's

probably a butthole.” But when we get through the conversation, man it’s like, “wow, I didn’t know you were like that,” as far as being down to earth and trying to be on the level of the students we’re dealing with and the public (Appendix B).

As for Officer D’s response, which recalls that many university students don’t realize that many universities have their own police departments, noting students often “had no idea of our arrest powers, of different programs we provided, the services we provided, that we can write tickets, that we can do any sort of police functions like the police department where they were from” (Appendix B). I have experienced this as well when giving presentations to groups of students. The discovery of this particular assumption often starts by asking the group what they know about their university police department. Few students volunteer what they may know about their university’s police department, and it is often wildly inaccurate when they do, however some students genuinely do not know that their university has a police department and thus are unaware of what campus police do. Officer D’s surprised response leans somewhat on their personal experience of their legitimate police identity, and yet the response is still aligned with the dimension of experience or vicarious experience with policing by the audience. The students in the class being used as an example based their knowledge of the campus police department on their culturally developed context of what “policing” looked like where they were from. In this case, as can be seen in Appendix B, some of the students were from a large metropolitan location.

Every other officer responded specifically to the experiences or assumptions that audience members have about police officers that officers conduct certain tasks, especially when it comes to enforcement duties. The general view from participants is that citizens assume that police officers are hard to get along with, may resort directly to some use of force, or take actions to fulfil “quota” expectations. However, the officer responses often acknowledged either directly

or inferred that it is important to explain why officers may take certain actions so that citizens have the context of the desired outcome of a situation (e.g. traffic safety, de-escalation). The responses to Q2 across the data clearly demonstrate that the participants, regardless of rank or years of experience, all recognize that assumptions about policing (the people or the function) have a role in police-community relationships. Additionally, by recognizing this role of assumptions, the officers demonstrate a recognition of culturally contextualized information that may generate those assumptions about the role of police. Many participants, when acknowledging assumptions about police, note that those [often negative] assumptions are generated by experiences with police, vicarious experiences of others, observations, media information, or a lack of communication of information. Particularly in a campus community where a student population may be somewhat transient, those students bring with them their pre-formed, culturally developed experiences of what “policing” looks like where they are from.

A clear area in the responses to Q2 is that respondents recognized the impact of prior experiences with police, or vicarious or third-party experiences with police, even anecdotal experiences, impacted how community members may make assumptions about campus police. Eight of nine respondents (88.8%) mentioned the impact of prior or even vicarious police experience. For example, Administrator A responded:

...when information is sent out that's not complete or when information is not sent out then people are forming opinions based on what traditional media may be providing to them based on their [air quotes] sources. Or are people formulating opinions based on the incident that they see in social media (Appendix B).

Administrator C commented that many students “bring a lot of distrust to the police department based off of where they come from throughout the country. Based on their dealings, or most of the time, their friends’ dealings with law enforcement” (Appendix B). Officer F said, “The media can project police in a negative way, so of course when you come on scene, they automatically

assume that you're going to draw your weapon or things like that" (Appendix B). Officer H pointed to negative police behaviors and other officers getting lumped into that perception, commenting "I feel like every day the general public makes assumptions...based upon the previous trend pertaining to [police]. Let's say that an agency had corruption...When the general public heard of the corruption, they kind of stereotype everybody" (Appendix B). Jacobsen (2015) pointed to this very issue reported by the officers, noting that "...individuals' perceptions of police legitimacy and their likelihood of complying with officers' orders can also be shaped by their vicarious experiences with law enforcement officials" (Jacobsen, 2015, p. 313). In other words, in addition to personal experience, which I would argue is statistically a low probability, people form their perceptions of police legitimacy – and propensity to interact or cooperate – based on the recounting of tales from other people or even the media. These vicarious experiences are then internalized and, like other vicarious experiences, become encultured.

Question 3

Question 3 (Q3) saw a nearly unanimous response in each administrator and officer interviewed, who believed that assumptions about policing would influence how officers tried to perform their jobs. They were asked: *Do assumptions about policing influence how police officers try to perform their jobs?* The original purpose of Q3 was to determine if participants acknowledged or demonstrated elements of police rhetorics. That is, do they acknowledge police behaviors, symbols, communications, or other demonstrable factors that may influence the manner in which people assign meaning of what "policing" means to them, especially in the campus community. However, beyond seeking to observe recognition of police rhetorics on the part of police officers, Q3 has an added benefit of assisting to explore the participants' rhetorical self-awareness by asking them if assumptions about policing influences police officer job

performance. This part of the questions sought to elicit if the participants felt that police officers adjusted their performance based on perceived assumptions about them as police officers. This information impacts the broader discussion about the contributions of cultural contexts of policing in the campus setting.

Table 4: Q3 Primary Themes and Prevalence

<i>Q3: Do assumptions about policing influence how police officers try to perform their jobs?</i>		
Identified Primary Themes for Question 3	Prevalence of Themes Among Police Administrators	Prevalence of Themes Among Police Officers
Rhetorical self-awareness: assumptions about police officers influence their performance/discourse (rhetorics)	All (100%) of administrators agreed that knowing assumptions about police would influence task performance [to avoid living up to assumptions]	Five of six (83.3%) agreed that knowing assumptions about police would influence task performance
Police rhetorics: past negative police actions and discourse feed assumptions about police	Two of three (66.6%) of administrators acknowledged “bad” police behaviors contributed to assumptions about police	Three of six (50%) of officer respondents acknowledged negative police experience as feeding assumptions about police

Only Officer G, an officer with about 23 years of experience, said they did not think assumptions about police would influence how an officer performed their tasks. Each of the three police administrators articulated specific examples and instances to explain their responses. Administrator A and B both used examples of police misconduct that occurred elsewhere and tied those actions back directly to how the public perceives that police officers perform their jobs. Administrator A responded, in part:

Yeah, I think it does. Especially after recent incidents with George Floyd and Black Lives Matters. People paint us with a pretty broad brush, that we, uh, because of the bad apples in our profession, what they have done, they assume every officer they come across is the same (Appendix C).

Where Administrator B similarly noted, in part:

Yes, yeah, I think it definitely does. I think that, particularly in a campus setting, sometimes our officers go out of their way to try to be a friend to the students, where that's not really their role. You know, sometimes, you have to give people...ok so the assumption is that all police officers are bad. That's where the pendulum kind of current is (Appendix C).

Administrator C responded less directly but noted that officers are conscious of their responses because of the way police are perceived, noting that officers often “go into our encounters more guarded because we are aware of the assumptions of the public. And so, we go in more guarded, we go in just trying to make sure we do everything right” (Appendix C). Both Administrators B and C pointed out safety as a concern with this approach; that is, officers being conscious of not being viewed as the “bad guy” to the extent that they could jeopardize safety by not responding authoritatively enough in order to retain a friendlier appearance.

Administrator A's response to Q3 in particular indicated a rather high-level connection between police rhetorics, rhetorical self-awareness, and the influence of assumptions on police job performance, by alluding to the interplay between them. In addition to commenting on how police rhetorics, especially police behavior and actions, may influence assumptions, Administrator A commented deeper on what it takes to avoid – or at least mitigate – the influence of assumptions by noting the importance of positive cultural understanding of the police-community relationship, noting that:

I think where agencies who have avoided that stigma have succeeded and thrived is where they have had really strong preexisting relationships, trusting relationships, transparent relationships with their communities. They've been able to go to their communities as these things have happened across the country and even within their own communities and said “hey look let's talk about some of these things, let's be open about it, let's have these discussions. Y'all know how we are, and this is not indicative of what our police department is about...” So, I think agencies who thrive, and they succeeded in those types of situations that have popped off in other parts of the country, aren't even in their local jurisdictions or adjacent jurisdictions, it's because of those preexisting, positive relationships that they've had (Appendix C).

Where Administrator A's response situates itself in a direct connection to cultural understanding of the contexts of policing in that community, but Administrator A also describes a culturally rhetorical relationship partially built upon deliberate interactions and communications designed to maintain a culturally significant police-community connection.

Similar to the administrators who participated, police officers provided nearly unanimous responses in that they did believe that assumptions about policing influenced how officers tried to perform their tasks. Officer D responded with the notion of assumptions about legitimized police identity, continuing a similar theme from Q2 above, noting that "I feel that people have assumptions of how officers have done policing where they're from or something that they've seen in a negative light, where we have to fight through those assumptions..." (Appendix C). Officer F related body language and semiotics specifically, noting a very rhetorical example of not just optics, but an element that can be tied to police rhetorics:

I think so because you can tell...if you read body language, people may change when you come around because they're not used to you because they're trying to figure you out; they're trying to see what type of person you are. And then, if they've ever had a negative experience with a police officer, you're a part of that because they see you in a uniform. Sometimes I think they forget that you're human and they just see the uniform and the badge (Appendix C).

Officer E dissented somewhat, related that they did not think it would influence how they did their job. However, Officer E also responded, "but it definitely gave me more thought to trying to explain why I was doing something. That's always something that sometimes I've seen with other officers; they don't have a good explanation for why they're doing something..."

(Appendix C). Thus, it is reasonable that while Officer E may not change their course of action based on assumptions about police, they acknowledge that it may influence how they explain a situation to the person(s) they are interacting with at any given moment.

Officer I revealed a very problematic job performance response to assumptions about policing, noting a drop in productivity and delaying decision making:

I do strongly believe that assumptions about policing influence the way officers perform their duties. During civil unrest, we saw a huge drop in officers' productivity, and they were unsure of which action to take. Officers would not make a decision and were waiting on their supervisor to tell them what to do (Appendix C).

Only Officer G disagreed that assumptions might influence how officers tried to perform their jobs, stating that a lot of students have negative attitudes. In response, Officer G's agency attempts to "have good communication with students, especially the ones that you just can't, or won't/don't want to have any interaction with you. We try to talk to them, approach them, and have conversations, other than anything enforcement. Just conversation" (Appendix C).

Each of these responses indicate a high level of 1) at least unconscious awareness of police rhetorics in how they influence cultural conception of policing and 2) a high level of rhetorical self-awareness in which the community "sees" them – rightly or wrongly – in a particular perspective. For example, the officers who commented about being viewed as perhaps "less than" municipal police are keenly aware of that positionality as campus police officers when compared to traditional cultural concepts of policing.

This conflict between what I suggest are cultural understandings of what policing is "supposed" to look like (municipal policing for example) versus campus policing calls for exploration of perspectives of police legitimacy being tied to traditional cultural contexts of policing which is often not associated with campus police. Jacobsen (2015) noted that "college students' perceptions of the legitimacy of campus police officers and how officers' actions serve to enhance or diminish this perceived legitimacy at institutions of higher education" (p. 310) is

an area that has been overlooked. Further, Jacobsen (2015) spoke directly to the issue that some of the respondents noted about their perceived status:

...although students expect the campus police to protect them from harm, they believe that officers should fulfill this function while not interfering with their lives as college students. Additionally, students delegitimize the power of the campus police by raising questions about their status as “real” police officers and highlighting how they overreact to the wrong types of behaviors, such as underage drinking (p. 310).

My experience has not been that students, or any other campus community members have tended to question my police status as being “real” in an antagonistic manner. However, the lack of awareness of campus police legitimacy appears to be the greatest factor, which may be attributed to the encultured notion derived from an essentialist view of what policing in the U.S. “looks like” to society when compared to perhaps less traditional experiences of policing. I point back to some of the responses from Q2 about assumptions about police that the interview participants noticed during their experiences. Administrators B and C, and Officers D, E, F, G, H, and I all commented on the experience of the community assuming the context behind police activity. For example, Officer D commented about a group of students who “had no idea that [redacted university name] had a police department, and that they didn’t know, they thought we were just security guards. They had no idea of our arrest powers...” (Appendix B). Officer F commented, “The media can project police in a negative way, so of course when you come on scene, they automatically assume that you’re going to draw your weapon or things like that” (Appendix B). Officer H stated, “I feel like every day the general public makes assumptions; they make assumptions based upon the previous trend pertaining to [police]” (Appendix B).

Question 4

Question 4 (Q4) was intended to cross over between both police rhetorics and rhetorical self-awareness. That is, the question is intended to draw out inferences for both elements.

Participants were posed this question: *Setting aside media portrayals, do the police organizations you're familiar with and their symbols, behaviors, and discourse influence community perception of policing?* The police rhetoric element was prompted by the inclusion of detectable police artifacts such as symbols, behaviors, and discourses of police organizations, in order to focus the participants' attention on means of rhetoric. Further, the second part of Q4 was intended to discern if and how the participants transferred their own recognition of police rhetorics to a notion of rhetorical self-awareness by articulating if those artifacts influenced community perception of policing. In sum, the results were indicative that the participants largely agreed that police rhetoric, such as symbols, behaviors, and discourses, did influence how the community perceived policing. In other words, the participants agreed that how they [police] display and depict themselves impacts the perception of police.

Aside from the fact that all participants agreed that police symbols, behaviors, and discourse all influenced how the community perceived the police, two additional data points stood out as interesting and are pointed out here. Both points support the first presumption about the data that the administrators' answers and officers' answers would demonstrate variances in the depth in which they answered, and it supports the second presumption that the administrators arguably have broader rhetorical awareness by citing specific, real-world events that impact their awareness of police agencies and police officers as actors. First, while two of the three administrators spoke about specific examples of police responses to events – George Floyd's death at the hands of police and Black Lives Matter – none of the officers gave such specific, real-life events. Their responses, while universally agreeing that characteristics of police rhetoric do influence community perception, were generally more abstract. This appreciable difference in

response style arguably suggests that some administrators may have, or at least demonstrate, a deeper consideration of police rhetorical self-awareness.

Table 5: Q4 Primary Themes and Prevalence

<i>Q4: Setting aside media portrayals, do the police organizations you're familiar with and their symbols, behaviors, and discourse influence community perception of policing?</i>		
Identified Primary Themes for Question 4	Prevalence of Themes Among Police Administrators	Prevalence of Themes Among Police Officers
Police rhetorics: police symbols, behaviors, and discourse influence community perception of police	All (100%) of administrators agreed that police symbols, behaviors, and discourse influence community perception	All officers (100%) agreed that police symbols, behaviors, and discourse influence community perception
Rhetorical self-awareness: recognition of past "bad" police rhetorics and <i>how</i> they influence community perception of police	Without prompt, two of three (66.6%) administrators gave specific real-world examples of how bad police behaviors impact community perceptions	All six officers (100%) referred to positive behaviors that positively influence perceptions. Only one officer mentioned a specific negative police group association

While I know that many police officers, regardless of experience or rank within leadership, are certainly aware of real-world police actions, bad and good, I noted that only Administrators A and B really identified specific real-world responses to police actions, those being George Floyd's murder (Administrator A) and the Black Lives Matter movement (Administrator B). This is significant in that many police officers, regardless of experience or characteristics, want to disassociate with those hugely impactful, negative police behaviors. Not to mention speaking about those deeper topics, such as race or police brutality, can be awkward for police officers who don't believe themselves implicated in those acts. The majority of the responses dealt with generalities when it came to media portrayals. Anecdotally, to combat this, I use a strategy to proactively offer students opportunities to ask "deep" questions about these types of topics when I speak at classes or other student groups. If students don't take advantage,

they at least see that I am open and willing to have those conversations and even start them myself.

The second data point that is important to acknowledge and relates directly to rhetorical self-awareness, is Administrator A's commentary about Robert Peel and these "Peelian Principles" that are referred to in Chapter One and are generally seen as canons of community policing efforts. The Peelian Principles are quite common in law enforcement literature and training that has roots or connection to community policing or community and police relationships. Speaking about the impacts of police rhetorics on community perception of police and policing, Administrator A commented:

You know, going back to Sir Robert Peel, we exist because of our community, and they allow us to exist as a part of our community. If we don't take into account and listen to what our community is saying about us, we are going to be doomed to fail because they are not going to trust us when we go into our community... That may mean adjusting our tactics, our equipment, how we approach situations, our interactions, etcetera. (Appendix D).

Administrator A is speaking specifically about one of the most famous Peelian Principles, also noted in Chapter One, that essentially the "police are the public, and the public are the police" (Williams, 2003, p. 100). In other words, the police are an extension of the community in which they serve the public. The community – society – collectively bears responsibility for crime prevention and accountability for resolving crime, however the police are permitted to exist as a group specifically tasked – and paid – to devote formal, full-time attention to it.

An important notion about Administrator A's commentary is that, while the depth of clarity of police rhetorics that Administrator A demonstrates is likely rare, the fact the most police officers are arguably able to consider the elements and impacts of police rhetorics, even if they don't consciously consider the notion of "police rhetorics" is probably not rare. I suggest this likelihood by pointing out again that every police officer that responded to Q4, regardless of

experience or level of leadership, agreed that their (police) behaviors, symbols, and discourses influenced community perception of police and police officers. Stated more simply, they know that their actions, even if only visible or symbolic, impress upon the public a certain opinion and view of police. One officer, Officer H, even extended that perception to their private life in that there is an expectation to be professional outside of work also. This notion is often codified as it is exceptionally common, including in my own department, to have a policy that addresses off-duty behavior, and that police officers can be held to account professionally for behaviors that they engage in while off-duty. This includes engaging in any behavior that brings their agency into disrepute in the community. Thus, also through policy, police agencies and police officers are aware of the potential for including community perceptions based on police rhetorics at all times, whether professional behaviors or personal ones.

Question 5

The participants were asked: *As a law enforcement officer, how do you think policing activities, behaviors, and responses impact how your campus community conceptualizes what policing means to them?* Question 5 (Q5) is another crossover question designed to extract commentary relevant to both police rhetorics and rhetorical self-awareness, and further, to encourage participants to apply both of those notions to their own understandings of how police rhetorics and rhetorical self-awareness impacts how *their* campus communities conceptualize what policing means to them. There was universal (100%) agreement amongst the participants that police agencies' and police officers' actions and behaviors play a significant part in how their roles are conceptualized, identified, and somewhat manifested into cultural recognitions. Specifically, the participants constantly and independently cited police-citizen interactions as a factor in how policing is observed and interpreted within the campus community. All of the

participants indicated a recognition that their interactive behaviors (activities, behaviors, and responses) with the community drive a substantial part of how the campus community conceptualizes the officers' roles.

Table 6: Q5 Primary Themes and Prevalence

<i>Q5: As a law enforcement officer, how do you think policing activities, behaviors, and responses impact how your campus community conceptualizes what policing means to them?</i>		
Identified Primary Themes for Question 5	Prevalence of Themes Among Police Administrators	Prevalence of Themes Among Police Officers
Police rhetorics: police activities, behaviors, and responses influence community concepts of policing	All three (100%) administrators agreed that police activities, behaviors, and responses influence community concepts of policing	All six officers (100%) agreed that police activities, behaviors, and responses influence community concepts of policing
Rhetorical self-awareness: recognition that interactive relationships substantially drive community concepts of police roles	All 3 (100%) administrators indicated that <i>positive</i> police-citizen interactions were key to forming community concepts of police as a role/function	All six (100%) officers suggested that positive interpersonal relationships between police and citizens influences how the community conceptualizes what policing “looks like” to them

Administrator A responded that they viewed every encounter with the community “whether its faculty, staff, students, visitors, guests passing through whatever it might be; it’s an opportunity for education,” (Appendix E) resulting in a positive outcome. Administrator C made a similar comment about positive results from the community observing police engagement with various programming. Administrator B’s response was detailed in differentiating between official and unofficial activities and behaviors, giving a clear understanding of the importance of having community engagements beyond “police” work, commenting:

I think, if we are out and about, we’re talking to students, we’re engaging in those non-business transactions, we go to the dining hall and we say hello to people as we walk through there, as long as we do things like that, I think it affects the way

the students see us. They see us as being people who are approachable, that if they do have a question or a problem, they can come to us and ask those questions without fearing judgement or whatever, where when we have certain officers who stop every car that's moving and don't do anything else, they get the perception that "oh they're just trying to jam us up on things." I think as long as you maintain a well-rounded enforcement and engagement philosophy that... most people know when they do something wrong that they're taking a chance...of getting caught. But, if you have those casual interactions as well as business interactions I think it's balanced out and helps you do your job better (Appendix E).

Officers D, E, F, G, H, and I all gave responses that indicated they recognized what Administrator B explained; there are different types of interactions that influence the perceptions of police and how the campus community conceptualizes what that policing function means to them. Officer F, for example, commented:

I think with the different types of students that we have here on campus, they're teenagers – most of them, so if you don't draw a line, they're going to inch towards it a try to cross it. But, if you show them, and I feel like we can teach them how police act on traffic stops, you know, let them know, "this is what you should do in a traffic stop." I think that we could actually be teachers. We are a part of law enforcement, but I think that we take more of a mentoring, counseling type approach here on campus (Appendix E).

The responses give indication of two types of interactions between police and the community from which the participants may view as impactful for how the campus community conceptualizes their police: business interactions and interpersonal interactions. It would not be surprising to campus police officers that several responses mentioned educating or teaching opportunities with the community. It is common for conversations in campus police agencies to include elements of educational opportunities to align with any law enforcement that is necessary. These education opportunities are often located in student conduct or other processes found within universities, which of course are administrative and not criminal processes. Universities tend to have more paths toward remedies than traditional law enforcement does. It is

recognized that students' mistakes may not need to be elevated to criminal prosecution in many cases, yet accountability is still necessary, and fair outcomes can still be realized.

There are distinct differences between business interactions and interpersonal interactions. Business interactions involve what are likely commonly considered activities of police within the community; responding to calls for service, taking reports, assisting with other safety needs, critical incident response, and of course enforcement actions. Interpersonal interactions may include business interactions however interpersonal interactions may also occur as stand-alone events in which officers and citizens interact even in the absence of "business" activities. Every participant's response to Q4 related either directly or indirectly to interpersonal interaction between police officers and the community, clearly establishing a link between what these police officers and administrators see as a connection between police rhetorics and rhetorical self-awareness, interpersonal interaction, and how those two characteristics influence how the community perceives police. Additionally, the participants' responses appear to lean more heavily on interpersonal interactions between police and community members either in connection to business interactions or as stand-alone interpersonal interactions as a major factor in community perception. This suggests a rather keen awareness across the participant group of the connection between community perception of police based on police interactions and behaviors, and the cultural integration of how police and policing as a function is recognized and understood to exist contextually within a community. It also suggests a high level of awareness of their police actions, behaviors, and appearance, which I refer to as police rhetorics, as well as a high level of rhetorical self-awareness of the influence their interactions have on the understanding of the campus police role.

Question 6

For Question 6 (Q6), participants were asked: *Do you think there are ways in which your background and experiences influence your understanding and concepts of police?* Q6, in a similar fashion to Q5, was intended as a crossover question, and was posed to participants to elicit commentary that could be associated with rhetorical self-awareness and to elicit any commentary on participants' concept of how one's background and experiences may influence their understanding of the concept of policing. Certainly, it is arguable that a reasonable person understands how one's experiences and background, including cultural background, may influence their understanding, concepts, or views on many different issues. Indeed, many are taught about the concept of culture and various cultural factors that do impact our upbringing such as family, schools, friends, church, community, or other involved factors. Consequently, while these responses are from currently employed police officers and have arguably been "encultured" into that profession, as is discussed in more depth in Chapter One and will be again discussed in Chapter Five, they are clearly still conscious of cultural influence. Thus, they occupy two spaces – police and citizen – at once but are cognizant of how those spaces connect and demonstrate a clear understanding of how one informs the other in either direction: police to citizen or citizen to police.

It must be noted that the unintentionally ambiguous wording of Q6 may have actually reaped more interesting responses. The question uses the phrase "your background and experiences," which was intended to be objective, and probably should have been offered as "one's background and experiences." It may have had better results than expected. The participants answered the question as it was asked, referring to their experiences, but it is interesting that some of the participants intertwined their own backgrounds and experiences with the objective one that "one" may have when understanding what policing looks like. In other

words, the participants did not get lost in their own experiences but chose to elaborate on the objective experiences of non-police. For example, Administrator C, Officer E, and Officer G all spoke from an objective perspective rather than the personal one. To me, this is important to point out because it is further indication that participants are likely to share a high level of rhetorical self-awareness.

Table 7: Q6 Primary Themes and Prevalence

<i>Q6: Do you think there are ways in which your background and experiences influence your understanding and concepts of police?</i>		
Identified Primary Themes for Question 6	Prevalence of Themes Among Police Administrators	Prevalence of Themes Among Police Officers
Police rhetorics: direct and vicarious experiences with police inform one's understanding and concept of police	All three (100%) administrators agreed that direct and vicarious experiences with police inform one's internal understanding and concept of police	All six officers (100%) agreed that direct and vicarious experiences with police inform one's internal understanding and concept of police
Rhetorical self-awareness: application of respondents of their acknowledgement onto their rhetorics and discourse	All three (100%) administrators reported acknowledging difference in how citizens internalize police concepts and adjust their responses when possible based on that recognition	Five of six (83.3%) officers empathized with citizen's cultural backgrounds and/or experiences with police as informing their police "experience." Three (50%) officers suggested they support intentional efforts to understand and positively influence citizen's police concepts.

Five of the nine respondents (55.5%) immediately recognized and acknowledged the influence of one's experiences and/or cultural background on their perceptions and interactions with campus police. This notion of Q6, relating specifically to background and experience influence on one's understanding of concepts of police, was intentionally directed toward querying if participants connected background and experience with how one internalizes their

views of police and the concept of policing. Relevant to experience in particular, several participants noted prior experience in dealing with police officers as a focal point for how one forms their understanding of policing. For example, Administrator B, Administrator C, and Officer E specifically reference one's prior police experiences as a factor in their understanding of the concepts of police. There is also acknowledgment of vicarious experiences impacting one's understanding of the concepts of police. Administrator C noted the following in Q2:

It's a never-ending battle that we have with our students because a lot of our students come at us adversarial. A lot of them bring a lot of distrust to the police department based on where they come from throughout the country. Based on their dealings, or, most of the time, their friends' dealings with law enforcement (Appendix B).

Administrator C also commented on previous experiences in Q6, commenting that:

People bring all sorts of backgrounds and experiences, some of them negative, some of them positive, but they bring their backgrounds and their experiences to wherever we are when they deal with us. I can genuinely tell what type of experience a person had with law enforcement in the past based on how they respond to me (Appendix F).

The recognition of one's background and lived experiences can be disconnected, however still have equal, legitimate influences on one's understanding of policing. Officer G noted that one's "cultural background, how they were raised, how they were brought up, I think has a lot to do with what they think about police" (Appendix F). While Officer G gives value to the cultural aspect, Officer G immediately contrasts those cultural influences with a lived experience possibly not yet experienced first-hand by someone interacting with police, noting that an influential background about police concepts may drive one's thoughts about police, "until they have an opportunity, and hopefully it's a good interaction between them" (Appendix F). This is an indication that, not unlike the other responses to Q6, that officers are often aware of the police

rhetorics impacts, has appreciable rhetorical self-awareness, and understand how community members may derive their understanding – and even views – about police officers and agencies.

Working in Both Campus and Non-Campus Policing

An interesting acknowledgement that resulted from Q6 in particular is that several of these interview participants have experience working in both campus and non-campus environments and noted distinct differences in experience between campus policing and non-campus policing environment: city/county versus campus specifically. Officer H answered the question relating to the influence of their own background and experiences in how policing was conceptualized in their campus environment in contrast to their previous employment as a deputy sheriff of a county. Officer H related that they realized they didn't know how to function on campus in comparison to their previous county law enforcement job. Officer H had to re-learn some aspects of their job, re-experience some things, and learn through interacting with the campus community members, ultimately realizing the campus environment was “totally different” (Appendix F) than the county environment. This signals the recognition of campus culture contextualization as the situational context of policing on campus versus perhaps the county environment in which Officer H previously worked. This connects not only to rhetorical self-awareness, which is apparent in Officer H's response, but it also suggests that contextualization of policing in the campus community situation recognizes the nuances of police discursive behavior and the expectations that may spring from that.

The responses that capture this point corroborate previous research (Jacobsen, 2014; Wilson & Wilson, 2015; Patten et al, 2016; Allen, 2020) that indicates that students may struggle in articulating campus police at times in contrast to municipal police. In the case of Q6, there seems to be acknowledgment of that idea as well, and the officers themselves drew some stark

differences in functions and response options between campus and non-campus policing environments, with at least some inference to a learning curve not just for community members, but perhaps also for some officers with non-campus experience. It is notable to point out that the officers' rhetorical self-awareness to draw distinctions between the campus community experience with policing versus non-campus (traditional) policing is compatible with discussion of community expectations of police in those different communities. This discussion is connected back to the cultural dynamics of campus policing in Chapter Two (2.3), particularly the anticipation of how police behave in the campus community (i.e. being more service oriented than municipal police). Thus, the participants taking a moment to infer their own rhetorical self-awareness about these environmental differences would not be a surprise to other campus police officers. These differences are not only appreciable by the campus community and their experiences but are openly acknowledged in many discussions within the walls of campus police agencies.

Question 7

Question 7 (Q7) asked the participants: *“As a law enforcement officer, when you think of your relationship with faculty, staff, and students, do you perceive that relationship is mutual in creating understanding of what policing means for the campus?”* The responses were generally positive from the participants in that they affirmed there was some level of mutual relationships in mediating understanding of what policing the campus looked like for their respective campuses. By mutual relationships, this study considers concepts of collaboration, interaction, or otherwise having some level of active relationships with the people of the community in creating a reliable level of understanding indicating that the community understands the

police/community relationship. Administrator A saw a relationship of understanding campus policing as a shared responsibility, noting:

So I think it's a shared responsibility to change perceptions of policing. It's not just my responsibility or my department's responsibility; it has to be a shared dialogue and a shared responsibility. One of the things that came out of George Floyd was a lot of demands were made by communities that police needed to change; "here's our list of demands, we need you to change this, this, this, and this." Well, that's fine and dandy, but the reality is, and I think this is where some agencies may have struggled. You need to have realistic conversations with them. Yes, we acknowledge that some things need to change; here's what we can change, but here's some things that can't change and here's why they can't change (Appendix G).

Administrator C had a similar outlook, commenting that they believed the relationship in creating understanding was mutual:

Yeah, I think it's mutual. I think it's critical. I think it's critical that they...that we interact with them so they can understand the role we play in their campus safety, and also gives me the opportunity to explain to them the role that they can play in their own safety... (Appendix G)

Officers F and G also responded similarly that they viewed their relationships with the population as mutual in creating understanding of the policing role in the campus environment.

Table 8: Q7 Primary Themes and Prevalence

<i>Q7: As a law enforcement officer, when you think of your relationship with faculty, staff, and students, do you perceive that relationship is mutual in creating understanding of what policing means for the campus?</i>		
Identified Primary Themes for Question 7	Prevalence of Themes Among Police Administrators	Prevalence of Themes Among Police Officers
Police Rhetorics: mutual responsibility for shared understanding campus police role	Two of three (66.6%) administrators agreed it was mutual. One (33.3%) suggested it was situational dependent	Only two of six (33.3%) agreed it was mutual and four (66.6%) suggested the mutuality was situational dependent

Rhetorical self-awareness: Contextualized (situational) mediation of police role varies among campus groups (students, staff, faculty)	One administrator (33.3%) suggested understanding police was mutual with students and staff, but faculty could be challenging	Four of six (66.6%) officers reported that mutual creation of role understanding was dependent, and that the student population was harder to create mutual role understanding. Barriers included transient student population and preconceived notions about police roles. Campus size may also inform role understanding.
---	---	---

A common theme from Q7 is that many of the participants responded to Q7 in a situational context. In other words, they saw Q7 as an “it depends” scenario. In other words, the level of mutual understanding varied. For example, Administrator B commented:

Sometimes. I find it often depends on...with students and staff, yes. I think it's very mutual, you know, because particularly students who are coming here...they're new, want to know “what are my boundaries, and where do you fit into that.” Um, staff, usually very easy to work with. Sometimes faculty can be challenging, because they believe that they should have certain...rights...or certain privileges that the rest of the folks don't have. And then, when you explain to them, “No you really don't have that right or privilege,” it can get a little...testy. Um, but for the most part, I think it is a mutual situation with the faculty (Appendix G).

Officers D, E, H, and I all responded that the mutual relationship is dependent upon the group who is party to the relationship, such as student, staff, or faculty, and the needs of the group.

Officer D pointed to critical incidents driving a deeper desire for police interaction, whereas a “lull in negative crisis situations” (Appendix G) may cause some to be less interested. Officer E returned to the idea that some have preconceived notions about police officers, responding to Q7 that:

I think some people do have preconceived notions about police officers especially in an institutional setting. The same kind of thing I just talked about, there are a lot of people in this setting, whenever we contact them it's their first experience with law enforcement. And so a lot of those preconceived notions I think are driven by the media or what they hear from their friends that have had experience with police, but especially during the very recent tumultuous times with police,

the overwhelming majority of what we got from faculty and staff on the campus was positive interaction (Appendix G).

Officer I's response brought attention to the fact that campus communities are often rather transient compared to other communities:

The relationship is not fully mutual in creating understanding of what policing means for the campus. Every year we get a new population added to our community and we constantly must strive to relay the message of what our responsibilities are. It is a never-ending cycle. One year, the relationship would be mutual but the following year it might not be. This relationship is mostly influenced by what is going on in the world/media at that time (Appendix G).

Officer I's response is significant in that Officer I recognizes the challenges of having to re-establish a relationship with a new population almost annually. This is a substantial challenge for both campus police agencies and campus communities alike when trying to solidify social and cultural meaning within that space.

Question 8

Question 8 (Q8) to the participants was: *Are police and campus populations two communities that are connecting culturally, or are they missing opportunities to connect? From a cultural perspective, how can we connect better?* This question was included to encourage participants to articulate the impacts of police rhetorics (their discourse and behaviors) and rhetorical self-awareness on the campus community (how aware the participants are). The cultural perspective, here, includes the backgrounds and experiences that campus community members bring with them to campus, but that perspective also includes the campus culture that exists situationally at their respective universities. That means that campus community members, which includes police officers, arguably share responsibility for helping mediate culture, contexts, and understanding of the environment, and that viewpoint is informed by their background formed before and after joining the campus community. Generally across the

research group, the responses largely placed a lot of the responsibility back on the police officers, police agencies or the profession in general. The participants appealed for mutual relationship-building and cooperation but took ownership of trying to open those doors.

Administrator A responded:

For the police, we need to do a better job of finding out what our community wants. It's one thing as a CALEA [accredited] to put out our periodic climate survey and say, "hey how are we doing?" But it's another thing to intentionally ask our community, "Hey, what do you want? What do you need, and how potentially can we help you? Give us some suggestions..." (Appendix H).

Administrator B responded by focusing on diversifying the police departments through the diversity of employees in order to connect culturally with the community and represent the community, pointing to recruitment efforts as being critical, stating "I think sometimes we are missing opportunities to connect, and I think it's just because the departments themselves don't necessarily have the diversity to represent the population on the campus...but you can't hire someone who doesn't come through the door..." (Appendix H). Like Administrator B, Officer D focused on recruiting new officers who may be affiliated with the campus community already (alumni, for example) and being conversational with students in particular.

Officer E and Officer F both extracted an important characteristic of making human connections, noting variance in police officer individual talent to make connections. Officer E commented, "...there are going to be people who are really good at going out there and building those connections... and some people they don't have that ability to befriend somebody they don't know" (Appendix H). Officers H and I, like the majority of the interview group, agreed that mutual connection between the police and the community did exist, however there were simultaneously missed opportunities to connect, and both placed more of the burden on the police. Officer H responded:

I think in some instances we are connecting and in others we're missing the opportunity ... I feel like we're missing the opportunity to connect in having more of an open dialogue with the students ... When students make suggestions and we take it to the administration and they sit on it, I think we're missing it (Appendix H).

Officer I responded with a focus on connecting better with the community through a process in which the police should learn to manage re-connecting practices with that transient campus community. Officer I suggests this can be done better by police by learning what that community needs or wants; to "...find out their interests by simply talking to the community" (Appendix H), and also to "understand the generational and cultural gaps that are existing now between police and the campus population" (Appendix H).

While some participants stuck to stricter lines of generating better communication and interactions with the campus community, the majority of the participants, either openly acknowledged or inferred, related their responses to the cultural aspect of the question. In other words, they recognized that the question was not strictly about having better communication or collaborating with the community. Rather, they recognized a need for a deeper connection culturally with the campus community to bring everyone to better agreement and understanding about what role policing played in that setting. Such connections impact perspectives by influencing how the community thinks and acts in regard to the campus police, and likewise those connections impact how campus police see their relationships with the community. Further, cultural connections influence beliefs, values, and a likelihood of more readily accepting information from police. Finally, cultural connections may also impact on how people perceive and contextualize police legitimacy, police discourse, and interactions. For example, Administrator A, Administrator B, and Officers, D, E, F, G, and I all make references to generational issues, cultural gaps, or other subjects that go deeper than the function of

communication and suggest trying to better understand needs and perspectives. To forge deeper connections, the respondents made various recommendations that they have used. Administrator A noted that they like using surveys to better locate service needs or opinions. Administrator B focused on hiring and recruiting campus community members to fill full-time positions and internships, which also aids in diversifying their workforce:

So, we really try when we have different programs that we do with the students. We really push the idea that, “Hey, you know, when you graduate you can work here. You don’t have to leave this place if you like it.” And, we try to get a more diverse pool. We have three officers right now who are students here. We have a couple that started out as part-time security guards. So, we...when we hire students, and we try to hire a lot of students as part-time security guards, we tell them, “You know, if you think this is something that you would like to do, every day you come to work, you’re applying for that job. You’re interviewing for that job because you are developing a reputation with us as you’re working as a part-time student (Appendix H).

Officers D, E, G, H, and I all suggested more officer-initiated programs to just get out and chat with the community, students especially, to generate more understanding and share ideas. Again, we find that the officers tended to lean heavily on interpersonal relationship building activities with students in order to make closer connections.

Table 9: Q8 Primary Themes and Prevalence

<i>Q8: Are police and campus populations two communities that are connecting culturally, or are they missing opportunities to connect? From a cultural perspective, how can we connect better?</i>		
Identified Primary Themes for Question 8	Prevalence of Themes Among Police Administrators	Prevalence of Themes Among Police Officers
Rhetorical self-awareness: Police awareness of how much they connect with communities culturally (as related to accepted and agreed upon police/community roles)	All three administrators (100%) suggested that police could do more/better in connecting with the community culturally (socially, behaviorally, in creating understanding of police roles)	Five of six (83.3%) officers referenced that police could do more/better in connecting with the community culturally (socially, behaviorally, in creating understanding of police roles)

Police rhetorics: The methods/manner in which they connect culturally with the community	All three administrators (100%) suggested that police could do more/better in connecting with the community through discursive practices, community interactions, and information exchange.	Five of six (83.3%) officers commented or inferred connecting better interpersonally with community members was a key to connecting culturally.
--	---	---

Ultimately, several suggested indications arose from the data. The first indication is that the interview participants, generally speaking and regardless of role and experience, tended to recognize their nuanced manners in discourse (police rhetorics) and the impacts of their discourse on their audience, especially as communicators of information. This recognition was often detected in the way that the police officers spoke about their communication practices in successes and failures and often commented on the impacts of their discourse. The second notion that arose from the data is that the interview participants also generally presented a high level of rhetorical self-awareness from their position as a police officer. That is, they recognized their role within the broader community, how they were perceived by the community, and that their discourse and interactivity influenced how the police role was contextualized by their audience. Many of the participants gave specific personal examples of how they interact, their preferences on how they form relationships with the community and how they believe those interactions direct contextualization of how the campus community understands the police role on campus.

CHAPTER FIVE:
**CONTRIBUTIONS OF POLICE RHETOTRICS & RHETORICAL SELF-
AWARENESS TO CULTURAL CONTEXTS OF POLICEING IN THE CAMPUS
SETTING**

5.1 Introduction to Chapter Five

While the contributions of police rhetorics and police officers' self-awareness could be broadly construed, this study suggests that some of the primary contributions to cultural contexts of policing in a campus setting are establishing or reinforcing campus police identity and legitimacy through campus-specific policing functions. Police rhetorics (as discourse) and rhetorical self-awareness among police officers within this research are evident in the interview responses. It is important to note the level of apparent deliberate rhetorical recognition found amongst the study participants, and their often-deliberate acts of projecting their discourse through interactions with the community. These acts contribute to the cultural contexts of what policing means in the higher education campus setting.

Where, in Chapter Four, the participants' responses were isolated toward the interview questions and thematized, Chapter Five seeks to contextualize the participants' responses and situate them toward broader identified themes that contribute to the overall cultural contexts of understanding police and policing in the higher education campus setting. Those central themes connect back to prior chapters and are police rhetorics, rhetorical self-awareness, police identity, and police legitimacy; all of which contribute to the cultural contexts of policing in higher education environments. By contribution, I mean these themes add to, influence, or otherwise play a major role in the way that campus communities perceive, digest, and ultimately resolve their understanding of the police role within that setting.

In this chapter, police rhetorics is redefined and its impactfulness articulated through participant recognitions of essentialism, artifacts, and discourse conventions. To demonstrate the contributions of police rhetorics to cultural contexts of policing in the campus setting, the study participants' responses are used to exemplify their articulation of how their discourse, that is, their rhetorics, influences how the public sees them and how the public understands their role. Similarly, rhetorical self-awareness is demonstrated as a contributor to cultural contextualization of police in a campus setting by connecting participant responses. Study participants universally acknowledged that they were aware of how their role influenced the community, including how the police are received and perceived, even if that perception is based on vicarious experience with police. Study participants demonstrated through their responses a high level of self-awareness that their role as campus police influence the community.

The study participants universally recognized that their status as campus police officers was sometimes confusing for the campus community and for students in particular. Part of that confusion is based on essentialized visions of police being tied more to traditional (municipal) police, rather than other police such as campus police. Thus, the participants recognized that the police identity on campus may be somewhat skewed for some of the campus community because of their prior experience. The study participants acknowledge this as impactful and acknowledged that they often take steps to educate others on the campus police role, while recognizing prior, non-campus police experience.

Police legitimacy is demonstrated in this chapter through police rhetorics, rhetorical self-awareness as it causes police to be aware of their rhetorics, and through essentialized views of police as a function. Study participants' responses are connected in this chapter to the concept of legitimacy, where, for police, the issue of contextualized authority is found within the campus

community. That recognized, understood, and accepted police role is tied to an applied identity role for police in which the participants acknowledge their role in their own identity and how non-police identify them.

I had two general anticipations on the data outcomes. One was that police administrators would have a higher recognition of police rhetorics and impacts, and the second was that there would be a gap between administrators and officers in their respective levels of rhetorical self-awareness. Administrators, I expected, would have higher recognition. Both anticipations were largely wrong in that both administrators and officers alike had relatively consistent recognitions of both their rhetorics and demonstrated similar rhetorical self-awareness. The fact that my anticipations were incorrect is a good sign because it signals that these campus police officers, regardless of role or experience, generally demonstrated high levels of awareness of their roles, role impact on others, and how those roles interact and mediate within the community.

5.2 Central Themes: Police Rhetorics, Rhetorical Self-Awareness, Identity, and Legitimacy

To remedy a lack of external knowledge about campus policing, Allen (2020) suggests that campus police shape others' perceptions by expressing their characteristics (interest in student welfare, resource, and powers of arrest) to improve "perceived legitimacy" (p. 117). As helpful as this is, this process is also an injection of self-identity into an otherwise socially-driven concept of the differences between municipal police and campus police – perhaps an exercise to challenge or advance cultural rhetorical assumption of knowledge of police in campus settings from a social one to an ideological one. The idea here is that this is an example of cultural rhetorics activity and can be both persuasive and multimodal. In taking such socialization activities, Fountain (2014) noted:

Multimodal displays, then, not only communicate knowledge and expertise; they also train participants to view this knowledge and the objects of their profession in a certain light. As such, technical expertise—an advanced mastery of the knowledge and expertise of a technical domain—involves learning to see and use objects, tools, and discourses according to the authorized practices of a particular group (p. 1).

Consider police rhetorics as a theorization of how police discourse and organizational culture are interconnected through a focus on the processes by which police language, texts, and other discursive practices like performance, embodiment, essentialism, and material rhetorics create meaning and the socially contextualized understanding of what policing means. This includes concepts of identity of police, essentialist or otherwise, and how that identity contributes to the cultural negotiation of what that role means. If campus police officers themselves are potentially divested from a police identity within campus communities, what impacts does that have on the cultural rhetorics – and police rhetorics – of that community? Additionally, as one who has been a “campus” police officer for nearly 26 years, I am appreciative of the attention given to policing in campus settings. However, as a career police officer, I find it interesting that research into the question of campus police officers being “real” in relation to municipal officers are largely based on perceptions of the community (Jacobsen, 2014; Wilson & Wilson, 2015; Patten et al, 2016; Aiello, 2019; Allen 2020) rather than results of practical knowledge or interactions, hinting at socially derived contextual knowledge of campus police versus municipal. This acceptance of perceptual knowledge leads me to consider this in relation to cultural rhetorics in which performative and embodied rhetoric may mix to aid the development of contextual knowledge even in the absence of practical or observed experience.

To this point, Allen (2020) noted the importance of exploring such perceptions, namely that such work seeks to determine why people hold such perceptions and are there any effects of these perceptions on people's behaviors [toward police]. The questions are logically associated with cultural rhetorics as well, but importantly so because of their relevance to this project, which seeks to combine a cultural rhetorics lens with police rhetorics. For example, how do perceptions of culturally perceived identities of police in campus settings affect behaviors toward those identities and their rhetorics? In regard to campus populations, only one (Q7) of the eight interview questions referenced "faculty, staff and students," which is a common method in how campus communities are grouped. Even when these specific groups were mentioned, only three of the nine participants actually spoke about specific groups. The other six participants maintained a broad community outlook. This may be an indicator of a high level of rhetorical self-awareness for at least some campus police officers in navigating any perceived differences among students, staff, and faculty groups.

Allen (2020) acknowledges drawbacks to campus versus municipal comparative data which may be impacted by the types of questions asked, but this sort of research could be built upon by "focusing entirely on perceptions of CP versus MP" (p. 105) to draw out a broader range of views. These comparisons have value because they draw distinctions and generate awareness of perceptions of policing and the contexts of policing in different communities. Comparative research between campus and municipal police, such as Allen's (2020), contributes to exploring the cultural rhetorics of a campus community because it gives insight into how a community filters their contextual knowledge of policing in different settings. However, focusing on campus policing in cultural contexts, which is done within this study, will better determine how that specific community, both police and non-police, understands policing in a campus setting.

Additionally, focusing on campus-specific data, such as community history, perceptions of police discourse and perceived police characteristics will provide insight into how that community derives cultural contexts of the police that serve in that setting.

One of the most telling aspects of the responses collected during this study is the regular commentary from the interview participants that indicated a strong awareness of the differences between more “official” discourse and unofficial, interpersonal engagements. Official discourse, often characterized by interview participants as objective factual information pushed out via official platforms such as social media, press releases, or some other type of distribution process, was recognized as not rhetorically effective for mediating a relationship with the community. In fact, at times, it may hinder mediating relationships with the community due to the impersonal nature of the information and the lack of contextual details to fill in potential information gaps. Several interview participants stated their preference for more personalized interactions with community members. This commentary signals a high level of awareness of the affordances and hindrances of both “official” discourse and unofficial discourse in contributing to the cultural contexts of policing in a higher education campus community.

5.3 Contributing Police Rhetorics

To discuss police rhetorics, one must first define it in some manner. For this study, I defined police rhetorics as *the systems of symbols, discourses, and practices, either actual, essentialized, or rhetorical, commonly associated with the policing profession and which locate meaning and understanding within policing contexts*. If it is generally accepted that occupational culture and police culture exist as definable concepts, it follows that those cultures may be characterized in some fashion. Cochran & Bromley (2003) noted that some occupations are characterized by a particular environment to foster the development of culture or sub-culture

type responses – such as policing occupations. For police officers and police agencies, those characteristics often take the shape of visual prompts, such as uniforms, vehicles, and symbols. There is also particularized language, such as jargon or legal language. Then there are policies and procedures, aligned with legal standards and industry best practices that drive many police functions and responses. Beyond that, one will find generally close-knit collegial and social relationships that are often marked by shared beliefs and outlooks on crime, law enforcement, and police services. This adds up to an environment that other research has described as “exposure to human misery, exposure to great situational uncertainty, and exposure to intrinsic danger...” (Cochran & Bromley, 2003, p. 88). Police officers, including myself, do not often think of their environment in those bleak terms, although one only need to observe popular cultural depictions of law enforcement to see these environmental elements being [often disproportionately] displayed. Intrinsic risks considered, they often think of it in terms of collaborating with other police officers, responding to calls and finding resolution in some manner. It is often rather task oriented, and we generally enjoy the jobs that we do. We sometimes think of our environment in social terms of an “us (police) and them (non-police),” because so much actual and rhetorical distance is put between police officers and non-police officers. We do not generally think of that as an *us versus* them, as in competing against the community, although that perception certainly exists in some communities.

While some of these police characteristics, such as police associated phrases, policies, and procedures may not be rhetorical by design or even by nature, they all serve to reinforce the meaning-making rhetorics of the police across the United States because they influence very visible policing functions and operations. For cultural rhetorics, there is focus on the meaning-making structures that are rhetorics and communicated by various discursive means and

mediums that inform and contribute to shape cultural contexts. Thus, the idea that “rhetoric has been and will always be a culturally located practice and study” (The C.R. Theory Lab, 2011, p. 1) stands, framed by the fact that discourse influences culture rhetorically and practically.

Defining and articulating police rhetorics are two distinct matters. If defining police rhetorics is the first step to locating “police rhetorics,” articulating police rhetorics is a logical second step. Pointing to a definition must be accompanied by articulable data and demonstration in order to add substance. However, a third step should be to demonstrate a tangible impact. In the case of this study, the contributions of police rhetorics and rhetorical self-awareness to cultural contexts of policing are likely the richest opportunity in providing tangible conversation of dominant narratives and cultural impacts that expose a process of contextualizing what police symbolize and how that function contributed to meaning making. Indeed, cultural rhetorics recognizes the word “rhetorics” to refer to studying systems of meaning-making and to the “practices that constitute those systems” (Powell et al., 2014, p. 5), and the study and practices are joined. Any police officer and community member can provide an opinion of what they believe police contribute to how we see policing in our communities. Depending on who is asked, a typical response would likely include answers that reflect practical service provision (traffic enforcement, responding to emergencies, etc.). This study offers conversation about what police contribute to cultural understandings of policing by way of their discourse and behaviors – their rhetorics – and how their rhetorical self-awareness may impact how police align their discourse and behaviors in a campus setting.

Articulating Police Rhetorics

The process of articulation must be supported by demonstrable phenomena of characteristics of police rhetorics that lends themselves to the further study of police culture and

rhetoric and constitute a source of information that supports a viable definition of police rhetorics as a lens. Certainly, some of these characteristics are more visible than others – language and symbols for example. I, as a long-time police officer, can argue that cops talk, walk, act, think, and react a certain way. Some of these characteristics are learned through training and formal means, while some are learned through observation of practical and rhetorical acts. Those behaviors are reinforced through various platforms, media in particular. It is common that people are fairly successful at “guessing” who the cop is in a group of people based on their appearance and behaviors such as body language and use of language. In fact, I’ve had it happen to me on more than one occasion throughout my own career.

As articulating police rhetorics may be comprised of multiple facets, this study offers a triangulation of police rhetorics through essentialism, artifacts, and discourse conventions – the result of which urges a phenomenon of not only enculturation within policing professions, but also a state of constant re-enculturation of police rhetorics that drive police culture and subsequent behaviors, contextual worldviews, discourse conventions, and power [im]balances. Each of these – essentialism, artifacts, and discourse conventions – from an organizational perspective, help drive the identity and image of the organization. However, they also help drive extra-organizational identity and images of not only the organization, but the cultural concept of what policing is rhetorically and practically.

Police Rhetorics Impactfulness

What is perhaps less visible are the rhetorical impacts of police-associated characteristics such as notions of essentialism and authoritative power that is imbued within essentialist views of police and what police characteristics are engrained into our society, as well as the responses that are elicited by those culturally relevant characteristics. This can perhaps be assessed on the

surface by simply asking people, especially those who have not interacted with police, to think about police officers and policing as a function of society and then describe the characteristics of police officers and policing. Perhaps more difficult is asking police officers themselves questions about their perspectives of how they are viewed and how their rhetorics influence the community's concepts of police and policing. This urges the creators and propagators of police rhetorics (the police) to recognize their discourse and artifacts, consider their own awareness, and ultimately consider how that contributes to the way they are understood to fit into the community.

The responses clearly indicate that the participants can recognize their own discourse as being impactful, even going as far as to identify the ways they communicate, including non-verbal communication that does or does not work so well based on their experiences. The data shows that the participants recognize and largely agree that their interpersonal communications, even if performative at times, expose their police rhetorics. By performative, I mean intentionally performed or displayed to offer up a certain image or to elicit a desired response. This idea is exemplified by Officer F's response to Q1 that they [police] "have to use all kinds of communication; non-verbal, verbal, even looks, like if you look at them a certain way they'll straighten up" (Appendix A). Additionally the study participants also broadly demonstrated they recognize the way they present themselves to others as police officers, either hardening or softening narratives about police through that presentation. Many of the participant's responses commented on the perception of campus police not being "real" police. One participant, Officer D, related that during a class presentation, some students didn't know that the university had a police department or what they did, mistakenly contrasting campus police functions as being different from municipal police.

The police rhetorics of campus police may disrupt the commonly held cultural and popular understanding of police, causing campus police discourse to have to be re-established in some ways to push back against the - sometimes incorrect - popularly held cultural perceptions of what police do, look like, and interact on campus. Officer I exemplified this idea in Q7, commenting that the police/community relationship:

... is not fully mutual in creating understanding of what policing means for the campus. Every year we get a new population added to our community and we constantly must strive to relay the message of what our responsibilities are. It is a never-ending cycle. One year, the relationship would be mutual but the following year it might not be. This relationship is mostly influenced by what is going on in the world/media at that time (Appendix G).

The idea that a campus community is somewhat more transient than a municipal community deserves consideration in that it is arguably more difficult to more robustly mediate cultural contexts of what policing means for the campus community.

The responses from the study participants indicate that the police officers who were interviewed appear to have a solid grasp in knowing how their community responds. They also know what works and what doesn't work, going as far as to describe learning how to speak to different audiences as Administrator A did in Q1 (Appendix A). In that particular response, Administrator A described the differences between communicating differently between a municipal community of people of color versus a campus community of college students.

A conclusion drawn from the data that relates to articulating and impactfulness of police rhetorics is that the police officer interviews, on the whole, placed more stock into interpersonal and community engagement opportunities, supported by artifacts and discourse, than they did visual cues, such as symbols, uniforms, vehicles, or even noticeable officer presence at a location, that are commonly associated with police.

Essentialism

The “essence” of something is often assigned by abstract ideas, values, or by socio-cultural mediated understanding. With essentialization, that abstraction is often substituted in the place for the actual thing. For police, the abstract images of police that have been culturally developed over time may work to a limited point with campus police. While visually, campus police and their various artifacts may initially be associated with visions of popular, culturally understood aspects of police, however when people begin to consider that the officer works for the university, a disconnect sometimes emerges and people occasionally struggle to associate campus police with “real” police. When distinctions are made between municipal and campus police, the disconnect feeds efforts to educate the community about campus police that several of the study participants described. Bordner and Peterson (1983) reported, even 40 years ago, that campus police interviewees at that time recognized the cultural contextual recognitions of police; that a municipal community grew up knowing what police were and what functions police served in that community. It is much less clear in campus communities because people often move into a campus community with an already-developed cultural context of what police look like and how they function.

The study respondents articulated in many of the survey questions that they recognized that the public held [pre]conceived notions about police and commented more directly on that topic in Q2, Q3, Q5, and Q6. Several of the participants commented specifically that it was common for students to not associate campus police with their culturally formed understanding of what police were and did. The interviewees report finding themselves having to educate students or student groups within the campus community about the campus police and their various services and functions. Officer I noted in Q7 (Appendix G), that campus police often

have to educate a sizable portion of the community every academic year simply because of the nature of the transient student population and first-year students who likely have had little direct interaction with police, and perhaps no campus police interaction. Administrator B also referenced the “newness” of students in the campus environment in Q7 (Appendix G), along with Officer E (Appendix G) in noting that a campus police experience for students is often their first experience with police.

The responses from the interview participants support prior research conducted over decades (Bordner & Peterson, 1983; Wada, Patten & Candela, 2010; Jacobsen, 2015; Wilson & Wilson, 2015; Patten et al., 2016) that calls attention to this cultural contextual disconnect between traditional (municipal) policing (“real” police) and campus police. Legally and functionally, campus police have the same authority and are largely only delineated by the same thing that delineates municipal police agencies from one another, which is geographical jurisdiction.

The conclusion for the assignment of a culturally embodied view of police may be attributed to multiple realities. First, municipal policing has been established significantly longer than campus policing. Most citizens who have police interactions are likely to have interactions with non-campus police because those agencies are much more prevalent. Additionally, university residential areas are generally not permanent in comparison to municipalities or other non-campus residential areas. Thus, culturally speaking, communities’ collective experiences, stories, and other supporting factors that develop cultural contexts about police are generally mediated outside of the campus community. If society ascribes police attributes relating to symbolism, discourse, behavior, or other observable phenomenon, they are likely ascribing the

lived experiences or stories from those non-campus experiences. This, aided by media depictions, often tells us what police and police work “looks like” or is supposed to look like.

The responses from the police administrators and officers suggest that attention should be given to the impactfulness that police rhetorics is likely to have on an audience, particularly a “new” audience, and especially when that impactfulness is connected to ideas of establishing mutual cultural understandings of the campus police role. When seeking to connect culturally with the campus community - that is, creating mutual understanding of police discourse and functions in that setting - all three police administrator respondents (100%) and five of six police officer respondents (83.3%) all stated explicitly or suggested that police could do a better job of. This suggests a high level of rhetorical self-awareness among the respondents that education about the realistic police role is critical in a campus environment.

Artifacts

The police profession is quite recognizable by its occupational artifacts, especially visual cues, industry-specific discourse, and codified practices. In the context of this study, an artifact is a tangible thing that is characteristically associated with the police profession and carries with it some communicative characteristic. Uniforms, vehicle make, models, and paint schemes, badges, stickers, military-like gear, coded language, and policies and procedures all contribute to popular conceptions of how police look, speak, behave, and respond to various prompts. Even noises (radios and sirens) can be included. All of these artifacts contribute to signal that police rhetorics communicate functionally or rhetorically. Police artifacts often carry their own meaning and associations, which may be positive or negative. When asked if police organization symbols, behaviors, and discourse influence community perceptions of police, the participants all responded that they felt they did influence perceptions (Appendix D). Surprisingly, the

participants did not comment as heavily on visual characteristics, of police as much as one may expect. Rather, participants often noted community programs and the tools that they used to engage with the community. Administrator A did comment on visual symbols, but downplayed the importance of visual cues in deference to tools and tactics that backgrounded how police interacted with the community, noting:

You don't have to always drive a bearcat into a crowd of people. There might be a better way to engage with folks. So, I think how we, not only what we present to them in terms of equipment and our personnel and what we wear, but also the manner in which we engage with them and how we adjust our policies, our procedures, our engagements, our tactics, says a lot to our community as to how much value we place in their input (Appendix D).

Two participants referenced police symbols/symbolism outside of the workplace. Administrator B commented specifically about "Blue Lives Matter" stickers and how that slogan upset some people because of the play off the Black Lives Matter movement, recognizing that those artifacts and their meaning felt appropriated to some audiences. Administrator B also noted other stickers, such as a "Punisher" sticker with a blue line through it. "Punisher" is a reference to a Marvel Comics character who essentially wages a war against crime in a vigilante manner, acting as judge, jury, and executing a sentence. A common "Punisher" sticker is often the depiction of a human skull. Administrator B explained the problems with these symbols because they conveyed an "impression that at least the officer that's got that stuck on the back of his car or truck or whatever feels that he is the judge, jury, and the person who's going to take out whatever punishment" (Appendix D). Officer E also noted their lack of participation with non-work police groups because of the negative perception. Officer H and Officer I both commented vaguely about looking professional in uniform because it portrayed professional appearance.

Officer H specifically commented that a well-kept, professional looking uniform translates to respect due to professional appearance.

While study participants voiced less concern about police symbols and visual cues, they collectively commented more heavily on artifacts that required community engagement such as policy, procedure, and, in particular, programming that was offered to the community. This was especially observed with the administrative officer participants. Administrator A, Officer E, Officer F, Officer G, and Officer I commented that police programs or engagement/interactivity were influential in how the community perceived police on campus and impacted outcomes such as police perception and relationships. It is my view, based on my own professional experience, that police officers view the visual cues and artifacts affiliated with their occupation as just that - occupational tools or necessary byproduct of the job. We do understand the rhetorical power of officer presence, and it is taught to police officers that officer presence is a [behavior] control technique. Beyond that, police officers do not generally see the bulk of their artifacts, such as uniforms, vehicles, tools, coded speech, and especially their policies and procedures as rhetorical. They are merely means to perform tasks and functions, or to distinguish the officer as performing that role.

The police officers interviewed did not appear to strongly consider the visual rhetorics of their police positionality such as uniforms, badges, vehicles, and other physical artifacts that are so traditionally and famously engrained into that particular professional scene. They could recognize the significance in visual association; however they did not appear to give a great deal of weight to how they allowed that to impact their roles. One contrary matter is that the public, which is the community being served by police, do give a great deal of weight to police visual associations, even the mere presence of police may make people uncomfortable and perceive that

something criminal or negative is afoot, and it makes some people uncomfortable. Within that situation, citizens are contextualizing police presence, visual cues that come with that, and are influenced to perceive police in a variety of ways, some harking to previous or vicarious experience. On a campus of higher education it may be no different than in a city neighborhood. Police discourse and rhetorical influence will contribute to how the campus culture sees their police.

The interview response that relates most to this was Officer G's comment that people related those visual cues to negative experiences with police, stating that other police officers are not "a part of that because they see you in a uniform. Sometimes I think they forget that you're human and they just see the uniform and the badge" (Q3, Appendix C). The majority of people view police as a thing, a necessary social function. We know this because this is how much of our society refers to police officers - simply as police as if a mechanism - and the human officer gets pushed to the margin in favor of the police as a function. Arguably, this is the same reason that police officers get lumped into a barrel with a few bad apples. They are often seen as a uniform authoritative police-as-function as opposed to police-as-humans. Thus, unless people know police officers personally, they often associate officers with the function. It is likely not to be impersonal or disregard the officers' humanity, rather it has been culturally mediated over time to associate with police actions and not police individuals. It does not help that the police profession, from training, to policies and procedures, to writing, and to courtroom decorum, and other areas, all demand "objectivity" because that is seen as the measuring stick for fairness and equal treatment under the law. I suggest that police artifacts are partially responsible for this view because of the meaning-making that is produced by those artifacts. Indeed, society needs

whatever objectivity can be had in those forums and the application of police and legal functions, but one should be aware of the struggle between the objective and the subjective in that world.

Generally speaking, the participants indicated a strong preference for engagement and, while some did acknowledge visual police cues, most of the study participants did not discuss the very obvious and established police visual characteristics such as uniforms, vehicles, flashing lights, or other established police visuals. It may be argued that, for police officers and agencies, the most visibly and famously associated artifacts of the profession are simply everyday tools for police officers, thus diminishing the rhetorical value that police officers place on those particular artifacts. In other words, those artifacts exist and are used on the job and have their own rhetorical contexts readily displayed. The rhetorical contexts are really only readily displayed for the community - the audience of the police agencies and officers. Most police officers see these as tools and means to affect a job. Many police artifacts, such as the visual ones, are so culturally engrained, whether by tradition, historical display, or by the aid of popular media portrayals, that they convey meaning and often likely don't need mediated understanding for the great majority of society; hence the use of the phrase "readily conveyed." Conversely, other artifacts such as policies, procedures, and programming require application in order to aid or manufacture equal rhetorical context. In other words, these types of artifacts may need to be activated in some manner for their rhetorical contexts to be displayed. Examples of this may include police "services" that are not traditionally associated with police. A specific example of this is a contemporary uptick in programs in which mental health professionals accompany police officers to certain calls for assistance. Mental health resources are not historically associated with police functions; however they are a major resource that drives new police policies and procedures.

This was an interesting result considering that an officer's lowest level of force is officer presence, which had been taught as part of a police use of force continuum for decades. Officer presence, being considered a "use of force," simply means that an officer's mere observable presence may provide sufficient rhetorical influence to change someone's behavior, prevent something from happening, or otherwise manage a relatively minor situation. Not to mention, the rhetorical influence of police visual cues is generally the first indication of police presence and arguably communicates a substantial amount of information, rhetorically speaking. Yet, visual references, which are generally passive, were minimally discussed by participants in comparison to matters of active discourse such as interaction or direct engagement with citizens. I suggest that the reason that officers generally do not intentionally reference their own visual rhetorics is because, while they understand rhetoric and influencing space and people, they see this as just a byproduct of their jobs rather than a deliberate strategy in most cases. An officer's detectable presence is taught as a control technique, often for an acute situation. It is not taught as a concept to help drive cultural contexts or to navigate how communities contextualize the police role in their community.

While police may see visual rhetorics as a tool, the community may not. Rather they are using those cues to mediate how they understand police to exist in their space. There are some examples that are deliberate beyond the learned "officer presence" strategy. "Ghost cars" are another example. This practice is locating a static, marked police vehicle in a certain location to impact the behavior of people in the area such as speed reduction or to prevent crimes of opportunity. The ghost car is intended to provide a visual cue for rhetorical impact to suggest that a police officer may be watching the area. For police, this action may be well-intentioned to

prevent crime; for citizens, it may trigger some negative Foucauldian-style thoughts of being constantly monitored or suggest that police have distrust of the community.

Actions such as this, which officers understand to have rhetorical impacts, are generally viewed as a means to affect a result that is narrowed to the function of crime prevention. They are not used so much to influence or contribute to culturally situated understanding. However, even if officers see these visual cues as more mechanical tools to affect practical ends, which doesn't mean they won't contribute to broader ideas of police rhetorics and contributing to cultural contexts of policing on campus. Officers clearly have rhetorical self-awareness knowing that officer presences or detectable police-related visuals have an impact on behavior. Police visual cues are part of police discourse because they transmit silent messages that people will take as meaning making, which contributes to the overall understanding of policing concepts in that space.

Discourse Conventions

Police agencies and officers communicate in particular ways. Police officers are trained to be concise and exclude unnecessary information. This is why police officers use "10 codes" or other formal short-hand ways of speaking. Some speech, like 10 codes, are formal, while others are not formal, but are developed as jargon within police culture. Words such as "direct," which means "I know," or "four," which is short for "10-4," which is the 10 code for "message received." There are also "17," "21," "25," "72," and others, which are all shorthand versions of 10 codes; or "Perp" for "perpetrator." Nevertheless, these are examples of how even official short-hand speech is still broken down into unofficial one-word phrases that are intended to be as concise as possible, especially on the radio. Police officers are often traditionally direct in their communication and much of it flows in a single direction by issuing instructions or giving

information. It is very mechanical. It is also very much on display in popular media and television. So, while police are often characterized by the visual messages of how they look, drive, or arrive on scene, the way that they verbally communicate is also often characterized as police-specific, or police-associated language.

Two primary drivers of the conciseness of police verbal communication are timeliness and compliance. Keeping information exchange, especially on the radio, timely is important to keep the airwaves free of unnecessary talking so that emergency radio traffic can have access. Most police officers dislike when other police officers are perceived as being unnecessarily long-winded on the radio. It affects other police officers' ability to get on the air. Similarly, when communicating safety information to the community, it may be necessary to be timely, especially with emergency information. Compliance issues are also present, particularly for university campuses. There are police, rules, and regulations, or laws such as the Clery Act, which require compliance in pushing certain safety information to the community. These factors influence how police agencies communicate, and in turn influence how police officers see their own communication, as well as influences how the community associates communication methods and characteristics with police.

Discourse conventions – that is, the ways and means of communicating – was the primary element which the study participants articulated as impactful for how they (police) contributed to how campus communities understand policing in that space. Based on the data from this study, it could be argued that campus police officers and agencies are perhaps more successful – or at least they believe they are – at communicating facts and data and not as effective at communicating context and intentions. Yet, police verbal (and other forms of) communication are designed to be driven by facts and data, and not so much context and

intentions. Context and intentions require more time and thought, which is the opposite of concise and pointed. Administrator A noted in Q1 about police communication: “Oftentimes it’s just the facts. Here you go, do with it as you deem appropriate, and really there’s no humanity behind it; just raw data/facts” (Appendix A). Later, responding to the same question (Q1), Administrator A pointed to transparency, commenting “... it’s almost like we communicate when we have to...You have to communicate on a daily basis with your community. One, it lends itself to that transparency piece that we have to have in our community; that they expect, right” (Appendix A)? Other responses indicated that the participants recognize the impacts of their rhetoric, by involving themselves personally in their communication with the community, admittedly reaping better results from the personal interactions that they received from a statement or press release. Prominent grammatical and style markers include passive language, vernacularized phrases and words, nominalization, and anonymization. However, that is part of the discourse reality for police officers and feeds police rhetorics as a genre.

The belief of how language works within a social group infers an aspect of language ideology. These ideological perspectives of police discourse inform and reinforce identity perceptions (Johnstone, 2018), whether self-perceptions or perceptions of others who may be observing the police rhetorics whether they consciously know it or not. The role of identity includes “beliefs about how languages are learned, and beliefs about what the functions of language should be, who the authorities on language are...” (Johnstone, 2018, p. 67). Positions of authority will continually seek to retain or generate legitimacy among its constituents through its ideological positioning (Harkin, 2015). The re-enculturation that occurs in police organizations reinforces police officers’ identities internally and externally through their rhetorics. Through discursive practices, their collective identity emerges into public view in

relation to their positioning between their professional world and the discourse that emerges from it, revealing identity assignment both internally and externally (Andrus, 2019).

Additionally the study participants also broadly demonstrated they recognize the way they present themselves to others as police officers, either hardening or softening narratives about police through that presentation. Many of the participant's responses commented on perception of campus police not being "real" police. This idea is fed largely by already established cultural concepts of what police officers or functions look like, as well as campus police being largely service oriented as opposed to enforcement oriented. One participant, Officer D, related that during a class presentation, some students didn't know that the university had a police department or what they did, mistakenly contrasting campus police functions as being different from municipal police. The police rhetorics of campus police, such as their discourse and practices, may disrupt the commonly held cultural understanding of police, causing that discourse to have to be re-established. Officer I pointed to this notion in Q7, commenting that the police/community relationship:

... is not fully mutual in creating understanding of what policing means for the campus. Every year we get a new population added to our community and we constantly must strive to relay the message of what our responsibilities are. It is a never-ending cycle. One year, the relationship would be mutual but the following year it might not be. This relationship is mostly influenced by what is going on in the world/media at that time (Appendix G).

The idea that a campus community is somewhat more transient than a municipal community deserves consideration in that it is arguably more difficult to more robustly mediate cultural contexts of what policing means for the campus community.

While written and spoken language may perhaps be the most obvious discourse conventions for police organization, they are certainly not the only ones. Various communication

genres, such as police reports, press releases, social media platforms, policies, and other modes of communicating positionality, messages, and actions and intentions may be counted among police discourse conventions. When asked about communication methods and success and failures in Q1 (Appendix A), eight of the nine participants spoke about interpersonal communication being preferred and effective to capture the best context for communicating effectively. Further, and importantly, each of these discourse conventions carry with them rhetorical influences that are driven by police culture and police rhetorics. The participants' responses indicated that they were aware of the implications of their discourse conventions and were rhetorically self-aware of the impacts of their communication methods and audiences. Each of these discourse conventions project rhetorical characteristics such as ethos, pathos, and especially logos (probably more than the others), which can vary in intensity depending on the situation at hand. All forms of police discourse also carry serious implications of how a police agency may be viewed by the public and influence how the community contextualizes their police agency and their relationship with it. They are also primed for exploration, and ultimately challenging, both dominant police narratives and cultural ones that are relevant to how we see policing.

The study participants, nearly universally, recognized the impacts of the relationship-building potential for face-to-face community engagements related to safety programs, town hall style meetings, and simple casual interactions. The casual interactions serve as having, as Administrator B put it, “non-business transactions” (Appendix B; Appendix E) where the purpose of the interaction is not only practical, but also largely rhetorical; to build social capital with the community and to demonstrate a humanistic picture of police officers. When asked about police organizations' communication methods, the participants generally reported that

their most successful communication efforts occurred when they tried to establish personal or more casual relationships with community members. Several study participants commented on the contrast of facing assumptions by community members about police officers through more casual interactions, even when resolving service calls. Officer B summed it up this way:

I'm never really, like, very rigid unless I have to be, you know what I'm saying? But you can look at me, you're probably thinking, "hey this guy here, he's probably a butthole." But when we get through the conversation, man it's like, "wow, I didn't know you were like that," as far as being down to earth and trying to be on the level of the students we're dealing with and the public (Officer G, Appendix B).

The conclusion of the responses that relate to matters of discourse clearly sided on the effort of the participants to wield their individual – and sometimes organizational – police discourse as a flexible rhetorical tool to push back against essentialism that may be supported by various police artifacts and culturally embedded police representations. This conclusion suggests that the participants are not only aware of their police rhetorics but are rhetorically self-aware enough to recognize the influence of their police positionality on how the community conceptualizes police. If this were not the case, would they still put so much effort into their discourse to engage in stronger personal connection with the community?

5.4 Police Rhetorical Self-Awareness

Generally, the questions that were asked and intentionally sought to elicit responses that could measure rhetorical self-awareness within the participants were successful. These questions were primarily Questions Four, Five, and Six, and secondarily Questions Seven and Eight. Based on the responses from the interview participants, it is clear that they generally are rhetorically self-aware as individuals and collectively as campus police officers to relatively high levels. The

majority of the participants, when prompted by an appropriate question, acknowledged the role that police rhetoric (i.e., their discourse, practices, and behaviors) play in creating the meaning of the function and perceptions of campus police. They recognized and openly discussed the impacts of police organizations and their symbols, behaviors, and discourse. When asked if these things influenced community perceptions of policing, all participants agreed they did.

Administrator A commented in part:

I think how we, not only what we present to them in terms of equipment and our personnel and what we wear, but also the manner in which we engage with them and how we adjust our policies, our procedures, our engagements, our tactics, says a lot to our community as to how much value we place in their input (Appendix D).

Administrator B commented specifically about negative symbols that, while perhaps meaningful to police culture, send a negative message to the community about police:

...you've seen the punisher stickers with the blue line through it...I hate them...because that gives the impression that at least the officer that's got that stuck on the back of his car or truck or whatever feels that he is the judge, jury, and the person who's going to take out whatever punishment he deems is necessary (Appendix D).

An interesting notion about Administrator B's commentary is that these stickers are not sanctioned by police agencies, rather they are culturally relevant to police officers because of police culture, not strictly because of organizational culture. Nonetheless, these responses, and others demonstrate that these officers are rhetorically self-aware of their actions influencing perceptions of police and serve to influence how those perceptions are integrated into community culture of how we understand policing in that space.

Several of the study participants commented on specific, nationally known cases of police misconduct and the negative impacts that those cases had on the general reputation of police as a profession. The question “Do assumptions about policing influence how police officers try to perform their jobs?” (Q3, Appendix C) drew out a number of responses that demonstrates that these campus police officer appeared to hold a high level of rhetorical self-awareness. Administrator C’s response was indicative of the group:

...I think it does so in this sense – we go into our encounters more guarded because we are aware of the assumptions of the public. And so, we go in more guarded, we go in just trying to make sure we do everything right. We do in trying to not step on any toes...while we are there trying to deal with an issue. And so, we try to be extra careful, but we got to be careful with that because we don't want to jeopardize officer safety. We don't want to jeopardize the whole reason why we're there in the first place, which is to maintain order, provide a service. And we could find ourselves in a space where we are exercising more leniency whereas we really need to be dealing with that with a hammer...because of those assumptions. So, we go in more guarded (Appendix C).

Similarly, Officer H’s response, while short, also demonstrated a high level of rhetorical self-awareness in how their behavior is not only impacted by historical assumptions and perceptions, but also by their own actions as a police officer. Several responses indicated that while the officers interviewed understood the implications of police perceptions and discourse as it pertains to rhetorical self-awareness, several officers were keenly aware of the potential to create safety issues out of trying to tailor their discourse to alleviate those perceptions of police.

Another conclusion that may be drawn from conversations about rhetorical self-awareness among the interview participants is that there may be a disconnect between what individual officers actually understand about their own rhetorics and rhetorical positionality, and what they are able to translate to the community. In other words, even if police officers/agencies are seemingly highly rhetorically self-aware, they may not project that well, leaving the

community, at times, to see the police as appearing ignorant to how they impact police perception within the community. This conclusion ties back to various commentaries from the study participants in which they describe their own failures in communication processes, such as failing to communicate using daily “non-business transactions,” suggested by Administrator B (Appendix B, Appendix E), failing to communicate context, and failing to offer sufficient transparency. Several interview responses acknowledge communication breakdowns, or actual/perceived poor communication practices on the part of police.

Bordner and Petersen (1983) noted, based on their research at that time, that campus police officers “attitudes toward various community groups reflect their perception of different groups’ attitudes toward them” (p. 72). Bordner and Petersen (1983) also asked campus police officers how they felt different community groups perceived them, with the responses indicating that they felt, at that time, that students saw them the least favorably. While the study included here did not measure campus police officer attitudes toward the community such as Bordner and Petersen (1983) did, it did seek to qualitatively measure, through various interview questions, how campus police officers felt their rhetorics and discourse influenced community perception. The conclusion of that is the participants generally agreed that their work, their discourse, both influenced police perceptions and were influenced by police perceptions. Overwhelmingly, the responses to these were positive in nature as the participants explained how they tried to influence the community, indicating a high rhetorical self-awareness.

5.5 The Campus Police Identity

Matters of police identity faced by the study participants were generally universally acknowledged. Most of the participants at some point within the interview related knowledge, an anecdote, or some other indication, that they were well aware of the regular confusion or lack of

understanding of their police identity because of their university employment versus municipal employment. Several of the participants recalled their experience of working both municipal and campus policing. Several of the participants also related their police officer identity, or the confusion thereof, to the efforts of their campus police organizations. In particular, several participants recalled stories of the student population not fully knowing what campus police did versus “traditional” municipal police. While they did not respond that this caused negative encounters, they did relate that there were significant educational efforts that were necessary on their part of their agencies. The matter was significant enough that most of the participants discussed this issue and sometimes addressed it more than once. This, to me, while possibly frustrating to some campus police agencies at times, is an ongoing opportunity to engage with a community that is in a position to have new police interactions to reform any already contextualized ideas of police. Participants acknowledged student in particular coming to a campus with pre-formed concepts of police, however those concepts are likely based on their experiences with “traditional” (municipal) police. Experiencing policing in a campus environment in some ways may be quite different from previous understanding.

The fact that this issue of identity was broached repeatedly within the data points to a real contribution of repetitive identity establishment. The cultural impact of identity for organizational success is explained by Faber (2002):

Identity is closely linked to communities and to cultures as it is an interpretation and a performance of our cultures and our cultural stories. Change enables the members of an organization to successfully restructure and reposition their own identities – and their larger organization’s identities – as they strive to resolve their competing needs, expectations, and the goals for the organization (p. 26).

Where we find the change connection is in the context of policing in a campus environment in comparison to a non-campus one. The participants in this study routinely noted their efforts in

establishing their identities as police officers with police functions in response to a change in environment for a sizable portion of the campus community. Culture identifies with performative social functions that serve as a sort of cohesive material that seemingly unites a common thread of contextual understanding, even if not total agreement, and often defined by the various notable social functions that are the “networks and relations that provide continuity across the community” (Faber, 2002, p. 26). Thus, the study participants’ continuing efforts to establish and re-establish their police identity serves as a contribution to the cultural networks and relations that provide context continuity across that campus community.

Communicating Organizational Identity

Faber (2002) argues that change as a function of identity is a communication project, suggesting the following:

...change occurs through the manipulation of specialized forms of language. More often than not, the primary form of this communication is storytelling. This finding is grounded in observations of organizational life that have shown the powerful roles communication plays in creating and maintaining organizational structures. Organizational communication enables business processes, constructs organizational knowledge, and creates the everyday workplace stories that make it possible for people to work together (p. 29).

Faber’s (2002) argument of specialized forms of language manipulating change to several key factors to define what is meant by “language,” is not relegated solely to workplace processes and constructing organizational knowledge, but also aiding in the construction of cultural knowledge, processes, and stories that have broader cultural implications outside of the workplace, and particularly in the policing organizational perspective. This outlook finds a great deal of accuracy within the policing workplace in that specialized forms of language drive change and construct organizational knowledge and stories. The knowledge and stories are then translated via discourse to project organizational identity.

The responses to the first interview question (Q1; Appendix A), particularly by the police administrators who were interviewed, indicated a heightened sensitivity to matters of organizational communication. A common thread within the administrators' responses pointed to their acknowledgment of "story-telling language" noted by Faber (2002). This was manifested in the administrators' commentary about their communication successes and failures and the contrast between storytelling with objective, factual language, and storytelling with contextual opportunities, such as the "human part of communication" noted by Administrator A (Appendix A). Expanding the context of "language," these specialized forms are certainly beyond the narrow view of spoken or written language. Images, policies, procedures, either written or otherwise codified or practiced, and various other artifacts, are included in those specialized forms of language. This is so because each of those things, among others, convey meaning, intention, or some expectation of maintaining or developing some palpable context of how we, the community, understand what policing means to us. Each of those things – those specialized forms of language – are rhetorical.

Managing organizational identity is a substantial challenge for police agencies. The interview participants regularly commented about their efforts to collaborate with the community, generate positive outcomes and interactions, and educate the community about campus police and resources. The participants also generally recognized the contributions of police symbols, behaviors, and discourse to influencing community perceptions of police. The challenge is in the balancing of the rhetorical, often culturally pre-configured, influences sometimes negatively associated with police against the backdrop of seeking to influence the community positively through similar rhetorical and practical means. In other words, it is how the police respond to events which demonstrate police discourse that serves to influence

perceptions, which may or may not align with an agency's purported identity. Police discourse influences an identity association as much as culturally mediated perceptions about police.

An organization's identity may consist of what Faber (2002) suggests a combination of narrative and image, arguing that narrative is created internally as a "manifestation of 'insiderness' within the organization" (p. 31), while various interested audiences create image externally. The organization's identity is then reflected in the convergence of narrative and image. While Faber (2002) is speaking of organizational boundaries, this argument extends beyond strict organizational and toward a broader cultural rhetorics orientation. If narrative represents a social scene in which social contexts are constructed and social products that situate understanding are created, then this application is appropriate considering the idea of cultural rhetorics is that social constructs are both rhetorical and cultural. Then, it may be suggested, that narrative is not only created within the organization, especially if it serves as a socially symbolic act that takes on social context via social construction.

Similarly with the notion of image, while Faber (2002) notes that image is constructed externally of an organization by the organization's various audiences, that point suggests that image can also be a creation of an organization. The external powers that impact that image is how the image that is invented or fostered by the organization is mediated by the audiences and ultimately contextualized to a broader meaning. In the cause of this discussion, a police organization may foster a particular narrative or image, but that does not mean that it will be accepted. The specialized forms of language may help determine the level of mediation of narrative and image, how and to what extent it is mediated for meaning by the audiences, and then ultimately accepted both rhetorically and culturally. Faber (2002) notes that "Images exist apart from the organization as something it often attempts to assume but not as something it

absolutely controls” (p. 33). This notion is where the rhetorical rubber meets the road when it comes to what police organizations attempt to assume (their own image) versus what they cannot ultimately completely control.

Police organizations can control their own intent and to a large extent, their actions, however police organizations cannot control image reception, mediation, and ultimate context. The reason is because the image is derived from the police organization’s positionality within its environment along with all of the demands, actions, and standpoints that come with that environment; even the rhetorical, the cultural, the factual and perhaps even the inaccurate. Faber (2002) makes a critical point to this, noting that “Even though the ways in which an organization describes itself often influences the production of its image, an image may be created in opposition to an organization’s discourse or in the absence of such discourse” (p. 34). In other words, the audiences of the organization’s communications, rhetorical or actual may also be a source of the organization’s image. This is particularly the case of a high-profile, public agency such as police organizations.

The inability for a police organization to communicate an image consistent with the image that is being developed by its audience is significant, or organizations may possibly “become distressed when their externally projected images conflict with their internally produced narratives,” (Faber, 2002, p. 36) resulting in damage to the organization’s identity and discordance. For example, every police organization that I am familiar with openly touts their ideals related to professionalism, fairness, and aversion to police misconduct. However, when police organizations or their police officer representative ultimately engage in unprofessional acts, perceived or real lack of fairness, or perceived or real police misconduct, that communicated image is in discordance with the image that is being rhetorically mediated by that

police organization's audiences. Several interview participants commented about transparency – or the lack of – as a key factor in communication failure, indicating a recognition of the impacts, both actual and rhetorical, to the audience when police agencies lack transparency resulting in downgraded ethos. This leads to a discordant identity that does not align with the purported image that police agencies often champion. A change process would likely be necessary to bring those discordant identities back into alignment.

Organizational identity, according to Faber (2002) is “performed in the ways people dress, the cars they drive, the architecture and interior design of an organization, and the communicative genres people use within an organization” (p. 28). Each of those examples hit terribly close to the nuanced, yet culturally contextualized, images and artifacts of every policing agency that can likely be imagined in our collective cultural contexts. This applies to the notion of “professionalism” as well which includes “historical identity, highly sought expertise, professional memberships, and standardized education, including certifications, licensure, or higher education” (Angeli, 2019, p. 48). Further, one may extend Faber’s (2002) comments here beyond the boundaries of organizational identity when it comes to police organizations in particular because of their propensity to extend that identity into the community by way of exactly what Faber (2002) noted, but also because of the original intended concept that policing, at least in the U.S., was originally intended to be a function of society. Sir Robert Peel’s alleged Principle 7 that states “Police, at all times, should maintain a relationship with the public that gives reality to the historic tradition that the police are the public and the public are the police” (Bratton, 2014, p. A20).

To illustrate Bratton’s (2024) relation of Peel’s attributed principle above, as evidenced by the responses of the interview participants, this suggestion of the police and public being

ultimately connected, that this notion is not solely related to policing as a function. It is also related to shared culture. The responses to the interview questions established that the participants certainly largely retain very reasonable levels of rhetorical self-awareness and awareness of their own police rhetorics. Hence while they, and other police officers, may arguably have been “encultured” into their policing functions, organizations, and professional community, they are still very connected to broader cultural aspects. In other words, even if they are encultured into a professional culture, which is largely recognized as a common phenomenon with many professions, these participants are not simultaneously uncoupled from civic or communal culture, regardless of how the community views them when they put on a police officer’s uniform. Question 6 (Q6) responses in particular suggest that any reasonable person would agree with broader cultural acceptance and recognition of the impacts of variances in cultural views related to experience and background. The participants, in their way, universally acknowledged that notion and not solely from the view of police officers, but also from contemplative humans who are part of a community.

Within the study of police culture, the specific study of police in campus environments (campus police) is relatively understudied in comparison to municipal policing (Wada, Patten & Candela, 2010; Jacobsen, 2015; Wilson & Wilson, 2015; Aiello, 2018; Patten et al, 2016). Patten et al. (2016) noted significant findings that many members of their campus community reported that they were unaware of campus police duties, tasks, and training requirements, whereas in comparison to municipal policing, respondents reported higher rates of perceived knowledge of these same areas. Such data resonates with other research related to concerns of legitimacy of campus police (Jacobsen, 2014; Wilson & Wilson, 2015; Patten et al, 2016; Allen, 2020) in maintaining their roles within their community because of the lack of connection of campus

police officers with traditional (municipal) police roles. Concerns of legitimacy here also potentially impact identity which correlates to concepts of cultural rhetorics, particularly where cultural identity is involved.

In particular, Wilson and Wilson (2015) suggest that campus police officers struggle to maintain a police identity because of feeling separated from that identity since their tasks are sometimes not likened to those of a municipal department. This idea is confirmed in this study. Consider that regardless of years of experience or leadership position, the study participants all seemed to recognize the challenges they face in projecting their police identities. The participants acknowledge continual efforts to correct misinformation and to combat a true lack of knowledge about campus policing, to the extent that some university students did not know that the campus police even existed. This creates challenges not only for individual police officers in establishing identity, but also the identity of their organizations and the services that come with them.

5.6 Legitimacy

Police identities that are underpinned by notions of power and expectations must be vetted through legitimacy. Sunshine and Tyler (2003) argue that process-based regulation – that is, interactional functions – seek to “manage the relationship between legal authorities and the communities they police” (p. 514) by harkening to feelings of personal responsibility and obligations to community authority. These feelings, according to Sunshine and Tyler (2003), are social values that underpin legitimacy. Legitimacy is a “property of an authority or institution that leads people to feel that that authority or institution is entitled to be deferred to and obeyed” (Sunshine & Tyler, 2003, p. 514). That source of legitimacy is also a recurring, ongoing discourse between the authority and its constituents (Harkin, 2015). Gerber and Jackson (2017) argue that legitimacy played a central role in the consent of the public to be policed with

coercive force, and the police legitimacy was based in the public – or social – acceptance of the belief that what power the police have rightfully placed central to the procedural justice theory. That theory suggests “the idea that powerholders must wield their authority in ways that accord with common norms, values, beliefs and definitions if they are to be seen as legitimate by subordinates” (Gerber & Jackson, 2017, p.82). Research has demonstrated that people’s personal experiences with police and their subsequent views on the fairness of police procedures impact their reaction to policing (Sunshine & Tyler, 2003).

This argument is such that there is the “assumption that people form assessments of legitimacy based more on how the police exercise their authority than on their effectiveness or on how equally police provide assistance to the various communities where they work” (Sunshine & Tyler, 2003, p. 524). This is supported by research noting that how police interact with people is often more indicative of how people view policing more often than the quality of police performance (Tyler, 2001; Tyler & Huo, 2002). That argument may be applied to the discourse choices of police narrative authors as well because police narratives wield substantial power in the court of justice and in the court of public opinion. Situational legitimacy and the norms and expectations of the police and public are constantly debated, often publicly. This is rhetorically relevant for the forward movement of culturally accepted knowledge and legitimization of policing as both a concept and practice. Similarly to Tyler (2001) and Tyler and Huo (2002), this study found that the interview participants, police officers themselves, recognized that their discourse, especially the interpersonal discourse and interactions, provided a greater opportunity to develop more intimate relationships between the police and community members. This finding aligns with my own professional experience in that campus police officers generally tend to be more well-rounded police officers in terms of interacting with a

variety of community groups and with a variety of crime and non-crime related service calls.

They are certainly called upon to do more than might be asked of a municipal police department.

The responses from the study participants in which this preference for more interpersonal interaction between police and community members – students in particular on campuses – may be a contrast to more traditional views of effectiveness that relied more on distributive fairness or police services which may just how police control/resolve crime as opposed to paying attention to the procedural fairness of how police officers gain legitimacy through how they handle their communities. The responses, especially from the police administrators who participated noted substantial tension between the distributive discourse and service and the procedural discourse and service. It is the “just the facts” posture noted by Administrator A (Q1, Appendix A) versus the “let’s have a conversation” interpersonal posture that demonstrates appreciable tension between the two. It may also be a *forced* legitimacy established in law and code versus a *culturally developed* legitimacy established by relationships.

Sunshine and Tyler (2003) sought to determine the influence police legitimacy had on public support and the propensity to comply, cooperate and support policing policies, and to examine the determinants of legitimacy. This research acknowledged more historical perspectives of policing via instrumental procedures such as using police effectiveness to generate support, or the public tendency for risk-aversion (i.e.: getting caught) to maintain legitimacy. The motivation for compliance based in accepting police legitimacy is “distinct from the belief that one is likely to be caught and punished for breaking the law” (Sunshine & Tyler, 2003, p. 517). Like Sunshine and Tyler (2003), focus may be placed on more social values and cultural contextual understanding to find the support for procedural focused foundations of legitimacy. In other words, does the way police perform their jobs in relation to the expectations

of the community impact on the cultural contexts of how policing is understood in that community? Arguably, yes. Many people already have some sort of contextual understanding that “campus police” and “real police” aren’t the same, and that campus police task association is more heavily based in service rather than responding more so to instances of criminal activity. These distributive factors associated with how policing is conceived in a campus setting are deepened by procedural factors in how campus police interact discursively with their communities, driving deeper cultural contexts of policing in the campus setting.

The notion of legitimacy refers to the idea that people obey laws which they view are legitimate, in that the law aligns with expected moral and social norms held in general by collective social groups (Jacobsen, 2015). Sunshine and Tyler (2003) show that legitimacy is a social value argument that is separate from the evaluation of performance, and police can “best regular public behavior by focusing on engaging the social values, such as legitimacy, that lead to self-regulation on the part of most of the public, most of the time” (p. 535). Jacobsen (2015) further argues that police legitimacy is shored by concepts of both distributive and procedural justice. Distributive justice refers to “how fairly officers distribute their services across different social groups, in addition to the fairness with which officers treat those belonging to these groups (Jacobsen, 2015, p. 311), and this support for law enforcement would be located higher when people perceive that police outcomes are perceived as being fairly distributed amongst various social groups.

When police are viewed as legitimate then the public is more likely to follow the law and cooperate with police, as well as view policing as a legitimate function of society. This is a distributive justice argument in that people view policing outcomes on a scale of fairness to groups and people who may interact with police. Procedural justice refers to the exercise of

authority and quality of decisions, as well as the level of interpersonal treatment while resolving police-involved matters. Tyler (2004) suggests four characteristics that align with procedural justice, which are extent of participation in the decision-making process, police-exercised neutrality, demonstration of respect, and caring (or at least empathy) to others' plights. The participants in this study generally recognized, and often deferred to, procedural justice in explaining how they often interact with various community groups when establishing legitimacy or developing more interpersonal relationships between officers/police and community members.

Yet, distributive justice concepts were not discarded totally for procedural justice. Administrator A pointed to a balance when they commented that police can acknowledge needs to change, but can respond with " Yes, we acknowledge that some things need to change; here's what we can change, but here's some things that can't change and here's why they can't change" (Appendix G). This response acknowledges that some things cannot change; things that are likely more aligned with distributive justice, while some things can change, which are likely things more aligned with procedural justice matters such as decision-making process participation with the community or changing the sensitivity level toward socio-cultural topics and recruiting those perspectives into police responses or considerations of resolutions.

Connecting culturally with their respective communities may be the key for campus police agencies. When asked if police and campus populations are connecting with one another culturally (Q8, Appendix H), the majority of the responses were mixed, but generally positive in outlook. Most participants felt the cultural connections between campus police and campus communities were there, however progress could be made. Often, the responses suggested that better communication and cooperation on what that community wanted from the police and what

cooperative efforts the police would like from the community were the highlighted opportunities to connect better. Recognizing diversity in representation and shoring up police/community relationships were regular comments from the participants. A particular challenge is the level of natural transitoriness of campus communities, particularly the student population. At least one interview participant, Officer I, drilled down on this issue as a particularly exhausting process. However, they also acknowledged that this process taught police how to become more effective in sharing the responsibility of generating cultural connectiveness between police and community.

5.7 Conclusions

Of the take-aways from this study, there are two that I focus on as being encouraging for research on campus police. First, the participants, regardless of rank and tenure, seemed largely aware of the professional and social means and impacts of their communication, including visual, behavioral, and non-verbal body language. While I, as the author, sought to define police rhetorics, the articulation of those rhetorics largely depended upon the participants' responses, which did produce articulations of police rhetorics. That is, the participants acknowledge various methods of communication that police use and are often associated with police-specific communication. They also acknowledged the impactfulness, both positive and negative, to the community in how they respond to campus police. The value of this is that it suggests that campus police are cognizant of how they communicate and the results of that communication.

Second, the participants, regardless of rank and tenure, demonstrated a high level of rhetorical self-awareness. Both of these characteristics are important to how the participants offer their images, messages, and relationships to the community. Further, the participants understand how those characteristics impact how the campus community contextualizes their understanding

of police in that setting. The participants recognized the rhetorical impacts of their presence and communications and generally are able to articulate how their presence impacts others. Therefore a strong argument can be made that the participants, even if not explicitly talked about, tend to recognize rhetorical elements and how they impact others.

Additionally, the participants demonstrated a solid grasp of their police identity as it relates to the campus role. They recognized that many students are unaware of campus police and their roles, but they also spoke about their efforts to education the community about campus police when it was necessary. This, again, indicates a high level of rhetorical awareness. These participants frequently know how they are viewed by the community and are able to adjust their responses to accommodate those perceptions.

Perhaps the greatest take-away that campus police still struggle with, to some extent at least, is legitimacy. That struggle is not to be construed as a negative struggle but was an appreciable topic during the interviews that was prompted by the interview participants. The participants recognized their identity as campus specific and generally recognized the level of awareness of the campus community about the roles of police in that setting. The participants acknowledged that students in particular sometimes do not fully connect a campus police department with a “real” police department. The responses indicated that at least some of that perception is understood by the participants to be associated with prior experience with learning what police “look like” or how the police function before they came to the campus. Therefore, lack of association of campus police with not being actual police seems to project from cultural contexts of how society views traditional (municipal) police and is not intended to be dismissive of police identity. The transient nature of a campus student, which was also acknowledged by participants, appears to be a motivating factor in continuing efforts to establish legitimacy.

Nevertheless, this topic is a major topic that historically and contemporarily seems to be a point of disconnect between campus police and the campus community.

It is my hope that Rhetoric, Writing, and Professional Communications (RWPC) as an academic field and field of study, may be prompted by any part of this research to open additional doors of study. RWPC is such a dynamic field that crosses both academic and professional spheres, that police research such as this, which I argue has not largely been explored within RWPC, would greatly benefit both academically and professionally by having a greater body of research. In my view, the opportunities for RWPC to conduct research on police, particularly within culture, rhetoric, and social circles, are as wide open now as could possibly be. Williams (2003) points out that Sir Robert Peel, often considered the “father” of modern-day policing, gave the police profession this concept of community policing, allegedly noting that the “police are the public and the public are the police” (p. 100), meaning that the general welfare is the responsibility of us all. Thus, we should benefit both professionally and culturally from research from the RWPC field.

CHAPTER SIX

SPEAKING TO MY PROFESSION

6.1 Introduction to Chapter Six

While sorting through the dissertation process, it was recommended to me by one of my dissertation committee members to consider a chapter intended to sort of “speak to my profession.” This was prompted by my expressed desire to somehow communicate my experiences as a student that complimented my professional experiences. After all, I had a great deal of positive experiences being able to make connections between the professional and academic worlds. After some consideration, I decided that this was a suggestion in which I found a great deal of value for two primary reasons. First, the policing profession is largely based on practical application intended to find practical/tangible results, and documenting those very practical functions. Perhaps the most tangible results are crime prevention, reduction, and resolution through the various existing means, including using the criminal justice system, to accomplish those goals. This may cause a gap in perceiving opportunities to view law enforcement’s interactions from a social-cultural lens.

Second, it is important for my profession to not only be able to see these conversations, because these types of conversations are generally not experienced in this way in our organizations. Further conversations found in this research do not often bridge into our very practical professional realm to an academic realm. Indeed, in some ways the study participants experienced that bridging by responding to the questions being asked. Clearly, the responses from the study participants indicate that they are fully capable and have a strong level of awareness of the very socio-cultural perspectives that are often found in conversations about

policing in the United States, often when speaking of matters of power, equity, and abuses found in policing.

Chapter Six is, by design, intended to be ethnographic, reflective, and directed to the law enforcement profession – the profession in which I am both an active participant, but also a professional and academic observer. The intent of such a chapter is driven by a desire to bring attention to any audience, particularly an audience of my professional colleagues, to the idea of exploring cultural contexts in a police world that is so often backgrounded by practical applications, thereby closing more tightly that ethnographic perspective. Finally, Chapter Six seeks to urge the police profession in general to consider this research and discussion and to also consider the recommendation of opening deliberate conversations about cultural rhetorics and rhetorical self-awareness. The research here indicates that the notions and concepts of those topics already exist within our campus police. We just don't call it by those more academically leaning terms. We should talk more explicitly about discourse and rhetoric and what those terms mean and infer beyond their existence within practical contexts. These are missed opportunities that could inject a greater general understanding about how we expect to police our campuses of higher education.

6.2 Deliberate Conversations about Cultural Rhetorics and Rhetorical Self-Awareness

The policing profession is as practical a realm as can be found in any profession. This is not criticism, as that practical application is a necessary thing to achieve tangible results relating to the functional expectations that society places on the responsibility of police and the act of policing. The training, the policies and procedures, the expectations, the discourse, and other artifacts, such as tools, equipment, and even technology, that go along with that profession almost always serve some practical purpose; a uniform, a car, tools, services provided – they are

all driven by some expectation of an outcome that is tangible that one can nearly, if not actually, put their hands on and grasp. This is also a necessary thing. All professions expect some sort of tangible outcomes from their actions that can be measured and demonstrated as either successful or not toward their desired ends.

Police organizations and police officers generally do not, in my experience, have conversations about rhetoric, cultural contexts of policing, or even rhetorical self-awareness, which are the conversations found in this research that need to be fostered in the police professions. At least, not in the context being discussed here. We police officers do participate in and often proactively seek out various diversity or cultural training to broaden our perspectives and sensitivities to challenges faced by our communities. Our communities include marginalized groups such as communities of color, LGBTQ+ communities, or other communities such as juveniles, who may have historically been mistreated, otherwise disregarded or perhaps even unfairly targeted by police agencies. Campus police do have conversations about police and community relationships; however those conversations and even related training are still largely based on practical outcomes such as problem-solving processes, establishing relationships to tackle community specific concerns, or establishing or repairing police/community relationships in order to find more cooperation or good graces in those areas. These efforts are often driven by some sort of community-based policing models, and they are designed to foster those relationships both theoretically and practically. Nonetheless, they are still intended to reap some sort of tangible outcomes rather than cultural understandings of why and in what manner policing exists in a communal space. Perhaps in addition to industry contexts or field-cultural words and phrases, we should urge additional conceptual thought beyond the practical context. An example of that conversation may look like this:

Professional Concept	Practical Context	Rhetorical Concept	Ideal Outcome
Officer Presence	Occupying a physical space with the intent to influence behavior	Visual Rhetoric	Beyond affecting a result, seek to understand how officer presence influences an audience's perception and understanding of an officer's presence in a given context. How does that understanding contribute to broader cultural recognitions of policing?

The words “culture” and “rhetoric” are often not used interdisciplinarily in our profession. When we talk about culture, we usually mean organizational culture. When we talk about rhetoric, it is usually in the historical sense associated with ethos, pathos, and logos. It’s certainly not mentioned in the same sentence with the word “culture.” These conversations, when they occur, are based on too narrow a view of both culture and rhetoric, especially when one considers all of the potential lenses that could be used with those topics. The word “rhetoric” often has some negative notion attached to it, as if someone is striving to urge their position on others and convince them of it. However, the idea of rhetoric and the use of it is not inherently negative and it doesn’t have to be. We, as police officers, use rhetoric on a daily basis through various means of communication, including non-verbal communication. We know this, we just don’t talk about it as rhetorical; we talk about it from the point of functionality of accomplishing the practical means called for by our duties. This is a gap that should be filled with deliberate conversations about police rhetorics and rhetorical self-awareness.

The good news is, if the responses collected in this research are any indication, universities and campus police departments should be encouraged as to the level of both cultural and rhetorical awareness demonstrated by the police officers who participated. However, we as a professional field, should operationalize the cultural rhetorics lens and

rhetorical self-awareness. By operationalizing, I mean deliberately considering how rhetorical cultural practices are and how historically embedded socio-political and socio-cultural understanding and relationships are as well. In practical terms, recognize both the ingress of culture into a campus community as well as the nuanced culture of individual campuses that may have a culture of its own. Understand that one's culture doesn't just inform their perspective, but also *how* they understand the world around them and the meaning of the world around them, including symbols, discourse, behaviors, and first-person or even vicarious interactions with police. One of the conclusions that I drew from this research is that the campus police officers who were interviewed, which based on my own experience I feel is generally representative of other campus police officers, already demonstrate an effective base for cultural and emotional intelligence.

6.3 Operationalizing Cultural Rhetorics: Cultural Intelligence

During my time in my doctoral program, I learned the value of being in a position of being a participant in the field that I was studying from cultural and rhetorical lenses. Oftentimes, these were experiences that I had not had before and ultimately I realized the benefit of attempting to build bridges between that very practical police world and an academic world full of new perspectives that were not so strictly practical. Bridging gaps between those worlds was always in the background of my work and I discovered a great deal of value in adding new layers of understanding and perspective. In hindsight, these academic experiences served to form the basis for my own cultural intelligence development. The theoretical foundation that this research is offering is from the cultural rhetorics' perspective in that our understanding of "how things work" are mediated within cultural settings and generate shared meaning of the things we experience in our cultural spheres.

The data collected during this study should, for the campus policing field in particular, be very encouraging as to the state of recognition that police officers generally have of their authority, the rhetorics of their various discourses, and the generally high level of rhetorical self-awareness that was demonstrated within the interviews. It is my primary hope that these sorts of conversations – about police rhetorics, discourse, and self-awareness find a more prominent space within the policing industry. These conversations are an opportunity to bridge the very practical world of policing – a world that seeks tangible, practice-based outcomes – and a world that fosters more theoretical conversations that can also be reasonably applied in that practical world. I envision these conversations noted above to provide deeper context to how broader social and community understanding the people and function of police services from the social and community perspectives.

Campus police, as demonstrated in this study, see the value in community interaction to help foster successful police work and increase general safety. Operationalizing cultural rhetorics for our benefit can only increase the value of that interaction. Cultural intelligence (CQ) is a multidimensional concept of intelligence defined by one's ability to adapt to [new] cultural contexts (White & Schafer, 2024). Within CQ, one may be considered to have higher EI “within their own culture but struggle to adapt when confronted by cultural differences” (White & Schafer, 2024, p. 3). Ang et al. (2007) defines CQ as “an individual's capability to function and manage effectively in culturally diverse settings” (p. 336). Certainly many campuses of higher education across the United States would be considered culturally diverse settings and perhaps may be evaluated by Ang et al 's (2007) four CQ dimensions; metacognitive, cognitive, motivational, and behavioral. Metacognitive and cognitive dimensions of CQ are important for

police agencies and officers, and considering cultural intelligence as a companion to emotional intelligence will benefit police as a profession.

Metacognitive CQ “reflects mental processes that individuals use to acquire and understand cultural knowledge, including knowledge of and control over individual thought processes related to culture” (Ang et al., 2007, p. 338) and indicate one’s ability to be aware of other’s cultural preferences, even before interacting. For example, interview participants acknowledged that one’s prior experience with police, vicarious experience, and cultural development impacted how they felt about interacting with police officers. Direct and vicarious experience are dimensions of cultural development. Important for police officers, no? Cognitive CQ “reflects knowledge of the norms, practices, and conventions of different cultures acquired from educational and personal experiences” (Ang et al., 2007. p. 338). Cognitive CQ development was displayed by the interview participants and may be something aided by CQ training for police. For example, participant responses included evidence of their knowledge of campus cultural norms, such as diversity in people and experience, an academic setting, a somewhat transient population, and communication methods; all characteristics that inform campus cultural interactivity. Further, participants demonstrated how Cognitive CQ characteristics, such as these, informed their professional and social interactions. Motivational CQ “reflects the capability to direct attention and energy toward learning about and functioning in situations characterized by cultural differences” (Ang et al., 2007, p. 338). For example, Officer E (Appendix B) explained that they understood people had assumptions about officers conducting traffic enforcement and took steps to explain their actions to close an assumption about police and traffic enforcement. Finally, behavioral CQ “reflects the capability to exhibit appropriate verbal and nonverbal actions when interacting with people from different cultures”

(Ang et al., 2007, p. 338). For example, Administrator C (Appendix B) responded that officers can tell when people assume officers are “out to get them” because of previous negative experiences with police, and that they make efforts to engage positively in those situations to steer from that perception based on that prior negative interaction. All of these dimensions are critical for the cultural rhetorics lens for police. They also happen to be terribly relevant to the practical world that police often live in. This will be demonstrated by having or developing high CQ intelligence in all of those dimensions to not only be empathetic, but to understand and respond accordingly to multi-cultural settings, as well as working to foster the campus police/community culture.

Injecting theoretical or academic conversations into an industry that is heavily based in praxis will not be an easy task. While the topics would likely be welcomed, the formats would be more difficult to establish. Training for police officers and agencies are equally based in practical outcomes that often serve more than having conversations. It is often the conversational format that police officers avoid engaging in. It forces people out of their routines, comfort zones, and often requires them to consider changing their mindset; a difficult thing to do for police officers so ingrained in established procedures of their jobs. Further, police officers are often not easily swayed by negotiating perspectives from social perspectives because they most often operate in a very practical world with expectations to see tangible results based on fact, precedent, check boxes – all designed to cross some sort of finish line.

6.4 Operationalizing Rhetorical Self-Awareness: Emotional Intelligence

Based on the study responses, police officers recognize the visual cues of their profession: the uniform, the equipment, the various symbols, the vehicles, etc. However, the data demonstrate that it is possible that police officers may downplay the rhetorical impacts of their

visual cues when compared with the community. For example, Administrator B (Appendix D) referred to a “Punisher” sticker with a blue line through it. While a blue line suggests support for police, a “Punisher” superhero sticker, often displayed as a skull may suggest a different message to non-police. An officer who displays that may see it as supporting police and crime fighting, while non-police may see it as suggesting that the police are judge, jury, and executioner. Further, an officer’s presence in a space, while seemingly innocuous to them, may display a different impression to others in that same space. The police officers who were interviewed appeared to place more value into police/community engagement and interactive opportunities, and the tools to propagate those opportunities, than police symbolism and symbols. The preference was demonstrated by seven of the nine participants in Appendix E, such as Officer I (Appendix E), who stated their preference or high frequency of face-to-face interactions with community members. This does not appear to be an intentional downplay of visual rhetorics and semiotics. It may be that the officers simply are not focused on visual rhetoric and are more focused on tangible outcomes of community interactions. As mentioned previously, when we talk about or train about officer presence as the lowest level of force, it is spoken about in the context of just that - use of force. The conversations rarely are about topics related to rhetoric, and even more rarely include direct references to rhetoric or cultural contexts.

The apparent preference of the study participants to place greater value in actual interactivity is a positive attribute; an attribute that I argue leads to greater contextual and cultural understanding between police and audience than allowing visual rhetorics to carry greater weight of imparting meaning. However, do not allow this to be a trap that causes officers to downplay their own rhetorics, which may cause some level of dissonance between how we think we see the impacts of our visual rhetoric and how the community perceives it and invests

that into their cultural understanding of what policing means in their community. For example, while police officer use of force is certainly taught to police officers, and officer presence is the first level of force available to a police officer, it is taught as a means to control a situation or influence someone to manage or alter their own behavior in a scenario in which police may be involved. It is not taught to relate to rhetorical or cultural contexts.

Officer presence is not generally taught in a non-control manner other than general acknowledgement that police should put their best foot forward when in view of the public. So, from the police officer perspective, an officer's presence is often a tool not unlike some sort of panoptic influence when necessary. Other than that, there is a general understanding of being in the public eye. Even departmental policies that address police officer discourse and appearance do it from the lens of professionalism, not as a contributor to how we integrate that into cultural recognition of how we understand policing to be. The rhetorics of police visual cues are not taught or discussed in terms of rhetorical influence of voluntary, social interactions between police and citizens. Many of the study participants spoke of using positive citizen interactions to build relationships, but the officers did explicitly connect their presence with their rhetorical power; rather they focused on positive relationship development as bearing the greatest weight of cultural connection. This is possibly because they are not taught to make that connection by understanding rhetorical perspective but rather connecting for practical purposes of cooperation as a means to an end. All of these strategies are important to the police and their communities, however the rhetorical element, while always present, is also noticeably absent from open discussion. It is largely not a part of police officers' vocabulary, and I suggest the matter of rhetoric is not part of their thought process either even though they live it daily.

Positive relationship development is important, however that takes time to mold and may only skirt the boundaries of the greater observance of police, which is often based in highly rhetorical observation. What could be missing is a deliberate attempt to not only connect with the community, but to try to see beyond the practical, and seek a deeper understanding of the cultural context of how the community and police connect without the need for a practical outcome. Several of the study participants – the ones likely to interact the most with community members – indicated they saw the value in this by commenting about their personal efforts to get to know community members and to allow community members to become familiar with them as people. They already engage in it and hence seem to be prepared to combat negative perceptions of police, yet we as police officers or administrators do not promote or celebrate it. I suggest it's because we don't recognize it currently beyond that practical positionality.

One way to operationalize rhetorical self-awareness is the use of emotional intelligence (EI) testing and training as well as cultural intelligence (CQ) training. In the past, my own agency has used various training and battery “testing” to evaluate police officers EI, and further provided constructive feedback on where they could emphasize more awareness of their own characteristics and emotional tendencies. While various definitions of EI exist across various academic, psychological, and even professional fields, I offer Mayer, Roberts, and Barsade's (2008) definition, which is that EI “concerns the ability to carry out accurate reasoning about emotions and the ability to use emotions and emotional knowledge to enhance thought” (p. 511). The notable translation for police officers is that one is aware of emotions, especially their own emotions, and thus can style their communication around that self-awareness to ensure productive communication. The value in this is that this ties directly to one's rhetorical self-

awareness and can, if trained and aware, use effective EI to channel that rhetoric into productive ends.

There is a large body of research that indicates the value of using EI in policing, and that police agencies often support EI concepts as a measuring tool. Further, EI may be connected to other training and critical conversations such as de-escalation training and implicit bias training. In both of these areas, emotional intelligence, that is, emotional self-awareness, is important. What I suggest may be a missing element in that discussion is rhetorical self-awareness, which may capture other police characteristics that may not be captured by EI. For example, while EI may capture how we communicate to others under various circumstances by considering the emotional settings, EI may not capture the rhetorical characteristics such as symbols or other physical “police” associated artifacts. EI may not capture the historical relationship between police and their respective communities. EI may not capture the cultural contexts of that relationship either. Those characteristics, I argue, play an important role in the rhetorical and contextual relationship and understanding of policing within that setting and will be better captured by cultural rhetorics and rhetorical self-awareness as developing cultural intelligence to coexist with emotional intelligence.

Where cultural rhetorics and rhetorical self-awareness may bridge both EI and CQ in the policing profession is essentially tying the EI and CQ concepts beyond the police officers themselves, and into a broader area of intentional cross-cultural training. One of the best features of this type of training or concept implementation is that, even with “testing” for CQ and EI, there is no pass/fail. It’s a measurement to see where police can improve in these areas based on various metrics. Using CQ and EI stretches the police beyond the concept of providing police services “to” a community and into a more culturally mediated concept of policing “with” a

community; a concept that includes cultural and rhetorical relevance. That notion fits fine with current community policing models, but those models should work toward ends that include the practical outcomes that we are so accustomed to measuring as success, but also include cultural and rhetorical outcomes that, frankly, are sorely needed in our field.

6.5 Beware of Environmental Rhetorical Decay

Several of the interview participants pointed out one particular challenge that they face in a residential university setting, which is that the community sees an annual exodus and influx of a large chunk of the community and of students specifically. Participants pointed out that the challenge is that they have to essentially re-establish relationships yearly with a large portion of the population. With such re-establishment comes the re-establishment of not just interpersonal relationships, but also organizational and rhetorical relationships. In theory, at least as it pertains to the vast majority of university student population, campus police agencies may see an almost completely new student community every four to five years. This notion begs to ask both individual campus police officers and campus police agencies alike, how they go about keeping up their practical and rhetorical presences in the face of a constantly rotating audience. Clearly, this is at least something that is on their minds as their interview responses referenced it.

Holly Fulton-Babicke (2021) provides a framework for understanding the theory of rhetorical decay. Rhetorical decay, or “RD,” is the idea that some forces may, either intentionally or unintentionally, push a message toward a “state of discursive degeneracy that results from particular derailing and block rhetorical tactics” (p. 277). The constant renewal of a major audience for police agencies and police officers can certainly cause the degeneracy of their messages, especially the rhetorical power that police agencies and officers often display. Fulton-Babicke (2021) presents RD as a “category of conversational responses that (regardless of the

speaker's intent) function to impede discourse by blocking, disrupting, derailing, or otherwise stymying *productive rhetorical action*" (pp. 277-278). I argue that in the case of higher education campus communities, for campus police and others, RD is often an environmental impediment to productive rhetorical action by the sheer nature of the [mostly] temporary community. Campus police, in response, may find themselves having to re-establish their various discursive practices at the starting line more frequently than they may like, creating a feeling of running in place, which is not helpful from a strategic perspective when trying to build positive and even rhetorically positive reputations. Nevertheless, such efforts will be required to minimize any potential negative effects of RD for campus police.

Are productive rhetorical actions becoming stale or are losing their potency with "new" communities? This thought does not have to be a negative thought. There are opportunities for us to use the concept of RD to our advantage to generate new productive rhetorical actions. One opportunity for us as campus police officers is to use new audiences to our advantage in seeking to establish new relationships. Even a somewhat transient student audience, when engaged with productive rhetorical action, still broadens the audience, even as they matriculate from their respective universities. A rhetorical "reset" may not necessarily be a waste of time for police agencies. In some cases, it may be welcomed as an opportunity to put a new foot forward. As much as I like to think that campus police agencies generally have excellent relationships with their communities, I know that may not always be the case. After all, it is common for social and political tensions to be highest on university campuses, which are also commonly the scene of protests, rallies, and sometimes painful and emotionally charged conversations. These events often find campus communities and campus police at odds on event management issues.

Productive rhetorical action is required more often than not to manage and resolve these types of challenges.

Another opportunity is to take comfort in realizing that many of us already understand that concept of a temporary community, or at least that a large chunk of it is somewhat transient. Since campus police officers appear to already understand this, and while they somewhat lamented it in their responses, they also appeared to apply the resiliency necessary to meet the challenge of having constantly new audiences. This is indicative of high-level rhetorical self-awareness. The Community Policing (CP) Model is likely the best current option to help with this, and fortunately many campuses are already engaged in aspects of CP, which is characterized by cooperative, proactive crime prevention and crime fighting endeavors. The challenge, in my view, is that even CP on campuses is often driven by a desire for practical results. Practical results often include tangible statistics such as the number of programs offered, number of attendees, crime statistics measurements, survey results, etc. While tangible measurements are important, intangible results are harder to measure. These may be results such as effective relationships between police and the campus community. General feelings of mutual cooperation and support. Whether or not the campus sees their police officers in a positive light. A general understanding of the role of campus police that has been formulated over time into cultural contexts of how policing works on campus.

In my experience, campus police generally have a decent eye for programming, service, and other opportunities to keep positive relationships established, including with large chunks of constant outgoing and incoming community members. Take advantage of campus police officers' collective awareness of their community environment and in establishing those interpersonal relationships with the community that they place so much value in. The CP model

can be expanded into cultural conversations beyond practical outcomes. That expansion should include new conversations among police about what police rhetorics mean, how to elevate rhetorical self-awareness, and incorporate their influences into how we contribute to cultural contexts of policing in the higher education campus setting.

REFERENCES

- Aiello, M. F. (2019). Legitimacy invariance and campus crime: The impact of campus police legitimacy in different reporting contexts. *Police Practice and Research*, 21(3), 297–312. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15614263.2019.1570849>
- Akkerman, S. F., & Bakker, A. (2011). Boundary Crossing and boundary objects. *Review of Educational Research*, 81(2), 132–169. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654311404435>
- Al Ali, O. E., Garner, I., & Magadley, W. (2011). An exploration of the relationship between emotional intelligence and job performance in police organizations. *Journal of Police and Criminal Psychology*, 27(1), 1–8. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11896-011-9088-9>
- Albaladejo, T. (2016). Cultural Rhetoric. Foundations and perspectives. *Res Rhetorica*, 3(1), 16–29. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.17380/rr2016.1.2>
- Alexander, J. (1991). Chapter Four. In A. Honneth & H. Joas (Eds.), *Communicative action: Essays on Jürgen Habermas "The theory of communicative action"* (pp. 49–73). essay, Polity Press.
- Allen, A. (2020). Are campus police ‘real’ police? students’ perceptions of campus versus Municipal Police. *The Police Journal: Theory, Practice and Principles*, 94(2), 102–121. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0032258x20906859>
- Ancis, J. R., Sedlacek, W. E., & Mohr, J. J. (2000). Student perceptions of campus cultural climate by Race. *Journal of Counseling & Development*, 78(2), 180–185. <https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1556-6676.2000.tb02576.x>
- Andrus, J. (2012). Language ideology, fractal recursivity, and discursive agency in the legal construction of linguistic evidence. *Language in Society*, 41(5), 589–614. <https://doi.org/10.1017/s0047404512000668>
- Andrus, J. (2019). Identity, self and other: The emergence of police and victim/survivor identities in domestic violence narratives. *Discourse Studies*, 21(6), 636–659. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1461445619866984>
- Ang, S., Van Dyne, L., Koh, C., Ng, K. Y., Templer, K. J., Tay, C., & Chandrasekar, N. A. (2007). Cultural intelligence: Its measurement and effects on cultural judgment and decision making, cultural adaptation and task performance. *Management and Organization Review*, 3(3), 335–371. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1740-8784.2007.00082.x>
- Angeli, E. L. (2019). *Rhetorical work in emergency medical services: Communicating in the unpredictable workplace*. Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group.

- Basham, S. L. (2020). Campus law enforcement: The relationship between Emergency Preparedness and Community Policing. *Policing: An International Journal*, 43(5), 741–753. <https://doi.org/10.1108/pijpsm-01-2020-0010>
- Bawarshi, A. (2000). The genre function. *College English*, 62(3), 335. <https://doi.org/10.2307/378935>
- Bordner, D. C., & Petersen, D. M. (1983). *Campus policing: The nature of university police work*. University Press of America.
- Bratta, P., & Powell, M. (2016, April 20). *Introduction to the special issue: Entering the cultural rhetorics conversations*. enculturation. <https://enculturation.net/entering-the-cultural-rhetorics-conversations>
- Bratton, W. J. (2014, April 16). Sir Robert Peel’s nine principles of policing. *New York Times*, p. A20.
- Britz, M. T. (1997). The police subculture and occupational socialization: Exploring individual and demographic characteristics. *American Journal of Criminal Justice*, 21(2), 127–146. <https://doi.org/10.1007/bf02887446>
- Bromley, M. L. (2022). Chapter 14 The Evolution of Campus Policing: Different Models for Different Eras. In *Campus Crime: Legal, Social, and Policy Perspectives* (2nd ed., pp. 280–303). essay, Charles C. Thomas.
- Burke, K. (1969). *A rhetoric of motives*. Univ. of California Press.
- Cherniss, C., & Goleman, D. (2001). *The emotionally intelligent workplace: How to select for, measure, and improve emotional intelligence in individuals, groups, and organizations*. Jossey-Bass.
- Chilton, S., & Wyant Cuzzo, M. S. (2005). Habermas’s theory of communicative action as a theoretical framework for Mediation Practice. *Conflict Resolution Quarterly*, 22(3), 325–348. <https://doi.org/10.1002/crq.106>
- Chiricos, T., McEntire, R., & Gertz, M. (2001). Perceived racial and ethnic composition of neighborhood and perceived risk of crime. *Social Problems*, 48(3), 322–340. <https://doi.org/10.1525/sp.2001.48.3.322>
- Cobos, C., Raquel Ríos, G., Johnson Sackey, D., Sano-Franchini, J., & Haas, A. M. (2018). Interfacing cultural rhetorics: A history and a call. *Rhetoric Review*, 37(2), 139–154. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07350198.2018.1424470>
- Cochran, J. K., & Bromley, M. L. (2003). The myth(?) of the police sub-culture. *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies & Management*, 26(1), 88–117. <https://doi.org/10.1108/13639510310460314>

- Conti, N. (2009). A Visigoth system. *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography*, 38(3), 409–432. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0891241608330092>
- Debbaut, S., & De Kimpe, S. (2023). Police legitimacy and culture revisited through the lens of self-legitimacy. *Policing and Society*, 33(6), 690–702. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10439463.2023.2183955>
- Doing cultural rhetorics*. Cultural Rhetorics Theory Lab. (2017, March 4). <https://crtheorylab.wordpress.com/how-do-you-do-cultural-rhetorics/>
- Dux, G. (1991). Chapter Five. In A. Honneth & H. Joas (Eds.), *Communicative action: Essays on Jürgen Habermas “The theory of communicative action”* (pp. 74–96). essay, Polity Press.
- Eble, M. F., & Gaillet, L. L. (2004). Educating “community intellectuals”: Rhetoric, moral philosophy, and Civic Engagement. *Technical Communication Quarterly*, 13(3), 341–354. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15427625tcq1303_7
- ECU Police, Revision 7 General Order 1000-10 Residence Hall Liaison Officer Program 1–4 (2023). Greenville, NC.
- Ehrenfeld, D. (2020). “sharing a world with others”: Rhetoric’s ecological turn and the transformation of the Networked Public Sphere. *Rhetoric Society Quarterly*, 50(5), 305–320. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02773945.2020.1813321>
- Faber, B. D. (2002). *Community action and organizational change: Image, narrative, Identity*. Southern Illinois University Press.
- Fairclough, N. (2003a). ‘political correctness’: The politics of culture and language. *Discourse & Society*, 14(1), 17–28. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0957926503014001927>
- Fairclough, N. (2003b). *Analysing discourse: Textual Analysis for Social Research* (1st ed.). Routledge.
- Farmer, F. (2002). Review: Community intellectuals. *College English*, 65(2), 202–210. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3250763>
- Fischer, M. J. (2009). A longitudinal examination of the role of stereotype threat and racial climate on college outcomes for minorities at Elite Institutions. *Social Psychology of Education*, 13(1), 19–40. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11218-009-9105-3>
- Fountain, T. K. (2014). Introduction: Developing Expertise and Learning to See. In *Rhetoric in the flesh trained vision, technical expertise, and the Gross Anatomy Lab*. essay, Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group.

- Frewin, K., Stephens, C., & Tuffin, K. (2006). Re-arranging fear: Police officers' discursive constructions of emotion. *Policing and Society*, 16(3), 243–260. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10439460600811901>
- Fulton-Babicke, H. (2021). Impediments to productive argument: Rhetorical decay. *Rhetoric Society Quarterly*, 51(4), 276–292. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02773945.2021.1947512>
- Ganapathy, N., & Cheong, H. (2016). The “thinning” blueline: A Bourdieuan appreciation of police subculture. *International Journal of Comparative and Applied Criminal Justice*, 40(4), 325–342. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01924036.2016.1206026>
- Gee, J. P. (2014). *An introduction to discourse analysis: Theory and Method*. Routledge.
- Gerber, M. M., & Jackson, J. (2016). Justifying violence: Legitimacy, ideology and public support for police use of Force. *Psychology, Crime & Law*, 23(1), 79–95. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2710103>
- Gochhayat, J., Giri, V. N., & Suar, D. (2017). Influence of organizational culture on Organizational Effectiveness: The Mediating Role of Organizational Communication. *Global Business Review*, 18(3), 691–702. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0972150917692185>
- Haas, A. M. (2007). Wampum as hypertext: An American Indian intellectual tradition of multimedia theory and Practice. *Studies in American Indian Literatures*, 19(4), 77–100. <https://doi.org/10.1353/ail.2008.0005>
- Haas, A. M. (2012). Race, rhetoric, and Technology: A case study of decolonial technical communication theory, methodology, and pedagogy. *Journal of Business and Technical Communication*, 26(3), 277–310. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1050651912439539>
- Harkin, D. (2015). Police legitimacy, ideology and qualitative methods: A critique of procedural justice theory. *Criminology & Criminal Justice*, 15(5), 594–612. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1748895815580397>
- Herbert, S. (1998). Police subculture reconsidered. *Criminology*, 36(2), 343–370. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1745-9125.1998.tb01251.x>
- Herrick, J. A. (2018). *The history and theory of rhetoric: An introduction* (6th ed.). Routledge.
- Jacobsen, S. K. (2014). Policing the Ivory tower: Students' perceptions of the legitimacy of campus police officers. *Deviant Behavior*, 36(4), 310–329. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01639625.2014.935653>
- Johnson-Eilola, J., Selber, S. A., Thralls, C., & Blyler, N. R. (2004). The Social Perspective and Professional Communication. In *Central Works in Technical Communication* (pp. 124–145). essay, Oxford University Press.

- Johnstone, B. (2018). *Discourse analysis* (3rd ed.). Wiley Blackwell.
- Kahneman, D. (2011). *Thinking fast and slow* (1st ed.). Farrar, Straus, and Giroux.
- Lindquist, J. (2002). *a place to stand politics and persuasion in a working-class bar*. Oxford University Press.
- Loader, I. (2014). In Search of Civic Policing: Recasting the ‘Peelian’ principles. *Criminal Law and Philosophy*, 10(3), 427–440. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11572-014-9318-1>
- Mariano, S., & Awazu, Y. (2017). The role of collaborative knowledge building in the co-creation of artifacts: Influencing factors and propositions. *Journal of Knowledge Management*, 21(4), 779–795. <https://doi.org/10.1108/jkm-09-2016-0360>
- Mayer, J. D., Roberts, R. D., & Barsade, S. G. (2008). Human abilities: Emotional intelligence. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 59(1), 507–536. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.59.103006.093646>
- Mazerolle, L., Bennett, S., Davis, J., Sargeant, E., & Manning, M. (2013). Procedural Justice and police legitimacy: A systematic review of the research evidence. *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies & Management*, 36(3). <https://doi.org/10.1108/pijpsm.2013.18136caa.004>
- Miller, C. R. (1984). Genre as social action. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 70(2), 151–167. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00335638409383686>
- Murphy, R. M. (2022). Rhetorical ethnography and the virtue of vulnerability in transdisciplinary research methods. *Poroi*, 17(1). <https://doi.org/10.17077/2151-2957.31090>
- Mwangi, C. A., Thelamour, B., Ezeofor, I., & Carpenter, A. (2018). “black elephant in the room”: Black students contextualizing campus racial climate within us racial climate. *Journal of College Student Development*, 59(4), 456–474. <https://doi.org/10.1353/csd.2018.0042>
- Newman, G. E., & Knobe, J. (2019). The essence of essentialism. *Mind & Language*, 34(5), 585–605. <https://doi.org/10.1111/mila.12226>
- Nichols, A. L. (2019). Ethnographic Listening as De-Linking Practice. *Rhetoric Review*, 38(1), 7–9. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07350198.2019.1549402>
- Northouse, P. G. (2016). *Leadership: Theory and practice*. Sage.
- Novotny, M., Edwards, C., Fransden, G., Koepke, D., Marcum, J., Smith, C., Sommers, A., & Williams, M. (2021). Constellating community engagement in a cultural rhetorics seminar. *Composition Studies*, 49(1), 103–209.

- Paoline, E. A. (2003). Taking stock: Toward a richer understanding of police culture. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 31(3), 199–214. [https://doi.org/10.1016/s0047-2352\(03\)00002-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/s0047-2352(03)00002-3)
- Patten, R., Alward, L., Thomas, M., & Wada, J. (2016). The continued marginalization of campus police. *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies & Management*, 39(3), 566–583. <https://doi.org/10.1108/pijpsm-04-2016-0055>
- Powell, M., Levy, D., Riley-Mukavetz, A., Brooks-Gillies, M., Novotny, M., & Fisch-Ferguson, J. (2014). *Our story begins here: Constellating cultural rhetorics*. enculturation: a journal of rhetoric, writing, and culture. <http://www.enculturation.net/our-story-begins-here>
- Rankin, S. R., & Reason, R. D. (2005). Differing perceptions: How students of color and white students perceive campus climate for underrepresented groups. *Journal of College Student Development*, 46(1), 43–61. <https://doi.org/10.1353/csd.2005.0008>
- Reid, L. D., & Radhakrishnan, P. (2003). Race matters: The relation between race and general campus climate. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology*, 9(3), 263–275. <https://doi.org/10.1037/1099-9809.9.3.263>
- Riley Mukavetz, A. M. (2014). Towards a cultural rhetorics methodology: Making research matter with multi-generational women from the Little Traverse Bay Band. *Rhetoric, Professional Communication and Globalization*, 5(1), 108–125. <https://doi.org/https://docs.lib.purdue.edu/rpcg/vol5/iss1/6>
- Robinson, E. (2021). Objects, documentation, and identification: Materiality and memory of American Indian boarding schools at the Heard Museum. *Rhetoric Society Quarterly*, 51(2), 94–108. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02773945.2021.1877799>
- Rose, T., & Unnithan, P. (2015). In or out of the group? police subculture and occupational stress. *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies & Management*, 38(2), 279–294. <https://doi.org/10.1108/pijpsm-10-2014-0111>
- Rountree, C., & Rountree, J. (2014). Burke's Pentad as a guide for symbol-using citizens. *Studies in Philosophy and Education*, 34(4), 349–362. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11217-014-9436-1>
- Schnädelbach, H. (1991). Chapter One. In A. Honneth & H. Joas (Eds.), *Communicative action: Essays on Jurgen Habermas's theory of communicative action* (pp. 7–22). essay, Polity Press.
- Seawright, L. (2017). *Genre of power: Police report writers and readers in the justice system*. Conference on College Composition and Communication.
- Skogan, W. (2008). Chapter One: An Overview of Community Policing: Origins, Concepts and Implementation. In T. Williamson (Ed.), *The Handbook of Knowledge-Based Policing Current Conceptions and Future Directions* (pp. 43–58). essay, John Wiley & Sons.

- Sloan, J. J., & Lanier, M. M. (2022). Chapter 13 Community Policing on University Campuses: Tradition, Practices, and Outlook. In *Campus Crime: Legal, Social, and Policy Perspectives* (2nd ed., pp. 261–279). essay, Charles C. Thomas.
- Star, S. L., & Griesemer, J. R. (1989). Institutional ecology, 'translations' and boundary objects: Amateurs and professionals in Berkeley's Museum of Vertebrate Zoology, 1907-39. *Social Studies of Science*, 19(3), 387–420. <https://doi.org/10.1177/030631289019003001>
- Sunshine, J., & Tyler, T. R. (2003). The role of procedural justice and legitimacy in shaping public support for policing. *Law & Society Review*, 37(3), 513–547. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1540-5893.3703002>
- Taylor, C. (1991). Chapter Two. In A. Honneth & H. Joas (Eds.), *Communicative action: Essays on Jürgen Habermas "The theory of communicative action"* (pp. 23–35). essay, Polity Press.
- Tyler, T. R. (2001). Trust and Law Abidingness: A Proactive Model of Social Regulation. *Boston University Law Review*, 81, 361–406.
- Tyler, T. R. (2004a). Enhancing police legitimacy. *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 593(1), 84–99. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0002716203262627>
- Tyler, T. R. (2004b). Enhancing police legitimacy. *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 593(1), 84–99. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0002716203262627>
- Tyler, T. R., & Huo, Y. J. (2002). *Trust in the law: Encouraging public cooperation with the police and courts*. Russell Sage Foundation.
- Van Dijk, T. A. (2006). Ideology and discourse analysis. *Journal of Political Ideologies*, 11(2), 115–140. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13569310600687908>
- Vivian, B. (2021). The incitement: An account of language, power, and Fascism. *Rhetoric Society Quarterly*, 51(5), 361–376. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02773945.2021.1972134>
- Wada, J. C., Patten, R., & Candela, K. (2010). Betwixt and between: The perceived legitimacy of campus police. *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies & Management*, 33(1), 114–131. <https://doi.org/10.1108/13639511011020629>
- Waddington, P. (1999). Police (canteen) sub-culture. an appreciation. *British Journal of Criminology*, 39(2), 287–309. <https://doi.org/10.1093/bjc/39.2.287>
- Watts, J. H. (2019). *Policing America's Educational Systems* (1st ed.). Routledge.

- White, D. R., & Schafer, J. A. (2024). The role of emotional and Cultural Intelligences on Police Leaders' perceptions of reform. *Policing: A Journal of Policy and Practice*, 18. <https://doi.org/10.1093/police/paae118>
- Williams, K. L. (2003). Peel's principles and their acceptance by American Police: Ending 175 years of reinvention. *The Police Journal: Theory, Practice and Principles*, 76(2), 97–120. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0032258x0307600202>
- Williamson, T. (2008). *The Handbook of Knowledge-based policing: Current conceptions and future directions*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Wilson, C. P., & Wilson, S. A. (2015). Evaluating legitimacy and marginalization: Campus policing in the state of Rhode Island. *Cogent Social Sciences*, 1(1). <https://doi.org/10.1080/23311886.2015.1006091>
- Youstin, T. J., & Kopp, P. M. (2020). Role variations and perceptions of campus police versus local and state law enforcement. *Policing: A Journal of Policy and Practice*, 15(2), 1491–1506. <https://doi.org/10.1093/police/paaa054>
- Zeidner, M., Matthews, G., & Roberts, R. D. (2009). *What we know about emotional intelligence: How it affects learning, work, relationships, and our mental health*. MIT Press.

Appendix A

Question 1	<i>What kinds of communications do police organizations and police officers use? Can you share a story of a time when you felt police communication connected really well with the community or perhaps did not go well?</i>
Administrator A	So, I think police in general have always struggled with communicating. Just in general, whether it's internal or external, I think you know that. Working at a university, we have to communicate with our community when it comes to Clery relevant items. Often times it's just the facts. Here you go, do with it as you deem appropriate, and really there's no humanity behind it; just raw data/facts. God speed. For us, honestly, we have always struggled with that human part of communication and particularly with social media. We have never really had an intentional communications plan and its specifically social media or how we communicate with our campus on a daily basis; what we're doing right when our officers do something that is extraordinary or just above and beyond what their normal duty calls for. It's almost like, and I hate to say this in the position I'm in, but it's almost like we communicate when we have to. And that's not the way to do it. You have to communicate on a daily basis with your community. One, it lends itself to that transparency piece that we have to have in our community; that they expect, right? So, we just don't have that. I think if you ask others in our department, they'll probably say the same thing. If you ask a certain individual, they may say something completely different. So, I think that intentional ongoing communication is just lacking. We just don't have it. That actually just came to light when we did our climate survey at the end of last year [2023]. The results just came and were distributed at the beginning part of this year [2024]. At least internally our department said we...when our officers do something right...you only hear about it when they do something wrong. But they don't hear about it when they do something right. There's not an email that goes out department wide that officer so-and-so did x, y, z correctly. There's nothing that goes out to social media that officer so-and-so did something correctly. More specifically than that if anything goes out, it doesn't go out in a timely manner. And timeliness is next to godliness in everything that we do. It just doesn't happen all the time. That is the struggle that I see in our department. Honestly, I think that's the struggle that a lot of agencies have. And that's where they fall short when it comes to just communicating across the board, whether it's with themselves or with their community.
Administrator B	Well here, we try to do a lot of face-to-face communication. We have the office of university relations which does any kind of press releases for us. But I personally prefer the face to face in a campus setting where you can get out and actually talk to the students. One where I don't think it actually worked well for us. We had, a couple of years back, we had a rash of reported sexual assaults. We had five reported in one week; they didn't all happen that week, but they were all reported in that week. And it created a bit of a panic on campus, so we did a press release. And the press release didn't go over the way we thought it was going to go over. Instead, people got more upset. We

	were trying to explain that “hey, yes they were all reported in this week, but if you look at our overall numbers for the year, they are not out of line, and they did not all occur this week.” Prior to that press release going out we had already planned to do some community meetings over at the residence halls where the vast majority of the reports came from. And the town hall meetings went much better than the press release did. Which again, for me, reinforces it’s better to do face to face because that way if people...you can tell if they’re getting the message you’re trying to deliver. Where you put together this press release, 10 people read it, it all sounds good to 10 people. You put it out and it doesn’t do what it was intended to do.
Administrator C	As you know, we utilize multiple forms of communication. We utilize our emails. We utilize our cell phones that we’ve been issued. Utilize our radios as well. We unitize things such as what we’re doing right now – Microsoft Teams – and Zoom and all of those things. In terms of the trajectory of our communication it is up and down and across. We communicate with everyone by virtue of what we do. We have to touch bases with everyone throughout the entire campus community whether it be athletics, counseling, just student organizations, classroom instructors. Our communication is ongoing, it is non-stop. It’s something that...what’s interesting about communication is that you can always do a little bit better. You can always be better at it. Although we communicate with so many individuals, we never master it. We never master it. So, those are the forms of communication. In terms of when communication as gone really well, I have found we do well in communication with it is constant. What I mean by that is...let’s say for example, if we’re working on a project or I’m sitting on a committee – it’s a standing committee – as we have a regular communication process, I’ve found in those instances it has been better. It has been helpful, and it has gone well for us if we’re marching towards a goal, a project, an event; those types of things; Opposed to the one-off communication. Opposed to the one-off, or the emergency communication where it’s more direct on those things. One thing for me is homecoming. We know homecoming comes for us every year and it’s coined the “greatest homecoming on earth” where we receive thousands, up to about 80 thousand folks annually. Those communication processes start really, really early, like six months in advance. And so, every year it goes off like a hitch, but it’s because of that process.
Officer D	I think the different communications that we use are social media; I think that’s a big one. I think some departments do it well because they can assign a particular officer or unit to that. Or they can update it, really reach out to the community, get community groups involved in their social media to share different information. Also pertaining to campus police departments, I feel dorm programs are another form of communication. Different residence hall programs, staff programs, where they can interact with officers and communicate whether it be problems they’re facing or things that they’ve seen on, potentially, on social media from across the globe. I feel currently some of our programs that we’ve done in my particular office; we’re doing a program with the BAT mobile, the blood alcohol testing mobile. And communication

	<i>has been very good. I've been reaching out using my contacts with the residence hall coordinators, RAs, campus living staff, where they have started to share different information on their social media about this event to bring awareness for driving under the influence, alcohol safety, just general campus safety. So that's been a very positive one that I've seen. In terms of a negative one, some of the residence hall programs that we have run haven't been communicated well in terms of what we've wanted and what they've wanted so we haven't had the same kind of outreach or people coming to the different events to gain that knowledge. The communication hasn't been there on our part or on their part.</i>
Officer E	<i>Well, especially here, my biggest outreach to the community was through the RHLOP program. Especially whenever I started here, I was up here (hand gesture) age wise to a lot of the coordinators, so it was easy for me to check in with them, develop personal relationships with them, and through that I was able to meet a lot of the RAs that were in those buildings that I was response for, so even more than just the single safety and security meeting that we would do I would be able to reach out to these kids and have more of a one on one with a lot of them. That communication, it was more about, like, trust building and them seeing me as not just, "Oh that's Officer [redacted last name] I see every once in a while," but it's "Oh that's [redacted first name] and I can sit and talk to him." So, that was the biggest form of communication for me as an officer other than just general, "hey how's is going, how's the weather," with people who would stop me going down the street. I think because I was able to build those personal relationships, that's what led to it working really well. I knew in that my year three to five I was really plugged into that community, and so if I showed up somewhere and any of the RAs that I knew were there, they were going to give me the whole story, they were going to pull me aside, "hey this is what I saw, this is what I know, this is who it is," and so developing that trust opened that line of communication for things whenever I didn't expect there to be later down the road.</i>
Officer F	<i>We have to use all kinds of communication; non-verbal, verbal, even looks, like if you look at them a certain way they'll straighten up. A positive time where I feel it worked great, we had a group of girls who got into it with a group of guys. We were able to talk to them, and they were about to come to an agreement that they wouldn't fuss with each other further. In turn, that kept them out of the criminal court, and we were able to handle it through the student conduct side on campus. So, it's always great when we can keep them out of the system, especially over petty things. So, I think that worked really well. I think where you can see that it's actually made a difference is that you don't see them getting into trouble anymore. I think communication works well in that aspect.</i>
Officer G	<i>Some of the ways we communicate, we do a lot of in-person. We set up tables; it depends on what we're trying to specifically talk about. Just say we're talking domestic violence/dating or something like that, we'll usually set up</i>

	<i>tables in the university center, like highly walked areas. We'll set up a table and draw students to talk to us. You know as well as I do, a lot of students sort of shy away, especially if they see someone in uniform. What we do is try to get their attention, like "hey, hey, sort of bring them over to us and just try to initiate the conversation, to sort of segway into the topic that we're discussing. Another means of communications is we do emails; send out emails for things like, just say we got a large number of break-ins in a certain area; we'll send out emails, and we'll also go to residence halls and do the same thing as far as try to talk and communicate that way.</i>
Officer H	<i>The types of communications that police use are social media, they will have like a meeting, a public forum. They also will use the media outlets, news, broadcasting on the radio and television. Sometimes it's word of mouth. As far as a time that a communication didn't go well; it was during a time where [city] had a [controversial police] shooting of [name], the staff waited to release information to the general public, and I guess the general public felt there was a lack of transparency in relation to the shooting of [name].</i>
Officer I	<i>My police organization and police officers use [redacted name of alert system] to communicate to our community regarding high incident events (siren, text messages and emails pushed through out campus). We live in such an advanced technological era, and everyone has some type of electronic device, we find it easier to communicate using applications (Facebook, Instagram, and such). However, I do believe that an officer's presence is the most effective communication tool. One story that comes to mind, our organization was not seen in such good light by our community and Resident Assistants (RA in the dorm) did not want us walking around and be seen. However, we persisted and had officers performing foot patrol (not in the dorms but outside in the area). I had several students and staff come up to me complimenting me on my artwork (tattoos). We would strike up a conversation and would stand there and chat for hours. Once they got to know me, I shared details about our police organization and that we were there to keep peace. Those students and staff thanked me for educating them about what we do. Being out in the community and physically talking to them is the most effective way for communication.</i>

Appendix B

Question 2	<i>Can you recall a story where assumptions about policing (either the people or the function) came into play?</i>
Administrator A	<i>Um...I know in personnel matters assumptions play a big part. We obviously cannot speak about personnel matters because of the laws that prohibit it. And the fact that narratives are going to be created by individuals when they don't -.when they aren't provided the facts; it's going to take on a life of its own. They're going to spread like wildfire. We just can't do a whole lot to control those narratives from a personnel perspective. The same thing holds true with incidents that happen on or around campus. I think some good examples are...and they're kind of related...if we send out a Clery notification for an incident that happens on or near campus, you know, we tend to send out just the bare facts. And people may not understand 1) why we send it out or 2) why would we send it out for this but not a similar incident that they heard about in traditional media. And this university has been kind of...and I don't know how it is at ECU or other institutions, but there's the political game with Clery notifications um that...do we want to send this out, are we sending too many out, what's the wording of this compared to...you know...and they get in a this cycle of...uh...semantics. They get in this cycle of...um...should we send something out, and as a result, when information is sent out that's not complete or when information is not sent out then people are forming opinions based on what traditional media may be providing to them based on their [air quotes] sources. Or, are people formulating opinions based on the incident that they see in social media. If we're not able to provide accurate information upfront and on a regular basis as the situation changes, that makes our job difficult. We can't...it's very difficult to come back from inaccurate information that goes out if we're not able to be the one to control that narrative, that story, about an incident happening within our jurisdiction. And we really should because we are the ones investigating, or our partners in [redacted city name] are the ones who are investigating it and we're providing support for it. So, we should have all the facts, but if we're not the ones providing all the information in a timely manner on a regular basis, we're setting ourselves up, and by extension we're setting out community up for failure, because it lends itself back to that transparency. Does it build that trust? Well, no, probably not because people are going to be skeptical about...well I heard about it in the news, but our police department didn't communicate to us and tell us anything about it. So, that's kind of a struggle as well.</i>
Administrator B	<i>We've had incidents where our student assumed that because we were campus police, it's like we weren't "real police," and they did something and did not get the reaction they thought they were going to get. They thought it was going to be a, "hey don't do that again," and instead they ended up getting a ride downtown. And the fact that they were actually getting arrested kind of</i>

	<i>blew their mind, because they didn't think that campus police could or would do that. And, I'm not sure where that assumption came from because while we...here at [redacted university name] we really try to use the campus judicial system where it's appropriate. But we're not afraid to use the criminal justice system either. And the entire time I've been here, that's sort of been our, you know, policing philosophy. And for some reason, it seems every couple of years we get a new group of freshmen, and someone has told those freshmen, "oh they're just campus police, it's not the same, it's not like a real police department." And then August and September are kind of rough. And then they figure out, "oh they are real police, and they really don't care who my dad is, and they will take me to jail." And then they get over it. And then on the other side of that coin, we have some officers come in here with the assumption that we are just going to let them [the officers] do whatever it is they want to do; "What does it matter what I stop a car for?" "It matters a lot to us. You know, we have other things that we want you to do in addition to stopping cars. We want you to be out walking, talking, being in the residence halls, having those out of car experiences." Having what I like to term non-business transactions with our students. And we have some that just...they don't seem to understand that, "yeah, while you are a police officer and have this authority, we don't just want you stopping cars left and right for...a license plate light being out." Yes, that is a valid reason to stop a car, but we aren't doing drug interdiction here on campus." We want you to focus in other areas and they don't understand it. So, we have those kinds of assumptions on both sides of that coin.</i>
Administrator C	<i>People assume all the time. For us, our student body assumes all the time. It's a never-ending battle that we have with our students because a lot of our students come at us adversarial. A lot of them bring a lot of distrust to the police department based off of where they come from throughout the country. Based on their dealings, or, most of the time, their friends' dealings with law enforcement. So, we grapple with that all the time. We deal with the misconceptions of, you know, us having a policing quota. We have to get this many arrests, this many citations. They often times deal with us from a negative connotation and assume we're going to be a butthole; they assume we're just looking to get an arrest when that couldn't be further from the truth. We're just trying to engage and try to look for every opportunity to positively engage, but from the offset they don't look at it like that. They assume we're out to get them. They assume we're out to get them and it's something negative.</i>
Officer D	<i>Yes, I know there was one particular presentation I was giving to a group of students in a classroom that had no idea that [redacted university name] had a police department, and that they didn't know, they thought we were just security guards. They had no idea of our arrest powers, of different programs we provided, the services we provided, that we can write tickets, that we can do any sort of police functions like the police department where they were from. In this case there were some from New York City, and one I believe was a student from Florida, and they had no idea. I guess where they were from</i>

	<i>they were more security guard near the campus; not necessarily a campus police department.</i>
Officer E	<i>Yeah, especially doing a lot of traffic, there's a lot of assumptions of what we're doing. A lot of assumptions that I was writing tickets for the purpose of a quota or I was writing tickets because, you know, some people thought I had nothing better to do, and you know, trying to talk to people and establish the fact that I was either stopping them or citing them to hopefully correct their behavior, "hey you're doing something dangerous with your motor vehicle," and I want to correct that behavior – and if it takes the consequence of a ticket to get that point across – but there was definitely the assumption that I was doing it for reasons other than just trying to keep the other motoring public and people using the roadway round them safe, it was "well, you've got nothing better to do," or "you have to write so many tickets a month, so that's why you're giving me a ticket." Or if there was inevitably a situation where race or gender was assumed that's why I was giving a ticket and not a verbal warning or something like that. So, there's always those assumptions of why the outcome of a traffic stop would be what it was.</i>
Officer F	<i>Yes, I had to respond to a call in the dorm. The media can project police in a negative way, so of course when you come on scene, they automatically assume that you're going to draw your weapon or things like that. I had a student – he didn't know me at all – I went into the dorm, and somebody had came into the dorm and didn't give their ID card to the RA, which is a protocol when they sign in for visitation; they have to give their ID. So, I had to go ask the student can they either 1) leave, or give your ID; it's that simple. I just talked to them like, you know "what was the issue; all you had to do was give them your ID and this would be avoided." And I had a student, he was like, "what so you gonna shoot him now?" And I just looked at him and I was like, "we're not here to shoot anybody, why would you even say that?" I didn't teach him in that moment, but I pulled him to the side later on and said, "why would you say that?" That's not what we're here to do, especially for something minor like this. That does not call for shooting.</i>
Officer G	<i>This is my personal opinion, you know, when I deal with students; usually when I get done it seems like they have a different aspect of especially me as a police officer and what I try to do. I try to just do an easy conversation you know what I'm saying. I'm never really, like, very rigid unless I have to be you know what I'm saying? But you can look at me, you're probably thinking, "hey this guy here, he's probably a butthole." But when we get through the conversation, man it's like, "wow, I didn't know you were like that," as far as being down to earth and trying to be on the level of the students we're dealing with and the public.</i>
Officer H	<i>I feel like very day the general public makes assumptions; they make assumptions based upon the previous trend pertaining to [police]. Let's say that an agency had corruption within the agency. When the general public heard of the corruption, they kind of stereotype everybody in the agency to the same category as far as the corruption is concerned.</i>

Officer I	<i>After the fall of [controversial statue] and death of George Floyd which follows civil unrests across the nation, we saw a drastic change in our community. People would not call us for assistance, would not talk to us and thought that every time we encountered an individual it was going to end badly. Cell phones were always recording, which is ok, but the editing of the video and making us look bad was a hard pill to swallow. Especially working for university setting, other municipalities/faculty and staff believe that Campus officers are just “glorified babysitters” and do not realize that we have same law enforcement powers as city agencies.</i>
-----------	--

Appendix C

Question 3	<i>Do assumptions about policing influence how police officers try to perform their jobs?</i>
Administrator A	<i>Yeah, I think it does. Especially after recent incidents with George Floyd and Black Lives Matters. People paint us with a pretty broad brush, that we, uh, because of the bad apples in our profession, what they have done, they assume every officer they come across is the same. I think where agencies who have avoided that stigma have succeeded and thrived is where they have had really strong preexisting relationships, trusting relationships, transparent relationships with their communities. They've been able to go to their communities as these things have happened across the country and even within their own communities and said "hey look let's talk about some of these things, let's be open about it, let's have these discussions. Y'all know how we are, and this is not indicative of what our police department is about. We've been open and transparent about how we function here, invite our community to be part of us. We cannot exist without our community." So, I think agencies who thrive, and they succeeded in those type of situations that have popped off in other parts of the country, aren't even in their local jurisdictions or adjacent jurisdictions, it's because of those preexisting, positive relationships that they've had. If agencies can establish them early and often, maintain those open dialogues, day after day, month after month, year after year, can stand a lot better chance as a community surviving strife whenever it comes, because it will come.</i>
Administrator B	<i>Yes, yeah, I think definitely it does. I think that, particularly in a campus setting, sometimes our officers go out of their way to try to be a friend to the students, where that's not really their role. You know, sometimes, you have to give people...ok so the assumption is that all police officers are bad. That's where the pendulum kind of current it. And you've been in the business a while, probably not as long as I have, but then I'm a lot older. But, you know, the pendulum swings from one extreme to the other and it never stops anywhere overly long. But for the last couple years, police in general have been getting a black eye about, you know, some criminal activity that was carried out by police officers. So, we're all getting a black eye and I think sometimes because of that, the officers try to go too far to show "I'm not that kind of police officer," to the point where they could be endangering their own safety by trying to be super friendly and prove "Well I'm not one of those kinds of cops." And on a campus, you can probably get away with that a little bit more than you could across the street. But every once in a while, we see that, and it makes me a little nervous.</i>
Administrator C	<i>That's a really good question. I think it does so in this sense – we go into our encounters more guarded because we are aware of the assumptions of the public. And so, we go in more guarded, we go in just trying to make sure we do everything right. We do in trying to not step on any toes...while we are</i>

	<i>there trying to deal with an issue. And so, we try to be extra careful, but we got to be careful with that because don't want to jeopardize officer safety. We don't want to jeopardize the whole reason why we're there in the first place, which is to maintain order, provide a service. And we could find ourselves in a space where we are exercising more leniency whereas we really need to be dealing with that with a hammer...because of those assumptions. So, we go in more guarded.</i>
Officer D	<i>I think assumptions can. Some officers could take it as potentially people assume that on campus we aren't "real" police officers. So, they may take that as a slight potentially where "I am a police officer and here's your ticket to show it." It could. I think though that the majority don't. I feel that people have assumptions of how officers have done policing where they're from or something that they've seen in a negative light, where we have to fight through those assumptions and show "this is how we police: this is the right way of policing and what to do; that right frame of mind.</i>
Officer E	<i>I don't think it would touch on how I did my job, but it definitely gave me more thought to trying to explain why I was doing something. That's always something that sometimes I've seen with other officers; they don't have a good explanation for why they're doing something; and maybe it's just because of the way my brain works – I'm very analytical and the last thing people want on a traffic stop or at the jail is for you to quote general statute to them. I would literally want to break down, "this is what the law says, I want to educate you about what the law says and give you a reason why I'm doing this." So, those assumptions that people made about me and what my duties were as a police officer I would go, "well my job is to uphold the law, this is what the law says, that's why I'm doing this," and I felt like I did connect – not with everybody – but with some people that they would understand, "ok, I get that, I didn't know that before," or something like that.</i>
Officer F	<i>I think so because you can tell...if you read body language, people may change when you come around because they're not used to you because they're trying to figure you out; they're trying to see what type of person you are. And then, if they've ever had a negative experience with a police officer, you're a part of that because they see you in a uniform. Sometimes I think they forget that you're human and they just see the uniform and the badge.</i>
Officer G	<i>I don't think so. I don't think so. A lot of students have a negative attitude. Matter of fact when we were dealing with the first shooting incident, you had a couple officers come down, but it wasn't them, it was [redacted university name], it was a [redacted university name] officer. He said, "man, y'all's students here are more approached than they are at [redacted university name]." So, we try to have good communication with students, especially the ones that you just can't, or won't/don't want to have any interaction with you. We try to talk to them, approach them, and have conversations, other than anything enforcement. Just conversation. But, what he [other university officer] was saying was that on his campus it was very negative, if that makes any sense. It's like they don't want anything to do with the police. I guess it's just a different environment from where we're at, from what he's experienced.</i>

Officer H	<i>I think it does. I can speak for myself. Looking at the media over the past decade, the policing reputation has been tarnished. So, me as a police officer, I want to do the very best I know how. So, I try to make sure that I'm fair, firm, and consistent. I try to make sure that I treat everybody like I want to be treated. So, the public perception of policing in the past, it does affect me today...</i>
Officer I	<i>I do strongly believe that assumptions about policing influence the way officers perform their duties. During civil unrest, we saw a huge drop in officers' productivity, and they were unsure of which action to take. Officers would not make a decision and were waiting on their supervisor to tell them what to do.</i>

Appendix D

Question 4	<i>Setting aside media portrayals, do the police organizations you're familiar with and their symbols, behaviors, and discourse influence community perception of policing?</i>
Administrator A	<i>Yes, and specifically how we've changed over the years to influence those perceptions. So an example of, and again George Floyd and similar types of incidents; more specifically the response to those types of incidents where a lot of agencies have backed off of certain types of... how they response to protests, you know, with tear gas or impact munitions stuff like that. How they respond to things have influenced the public's perceptions as to whether or not they're taking to heart what their community is saying. Are they having the conversations about "hey you know there's a better way potentially to interact with the community in certain types of situations, um, where you don't have to pound them in the head." There may be a better way to deal with them. You don't have to always drive a bearcat into a crowd of people. There might be a better way to engage with folks. So, I think how we, not only what we present to them in terms of equipment and our personnel and what we wear, but also the manner in which we engage with them and how we adjust our policies, our procedures, our engagements, our tactics, says a lot to our community as to how much value we place in their input. You know, going back to Sir Robert Peel, we exist because of our community, and they allow us to exist as a part of our community. If we don't take into account and listen to what our community is saying about us, we are going to be doomed to fail because they are not going to trust us when we go into our community. And if we keep that in mind and make the adjustments, and evolve as a police department over the years because of the input of our community, we are going to be a successful police department. That may mean adjusting our tactics, our equipment, how we approach situations, our interactions, etc. So, I think positive evolution of our police departments will ultimately dictate the success of our police departments.</i>
Administrator B	<i>I think they can. And I say it that way because I really think it depends on the community. You know, when the Black Lives Matter was really big and hot, you saw a lot of stickers that said, "Blue Lives Matter," and that upset the community. And it wasn't because people were upset that we were saying that the lives of police officer matter too; it would have been the same if you said, "All lives matter." It was... you had this movement and this was their tagline, and you were trying to coop their tagline for your own purposes. And I think that got them upset more than, you know, because everyone knows that all lives matter, but this was trying to focus on a specific thing and then people were trying to coop that and kind of taking the meaning away from it. I think there's a lot of...you've seen the Punisher stickers with the blue line through it...I hate them...because that gives the impression that at least the officer that's got that stuck on the back of his car or truck or whatever feels that he is</i>

	<i>the judge, jury, and the person who's going to take out whatever punishment he deems is necessary. And I think that sets a bad image for us, um, and sometimes...and when I was in [redacted city], they had the [redacted city] Police Protective League, which was basically a union. I've never understood the point of joining a union in a state where there is no collective bargaining, but people do it. And a lot of times the message that that organization was pushing out to the officers and to the public, wasn't necessarily the message that the police department wanted to push, because, you know, they came in very aggressive acting like they were up in Boston or New York. And those tactics don't work here. Um, so I think those groups with the images that they use and the messages that they portray have a negative effect on us and they're trying...when they're not trying to have that negative. They're trying to garner support of the rank and file and they're forgetting that we need the support of the community more importantly than the support of the rank and file. And if your message upsets the community, you're hurting us.</i>
Administrator C	<i>I think so. I think the way we conduct ourselves, whether we are super professional, that influences the way they see us. Or whether or not we are not our best selves during the encounter; that influences them as well, how they see us. I think the vast majority of individuals respond to you how you respond to them. That's if they are a good guy. Now if they're doing something nefarious; they're selling drugs; they're trying to get away with something, that's something different. But I think the average citizen responds to us how we respond to them. That's been my experience over the years.</i>
Officer D	<i>Yes, I do believe they influence in a positive way. I think regardless of media portrayals, I feel the majority of interactions – not just our police department, but other police departments locally – affect...there are more positives than negatives; there are more of the those positive interactions that aren't necessarily recorded but those particular individuals remember those positive interactions and have positive assumptions from that, where they may have assumed something previously but now it's been proven that that wasn't the case – from that positive interaction.</i>
Officer E	<i>I feel like I'm not a part of a whole lot of police groups, other than when I'm congregated physically with police officers at work. And you said to take media out of it, because there is the perceptions of like the "thin blue line" and stuff like that. I think a lot of police groups do go out of their way to bring in the community, you know, the coffee with a cop or the Boys and Girls Club events that go on and just the same way as I was doing individually, they try and portray police officers as, "hey we're just regular people." So, I definitely think there are some police groups that people may be affiliated with such as an operators' group or a 1% or something like that that may not be as friendly or open or welcoming to the community, but I don't particularly associate myself with those groups.</i>
Officer F	<i>I think they do, and I think that if we made the community more aware of, like, the trainings and things that we actually have to do through that they would see that in a more positive way. I don't think we talk enough about the training that we actually have to do through, the hours in BLET, the in-service that we</i>

	<i>go through yearly, the different types of training. I think we should publicize that.</i>
Officer G	<i>I'm speaking from campus policing. I think with us trying to get out and engage with the students, and trying to bring up different topics, trying to do some type of programming, I think most of the students that I deal with have a good relationship with the police department. But, like I said, there's that percentage that you're not going to get across. Some of them are taught from birth to avoid the police. I would sort of think so, sure.</i>
Officer H	<i>Of course it does. The public perception of policing; we're supposed to be first class. Everything that we do is under a microscope. So, as far as when...policing, wearing our uniform, even our private life. They want us to not only say what we're going to do; they want us to live the life. They want us to be first class, they want shoes to be shined, they want our uniforms to be pressed. When our uniform is pressed, and we're sharply dressed it kind of demands respect. People respect us because of how we dress, and we keep our private life professionally.</i>
Officer I	<i>Police organization's symbols, behavior, and discourse influence community perception of policing. If the organization is constantly engaged in the community and citizens know those officers, the citizens would not pay attention to all the negative stuff they might hear about police officers. It all goes back to the basics, community policing, the more engagement the better outcome. Officers also need to present themselves in a professional manner from the way they look in their uniform to what words are coming out of their mouth.</i>

Appendix E

Question 5	<i>As a law enforcement officer, how do you think policing activities, behaviors, and responses impact how your campus community conceptualizes what policing means to them?</i>
Administrator A	<i>I am of the opinion, and I share this opinion with new officers, and I even share it with parents and students at our orientation. Every engagement we have with our community whether its faculty, staff, students, visitors, guests passing through whatever it might be; it's an opportunity for education. Even if it's a matter of letting a student know that "hey what you've done is not appropriate or not responsible. Here's the potential consequences, and here's what we can do to prevent those from happening again." Give them the tools to succeed. I think if officers, our officers, take that approach into everything they do, it has a ripple effect of changing the mindsets of our population so when they leave here, or when they just go home on a break, regardless where they're from, particularly if they are from marginalized communities or underserved populations, they know not every police department is a terrible police department; not every police officer or interaction with a police officer may result in a use of force, or result in a tongue lashing. It may result in a positive outcome "I might get a ticket, but the officer may treat me with dignity; may treat me with respect." So, it's our opportunity to change that perception not only of our department but of all police departments. Now, we don't have control over what other police departments do, but we do have control over what our folks do and that may translate into what other police departments may benefit from. So treating them, again, with respect and dignity, and every opportunity as an educational opportunity really does work for us.</i>
Administrator B	<i>I think, if we are out and about, we're talking to students, we're engaging in those non-business transactions, we go to the dining hall and we say hello to people as we walk through there, as long as we do things like that I think it affects the way the students see us. They see us as being people who are approachable, that if they do have a question or a problem, they can come to us and ask those questions without fearing judgement or whatever; where when we have certain officers who stop every car that's moving and don't do anything else, they get the perception that "oh they're just trying to jam us up on things." I think as long as you maintain a well-rounded enforcement and engagement philosophy that... most people know when they do something wrong that they're taking a chance...of getting caught. But, if you have those casual interactions as well as business interactions I think it's balanced out and helps you do your job better. So, like I enjoy going the different events because...I can't tell you the last time I took enforcement action. But, I enjoy going out there because I'm going out there to get to know the students, or at least try to portray to the students "well there's another image of our department that you need to know. We're interested in what you're doing,</i>

	<i>what's going on in your life, and how things are going for you on campus. And did you roll through that stop sign? Yeah, but rather than give you a ticket I'm going to stop you and I'm gonna say 'hey, just be more aware of that, we've got a lot of people walking around this campus, and you know they don't look up from their phones before they walk in the street.' And try to give that message, so they view us as more than just this enforcement arm.</i>
Administrator C	<i>Yes. Yes, I think they see how we respond. I think they see our interactions in terms of programming, in terms of all of the other things that we do; working basketball games or dances, or special events.; how they see perceive our Community Affairs Division. What they're out in the community doing. I think they perceive how we are based off of all of those things. The entirety of those things. Now, of course, if you are an on-campus living student, you will see more of us opposed to a commuter student. And so your judgement will be skewed based on the number of times you see us, and those types of things. But definitely I think they do see us based off of how we conduct business in the campus community.</i>
Officer D	<i>I think it's very huge. I think the things we do in terms of enforcement, even if somebody receives a citation, or they get counseled on something, they view it as a positive for the entire university. We get a lot more positive reinforcement from the actions we take whether it be programs or different selective enforcements, or just being seen than not being seen and not doing those things. I think it's a very big part of what we do is going out into the community and the university – just being available for people to talk to and the different programs that we run, that they can ask questions and we're here for them. I think that's big.</i>
Officer E	<i>I think it's huge because if you show up and you care, it's a big morale...even in a bad situation, even in a situation where there's a lot of chaos, there's a lot of anxiety and fear, if you show up and handle that situation the way you are supposed to, you can build that community trust with people that before you got there wouldn't have wanted your help or to look at you a second time, or have a cup of coffee with you. So, the way we do things and putting in that extra effort, instead of showing up, taking a call, and moving on to the next one, I think it's big for our perception of what we do here. It's rewarding for me whenever I show up on a scene with somebody who is maybe a frequent caller, whether it's just somebody who's been at the university for several, several years or they work in a position where, "hey we deal with a lot of problem students so our interaction with the police is higher than most." Whenever they see you coming and they know, "Ok, I can kind of relax about how this situation was going because I know the officer that's showing up and I know the quality of work they're going to put toward this call." I think that's huge for our perception in the campus community.</i>
Officer F	<i>I think with the different types of students that we have here on campus, they're teenagers – most of them, so if you don't draw a line, they're going to inch towards it a try to cross it. But, if you show them, and I feel like we can teach them how police act on traffic stops, you know, let them know, "this is what you should do in a traffic stop." I think that we could actually be</i>

	<i>teachers. We are a part of law enforcement but I think that we take more of a mentoring, counseling type approach here on campus. Not so much as what law enforcement does outside of campus because we're able to talk to them, we interact with these students more. We see them daily.</i>
Officer G	<i>Yeah, I think so. There's that fine line that, one, we're trying to educate. We're trying to educate the public on different topics, and there's that one enforcement topic. So, I think most people know the job that we have and how tough it can be. How can you go from trying to talk to a bunch of students about underage alcohol consumption or drug violations, and then you're enforcing it at a party? Sometimes when you enforce it, especially when you're dealing with a large group, your enforcement actions and your mannerism are going to change drastically. Sometimes you've got to be very stern when you're dealing with large crowds.</i>
Officer H	<i>Certainly. I tell students now; I've been almost at [redacted university name] going on five years, and I've actually grown into that job as a police officer. I bring 9 years of experience working as a deputy sheriff. One thing I've realized over the years is that as a police officer is we have to be engaged into conversation, into the activities of the student body life. And not only that, we have to have a dialogue with the students, and we have to understand that they are students, and they are going to make mistakes. At the end of the day, we have to listen to what they have to say, and then we also have to let them know that we're there not only to enforce the law, but also to be a mentor to them; not only the students but also the faculty and staff.</i>
Officer I	<i>Working in a university setting, every year you have a new community coming in, as seniors graduate, new freshmen join your community. We constantly need to be engaged with the community by being out and about and talking to people. If the community sees officers performing walking patrols and talking to folks, they will start developing a sense of safety and protection and will start engaging in conversations with officers. With so many campus shootings, the students, faculty, and staff are paying attention to how their police departments perform their duties on a day-to-day basis... Having those face-to-face conversations with the students, and such large presence of police officers in the area, it meant a lot to them.</i>

Appendix F

Question 6	<i>Do you think there are ways in which your background and experiences influence your understanding and concepts of police?</i>
Administrator A	<i>For me, having come from a municipality, yes, I think coming from how I was raised, where I was raised; predominantly lower middle class, white area of eastern North Carolina. I grew up in a military family, I grew up in a military community; fairly transient population if I'm honest. I may have a couple of friends, they may move, new friends come in. It allowed me to be exposed to a wide variety of people. Unfortunately, I had only a couple of close friends when I was growing up. Then I went to college and expanded my horizons even more and was exposed to even more culture, more diversity, which is wonderful. Went to work at my last department, and honestly it was culture shock let's be honest. REDACTED CITY NAME is an interesting place. Being a white male in a predominately African American city, and policing in a 100% African American neighborhood, it's a challenge. So, learning from my African American training officer that I needed to adjust how I was a person in interacting with individuals of color differently than interacting with my white colleagues. That's not to say treat them different, but you had to communicate with them differently because they receive communication differently; they communicate with each other differently. You have to treat them consistently and fairly with respect, even though you may communicate verbally and non-verbally with them in a certain way, or you're trying to communicate with them. Even more than that is what you might not want to say or do to not escalate the situation in an African American community. And then going into a university like REDACTED UNIVERSITY NAME, it was again having to adjust to a completely new environment. Not only how to talk to individuals differently and being that chameleon that all police officers really should be honestly, but also how to police differently. In REDACTED CITY NAME you were chasing people every night, you were fighting people every night. At the university that's not the case. Do you have the opportunity to do that every once in a while? Absolutely, you have to be the police every once in a while. But here, it goes back to not everybody is a bad person, or has bad intent. 9 times out of 10 they were college age men and women who made mistakes as young adults and they didn't need to be crucified for it. It was that opportunity to be that educator, to give them life advice, life lessons, prepared them for when they left REDACTED UNIVERSITY NAME. I hate to do this going out into the real world, but giving them that life information so that they could make better decisions once they were completely on their own and out from under the guidance of the university and their parents. So, over the course of my young adult and middle age life would be the life experience I've had, the work experiences I've had, people I've worked with, people I've been exposed to have really shaped who I am as a person. I think that's translated positively into who I am as a police officer, police manager, and</i>

	<i>ultimately how I think I've positively influenced those I've come across in my communities.</i>
Administrator B	<i>Yeah. This is my third type of policing. I was in the military for six years as a military policeman. And um, it's a lot tighter there; at least it was when I was in. Now, granted you're sort of dealing with a handpicked society on base, but you don't get to pick dependents, so you still deal with that. But, people were more used to "you need to do," and then they did, because that was the environment that they worked and lived in. You know, it was very autocratic, and somebody gave you an order, you did it. You might not like it, but you did it anyway. You might moan about it later, but you didn't sit there and argue about it. It was "yes sir," and off you went. Uh, then working for 24 years in a municipality where, if you told somebody to do something, that was almost the best way to get them to not do it. Uh, where you had to...really had to work on your negotiation skills because almost every encounter was a negotiation. And you got used to dealing with things that were literally life and death situations. I mean, in [redacted city name] we had shootings, stabbings, homicides, armed robberies...maybe not homicides, but we had the other three almost every day, and on all different shifts. So, you were going to things where you were constantly running into people who were seriously injured or had just seriously injured somebody. So, you came...you approached in a more...almost a more heavy-handed manner because you had to go in a take control of that situation right away, knowing that just telling people to do something wasn't going to work. So you went in there, you knew you had to go in heavy because you had to take control of the situation, but you also had to convince this person that it was in their best interest to do what you were telling them to do. Then here [at the university], you're almost...you're negotiating without the threat, I guess is almost the best way to put it. I mean most of these young kids coming in here, particularly your freshmen, you know it's the same at your university, it's the first time they've been anywhere without mom and dad looking over their shoulder, and they just do stupid things because they don't know any better. And sometimes you can sit there and talk to them and recognize...pointing out to them what they did what was wrong and how it could affect them down the road will be enough. I don't necessarily need to take them, you know, to jail. But, working on a campus you also have a lot of options that the municipal officers don't have. You know, basically if you're a municipal officer you have two choices; you can either hook somebody up or you can give them a break. There's nothing in between. Here [at university] we've got campus judicial, you've got counseling services, you've got this, you've got that. So, we have a lot more tools in our tools box, and I think some of those things you're seeing them in municipal settings now, where, you know, you go to a domestic situation, they'll send a counselor with you. Where, what do I know about counseling, but I can't tell you how many domestics I went to where I was the only person to offer any advice. And all of the services that are available now were not available, you know, 30 years so. So, I think society is putting more tools in</i>

	<i>the municipal officer's toolbox, but we've always had those on campus and it gives us a lot more flexibility in how we interact with our customers.</i>
Administrator C	<i>Yes. People bring all sorts of backgrounds and experiences, some of them negative, some of them positive, but they bring their backgrounds and their experiences to wherever we are when they deal with us. I can genuinely tell what type of experience a person had with law enforcement in the past based on how they respond to me. I can tell. And the I utilize it as an opportunity to either reinforce the positive that they had, or if they had a negative encounter, I use that as an opportunity to change their mindset, based off of how I engage them. So, I'm reading their body language, I'm reading what they're saying, and I'm tailoring my response to always make sure that they remain positive toward law enforcement as much as I can.</i>
Officer D	<i>Well, my background in particular, I had some work in the probation office and security before that, so I had a small grasp of what law enforcement did. Before that I had none so I just went into it just looking to help people because I had always assumed that officers do, which is what they do. But, in particular with my background with security and working with the probation office, I learned that it's a very positive atmosphere as well; what law enforcement can bring.</i>
Officer E	<i>You know, meeting all different kinds of people from different walks of life...you hear stories about people, well people grow up and they only have negative experience with police, they have that negative experience engrained in them. A lot of times, we talk about it a lot, people deal with police officers usually on their worst day, or whenever they're having really bad moments. A lot of people don't call the police whenever things are good. Some people's experience's with police are every time they show up somebody I know, love, myself, we end up going to jail, somebody gets hurt; but then you also have the flip side of it where somebody has never had an experience with a police officer and they call for the very first time and whether the officer is compassionate and they have a good experience, or the officer is very put off by the situation and they have a bad experience, I can definitely see the next time that person needed a police officer's presence, it would be very experience-driven by that only one time they've dealt with the police. Of course you can only speak to your own personal experiences because if I ever called the police it's because I needed help and I got that help. But, I can definitely see where other people see it has their experience of "the police are coming and this isn't going to be good."</i>
Officer F	<i>I worked with a [different] department as a civilian, so I was able to see the different parts of the department and how it works together – and not just the negative parts – I got to see how they interacted with the community, and I got to see all the good things versus all the bad stuff I was hearing in the media. That in turn made me want to join. I think that the fact that I also went to school at the university that I'm currently at, that that helps me understand the culture and understand what it's like, and be able to relate to the students better.</i>

Officer G	<i>I think so. Yeah, I think that's heavy. Very much so. Their cultural background, how they were raised, how they we're brought up, I think has a lot to do with what they think about police. Until they have an opportunity...and hopefully it's a good interaction between them. I think that has a big, big think to do with what they think.</i>
Officer H	<i>Absolutely. So, and it also goes back to whether or not you have adequate training. Policing on a college campus is totally different than what you do as a deputy sheriff in a county. So, my experience as a deputy sheriff, I had the basic understanding, the concept of law enforcement, but as far as how the function, how everything is carried out in campus police, I didn't have that. So, with experience and unfortunately due to some trial and error, and having an open conversation, having an open dialogue with students, I grasped that concept that it's totally different. Yes, a person's background and their experience does influence them as far as them doing their job on a university campus.</i>
Officer I	<i>I was a student at the university that I serve now. When I was walking from class to class and saw police officers out and about, it made me feel safe and I knew they were there to protect us. It is a good feeling for sure. Constantly seeing police officers, never in my mind did I think that the department is lazy or did not care about their community.</i>

Appendix G

Question 7	<i>As a law enforcement officer, when you think of your relationship with faculty, staff, and students, do you perceive that relationship is mutual in creating understanding of what policing means for the campus?</i>
Administrator A	<i>So I think it's a shared responsibility to change perceptions of policing. It's not just my responsibility or my department's responsibility, it has to be a shared dialogue and a shared responsibility. One of the things that came out of George Floyd was a lot of demands were made by communities that police needed to change; "here's our list of demands, we need you to change this, this, this, and this." Well, that's fine and dandy, but the reality is, and I think this is where some agencies may have struggled. You need to have realistic conversations with them; "Yes, we acknowledge that some things need to change; here's what we can change, but here's some things that can't change and here's why they can't change." You have realistic discussion with them, and they understand...explain to them what can't be changed and why, they're going to know, they're going to understand. You have a grown-up conversation with them. The flip side of that coin is you have to put some responsibility back on the community. You say, "Hey we're willing to accept responsibility. We're willing to change x, y, and z. But, some of this is on you all and here's what it is. Here's what we're asking of you, but here's what we're willing to help you with if you're agreeing to this." A kind of social contract if you will; a give and take. One thing we've struggled with, I don't know if you all have experienced it either, but when we gave that back to them and said, "Hey this is kind of what we need from you to make some of these things happen, or to make this a mutual effort," it was kind of radio silence. I don't know what other municipal agencies have experienced, but that's what our experience had been here at least from our student leadership at a the time. They were kind of like hands off, radio silent, once we put some of the stuff back on them or asked them to change some of the things or asked them for assistance in changing some things within the university. But, it's got to be a shared responsibility. It can't be a one-way street. And again it goes back to the police are the community, the community are the police. It's a two-way street, not a one-way.</i>
Administrator B	<i>Sometimes. I find it often depends...with students and staff, yes. I think it's very mutual, you know, because particularly students who are coming here...they're new, want to know "what are my boundaries, and where do you fit into that." Um, staff, usually very easy to work with. Sometimes faculty can be challenging, because they believe that they should have certain...rights...or certain privileges that the rest of the folks don't have. And then, when you explain to them, "No you really don't have that right or privilege," it can get a little...testy. Um, but for the most part, I think it is a mutual situation with the faculty. There's just certain faculty members, and every campus has them, I don't care how big or how small it is. Every campus</i>

	<i>has a few faculty members that just think “well that really doesn’t apply to me, that’s for everyone else.” At least here [at their university] I think we’ve got a very open and welcoming campus, and the faculty is part of that. They’re all “hey, how’s it going!” They’re very welcoming, they reach out to us a lot of time, because they’ve encountered a situation that they’re not sure how to handle, and they’re very receptive to the recommendations that we give them. So, I would say for the most part on our campus, it’s probably mutual except for those some handful of faculty members.</i>
Administrator C	<i>Yeah, I think it’s mutual. I think it’s critical. I think it’s critical that they...that we interact with them so they can understand the role we play in their campus safety, and also gives me the opportunity to explain to them the role that they can play in their own safety. I think it’s critical so every opportunity we have...or I try to encourage the officers every opportunity we have to put money in the bank please do so because we may pull on that later on.</i>
Officer D	<i>Yes and no. I feel that when there’s a critical incident, the staff and faculty are very much on board with what we want to do in terms of creating a safe culture; in terms of having safety and security being at a higher level. But when there is a lull in negative crisis situations, they’re not as inclined be as available. When stuff doesn’t happen they don’t see the threat that could still be there whereas when stuff does happen, especially stuff that may be closer to campus, that that heightened level of awareness springs on them and then they really want that police presence and that police assistance to make them feel safer and be safer.</i>
Officer E	<i>For the large majority I think yes. I think some people do have preconceived notions about police officers especially in an institutional setting. The same kind of thing I just talked about, there are a lot of people in this setting, whenever we contact them it’s their first experience with law enforcement. And so a lot of those preconceived notions I think are driven by the media or what they hear from their friends that have had experience with police, but especially during the very recent tumultuous times with police, the overwhelming majority of what we got from faculty and staff on the campus was positive interaction.</i>
Officer F	<i>I think it is. Whenever I have to do an enforcement action, I do my best to explain to the students and tell them about their process and all that. I try to be very fair and treat everybody the same. And I do try to work with them as well.</i>
Officer G	<i>Yeah, I think so. Especially the people I see on a daily basis or work. You know its first name basis, from faculty, staff, and students. Especially here, we’re a smaller campus, and I know y’all are huge. A lot of people I see at work at certain times, it’s like a first name basis.</i>
Officer H	<i>I just all depends. I believe that some faculty that work closely with the campus police; they have an understanding, but those individuals that do not work closely with policing I feel like they’re clueless. At a university unfortunately they feel like they have a sense of entitlement. Not only that, because they are educated, sometimes they feel like they are above the law. I</i>

	<i>had a situation where a professor ran a stop sign and when I pulled him over, he said that he did it all the time; almost as if it's a sense of entitlement</i>
Officer I	<i>The relationship is not fully mutual in creating understanding of what policing means for the campus. Every year we get a new population added to our community and we constantly must strive to relay the message of what our responsibilities are. It is a never-ending cycle. One year, the relationship would be mutual but the following year it might not be. This relationship is mostly influenced by what is going on in the world/media at that time.</i>

Appendix H

Question 8	<i>Are police and campus populations two communities that are connecting culturally, or are they missing opportunities to connect? From a cultural perspective, how can we connect better?</i>
Administrator A	<i>For the police, we need to do a better job of finding out what our community wants. It's one thing as a CALEA [accredited] to put out our periodic climate survey and say, "hey how are we doing?" But, it's another thing to intentionally ask our community, "Hey, what do you want? What do you need, and how potentially can we help you? Give us some suggestions." If we don't do that, listen, we'll never know. We'll just be guessing at it, and it's the same thing from our community. If they don't ask of us how they can help us, you just won't know. So unless we have these ongoing dialogues, where we're intentionally asking one another how we can mutually support one another, it's just going to be fumbling toward...have no idea...we'll just be grasping at straws. I think if we're intentional about how we communicate with one another, and then if we periodically will do these kind of temperature checks...and I love a survey I'll be honest with you. If we send something out to whether its our community leaders or our campus as a whole, and we send it out to 60,000 people, at least we're trying. We're putting forth that effort. We want to know from our community, "tell us what you need, tell us what you want, and let's work together to figure out how we can make that happen, and we can tell you what's unrealistic." But if we don't, we're just going to be left wondering, or we're just going to be left spinning our wheels potentially wasting resources, and people will still be wondering, "what does out police department do? Well, they're providing services we don't need any more." I think if we're intentional about it, we'd be better served.</i>
Administrator B	<i>I think sometimes we are missing opportunities to connect and I think it's just because the departments themselves don't have necessarily the diversity to represent the population on the campus. You know, we work really hard to try to be as diverse as we can, but you can't hire someone who doesn't come through the door. If they're not applying, you can't hire them. So, we really try when we have different programs that we do with the students is we really push the idea that, "Hey, you know, when you graduate you can work here. You don't have to leave this place if you like it." And, we try to get a more diverse pool. We have three officers right now who were students here. We have a couple that started out as like part-time security guards. So, we...when we hire students, and we try to hire a lot of students as part-time security guards, we tell them, "You know, if you think this is something that you would like to do, every day you come to work, you're applying for that job. You're interviewing for that job because you are developing a reputation with us as you're working as a part-time student. And that can transition over to...if you apply, "well you know, they don't have BLET...yet, but we know they're a hard worker, we know they come to work, we know they do their job, let's put them through BLET."</i>

	<i>We have an officer that was an intern with us, so we try use the intern program as a way of reaching out and most of our...probably out of our last five interns, four were females. So, we have a lot of females who are coming to us looking for internships and we give them that opportunity. And, we've had a couple apply. Didn't necessarily make it, but you know they apply. We're looking for that. But I think if you can reach out to different student organizations and let them know, "hey, you should apply to work with us and here's reason why." You can increase that cultural spectrum that you're working with. And we've gotten better over the years, but we still have work to do here. We're still a predominantly white department.</i>
Administrator C	<i>The key is to be better today than we were yesterday, and to be better tomorrow than we are today. I say that because there are always opportunities for us to reconnect and be better. There are always opportunities. No matter how much we do in the community, there's always chances where we can even do more, and be better. So, yes I do think we miss some opportunities. Some things that we do that really help us out, you know, is we stood up a citizen's police academy here. And we host it every spring. And we get a good number of people to go through that so they can kind of see the behind of scenes of law enforcement. Like y'all, we have interns that come in all the time. We do that every semester. And so these folks become somewhat of our alumni. Once they come out, come through one of our programs they become our alumni, and we reach back to them throughout the year to help us out with different things on the campus, because now they understand. They become our advocates in the community. So, no matter how you're doing, you can always do just a little bit more. Another thing we're trying to do is to tap into our STEM students so that they can develop apps for us; different things for us. Bring them in, "let me pick your brain. How can we communicate better? Can you develop an app for us, can you do this for us?" You know, because this is a STEM school, and so we try to tap in that way as well. Try to get something out of it. They can do surveys for us, and that type of thing. And so, we're trying to do some things, but we can always do more. There are always opportunities.</i>
Officer D	<i>I think that we are connecting. I think there definitely could be more; we've gotten more connected over the years – just with the times when you have younger generations of officers that may have gone to that particular university. I think that helps bridge that gap and they...just the younger generation has a new outlook on policing where they really want to get out there and be part of the community. I think things that can help are more officer-initiated programs where they just get out there and talk to community members; not just high ranking but students. Be open to them, be willing to answer questions even if they are challenging questions. I think that would be a...just the tip of how to really become more of one community instead of just the police and the university – and kind of bridge that gap.</i>
Officer E	<i>Even within our police community of the people who just work at this police department – and I feel like you're going to have it at any police department – there are going to be people who are really good at going out there and building those connections. Whether it's somebody who's walking through a</i>

	<i>dorm and taking the time to stop and take interest what students are doing, and some people they don't have that ability to befriend somebody they don't know. I think it is something that if we just take the time to build those relationships – I think inherently we're going for the same goal – they want to be safe while they're here, we want them to be safe while they're here. We have the same goal even if we don't see it the same way; we don't have the same values in our personal lives. Professionally I think we share this campus trying to do the same things. I think that lends itself normally to a very cooperative environment between both sides and you're going to have your very small outliers in those communities that I don't think would necessarily skew the majority of the interactions – it's just they're just the loudest interactions in the vast number of times that police and community interact on a daily basis.</i>
Officer F	<i>Honestly, I think that it depends on the officer. There are some officers on campus that students really connect well with and then there are others that they're just looking at then, and I'm like where's the disconnect. I think if there's a level of respect that each party is shown, then that will help the disconnect. Understanding the generation that you are now dealing with, and doing research on that, and understanding how they're wired, how they may be different from what you grew up to be. I think that would help to, instead of just thinking this person is being disrespectful because they're asking questions or because they're acting a certain way. You have to try to understand their background and understand the bigger picture, and understand why they act the way they do.</i>
Officer G	<i>I think we still could do a better job connecting with one another. I think we're doing better, but I think we can do a whole lot better. I think some of the stuff we talked about – the programming, the classes we put together; active shooter, the Run, Hide, Fight – I think if we just get out and they see us in positive eye and not just the enforcement part of it, I think all that will change. It will change sort of how we do our jobs and help bring things together as far as community.</i>
Officer H	<i>I think in some instances we are connecting and in others we're missing the opportunity. What I mean by missing the opportunity, like I said I do have conversations with the student, I feel like where we're missing the opportunity to connect in having more of an open dialogue with the students. Since I've been there, I've had students suggest certain things they would like to see from their police department; one is having an open dialogue, an open forum to give them an ideal as to what we do day to day and as to the laws that would be enforced on the campus. That's one instance. When students make suggestions and we take it to the administration and they sit on it, I think we're missing it. On the other hand, when we have certain function like when we're called out to work a basketball game or a sorority event, and student come up to have a conversation with us, and the officer is open-minded, I think we're engaged in that sense.</i>
Officer I	<i>The police and campus populations are connecting culturally to some degree but still missing some puzzle pieces to fully connect. By the time we connect with the community, it will be graduation time and some of that community</i>

	<i>leaves the university and now you are back to establishing those communications with new group of people. To some, it might seem like an exhausting process, but this process teaches us how to effectively connect with our community. The way we can connect better is to learn about the community and try to understand them. Find out what is the best way they like to be treated and talked to. Find out their interests by simply talking to the community. We also need to understand the generational and cultural gaps that are existing now between police and the campus population.</i>
--	---

APPENDIX I: IRB REVIEW & EXEMPTION



EAST CAROLINA UNIVERSITY

University & Medical Center Institutional Review Board

Willis Building · Mail Stop 682

600 Moyer Boulevard · Greenville, NC 27834

Office 252-744-2914 · Fax 252-744-2284 · rede.ecu.edu/umcirm/

Notification of Exempt Certification

From: Social/Behavioral IRB

To: [Jason Sugg](#)

CC: [Matthew Cox](#)

Date: 11/21/2023

Re: [UMCIRB 23-000751](#)

Police Rhetorics and Rhetorical Self-Awareness, and Their Contributions to Cultural Contexts of Policing in the Campus Setting

I am pleased to inform you that your research submission has been certified as exempt on 11/21/2023. This study is eligible for Exempt Certification under category # 2 AB.

It is your responsibility to ensure that this research is conducted in the manner reported in your application and/or protocol, as well as being consistent with the ethical principles of the Belmont Report and your profession.

This research study does not require any additional interaction with the UMCIRB unless there are proposed changes to this study. Any change, prior to implementing that change, must be submitted to the UMCIRB for review and approval. The UMCIRB will determine if the change impacts the eligibility of the research for exempt status. If more substantive review is required, you will be notified within five business days.

Document	Description
Interview Questions.docx(0.01)	Interview/Focus Group Scripts/Questions
Police Rhetorics and Rhetorical Self-Awareness, and Their Contributions to Cultural Contexts of Policing in the Campus Setting.pdf(0.01)	Study Protocol or Grant Application
Sugg Consent Letter_Focus Group.doc(0.01)	Consent Forms
Sugg Consent Letter_Individual.doc(0.01)	Consent Forms
Sugg Consent Paragraph_Focus Group Recruitment Script.doc(0.01)	Recruitment Documents/Scripts
Sugg Consent Paragraph_Individual Interview Recruitment Script.doc(0.01)	Recruitment Documents/Scripts
Sugg Email_1.doc(0.01)	Recruitment Documents/Scripts

For research studies where a waiver or alteration of HIPAA Authorization has been approved, the IRB states that each of the waiver criteria in 45 CFR 164.512(i)(1)(i)(A) and (2)(i) through (v) have been met. Additionally, the elements of PHI to be collected as described in items 1 and 2 of the Application for Waiver of Authorization have been determined to be the minimal necessary for the specified research.

The Chairperson (or designee) does not have a potential for conflict of interest on this study.

IRB00000705 East Carolina U IRB #1 (Biomedical) IORG0000418

IRB00003781 East Carolina U IRB #2 (Behavioral/SS) IORG0000418

