ISSN (Online): 2455-3662
EPRA International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research (IJMR) - Peer Reviewed Journal
Volume: 9| Issue: 10| October 2023|| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2013 || SJIF Impact Factor 2023: 8.224 || ISI Value: 1.188

BALANCING TRANSPARENCY AND PRIVACY: PERCEPTIONS OF BODY-WORN CAMERAS IN ANGELES CITY, PAMPANGA

Rhem Rick N. Corpuz[1], Kathya Greene Villafria[2], Kyla Alora Faith C. Reyes[3], Lorenz Angelo C. Cunanan [4]

[1]Faculty, College of Criminal Justice Education, Angeles University Foundation, Angeles City, Philippines
[2,3,4] Student, College of Criminal Justice Education, Angeles University Foundation, Angeles City, Philippines

Article DOI: https://doi.org/10.36713/epra14781
DOI No: 10.36713/epra14781

ABSTRACT

This research paper investigates public and law enforcement officers' perceptions of the implementation of Body-Worn Cameras (BWCs) in Angeles City, Pampanga. Using a descriptive survey methodology and a comparative approach, the study gathered insights from 219 police officers and 384 members of the public. The results indicate that both groups generally support the use of BWCs for various purposes, such as enhancing transparency, accountability, and security, without significantly affecting officer morale. BWCs are seen as tools to improve law enforcement practices and relationships with the community. Furthermore, the study highlighted the potential benefits of BWCs, including increased cooperation and respect from citizens, reduced aggression and resistance to arrest, and fewer complaints against officers. There were strong agreements between the public and law enforcement on the utility of BWCs. However, some differences in perceptions emerged, with the public viewing BWCs as tools for public oversight, while police officers might perceive them as intrusive. This finding emphasizes the need for robust privacy policies and additional research to fully understand the impact of BWCs. Demographic factors, such as age and education, did not significantly influence perceptions of BWCs. Nevertheless, there was a notable disparity in perceptions based on income, with lower-income individuals more likely to support BWCs. In conclusion, the research underscores the widespread acceptance and potential benefits of BWCs in law enforcement while also emphasizing the importance of balanced policies and the necessity for further research to address concerns and discrepancies in perception. The study provides valuable insights into the role of BWCs in promoting transparency and accountability in the criminal justice system.

KEYWORDS: ***Police and Public Perception, Body-worn Camera, Angeles City***

I. INTRODUCTION

Law enforcement agencies have widely implemented Body-Worn Cameras (BWCs) in recent months to enhance police conduct, transparency, and accountability, particularly concerning the use of force. The Supreme Court, through the Rules on the Use of BWC in Execution of Warrants, mandates the use of BWCs by police officers during the execution or service of arrest and search warrants by the Philippine National Police in response to widespread pressure from lawyers and activists [1]. The Supreme Court adds that there is an increase in the "number of civilian 2 deaths due to the execution of search warrants issued by trial courts, the causes and conditions surrounding such death being widely disputed".

The Supreme Court enacted this rule on body cameras in response to widespread pressure from lawyers and activists who called for the Court to intervene in escalating police killings [1].

The research community has shown a growing interest in the use of body-worn cameras (BWCs) in law enforcement, a subject that has raised a multitude of questions regarding their effectiveness, ethical considerations, and practicality. It was emphasized the potential of BWCs to address critical issues such as transparency, accountability, and the enhancement of trust in police-citizen interactions [2]. The extent to which BWCs truly resolve these challenges remains a subject of ongoing research and discussion [3]. The present research paper seeks to explore the complexities and implications of BWC deployment, with the aim of providing insights into the gravity of these concerns and contributing to the ongoing discourse surrounding their implementation.

BWCs can serve as a check and balance between police officers and the general public, reducing the likelihood of confrontations between the two groups and safeguarding

ISSN (Online): 2455-3662
EPRA International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research (IJMR) - Peer Reviewed Journal
Volume: 9| Issue: 10| October 2023|| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2013 || SJIF Impact Factor 2023: 8.224 || ISI Value: 1.188

against unlawful conduct by police officers and false accusations [4].

The goal of BWCs is to offer real-time monitoring and tracking of field enforcers from a command center or headquarters. BWCs record both video and audio simultaneously and feature administrative-level password protection [5].

The effectiveness of BWCs varies depending on the situation and may not necessarily affect other police or citizen behaviors [6][7][8]. However, they appear to reduce citizen complaints against police officers and may lead to cost savings [9][10[11][12]

As law enforcement officers investigate the use of BWCs, further research is necessary to determine their influence on the convenience and perceived utility of the technology [13]. It was stated that the utility of BWCs and their potential to modify the behavior of officers and suspects [14].

Law enforcement officials lack sufficient information and limited research to make informed decisions regarding the acquisition and installation of BWCs within their agencies. Concerns have been expressed by police officers regarding the use of body cameras [15]. However, officers who support BWCs may assist in their installation and operation, while those opposed to it may attempt to sabotage its acquisition [16].

The deployment of body-worn cameras (BWCs) in law enforcement signifies a pivotal advancement in policing technology, offering the promise of heightened transparency and accountability in police-citizen interactions. However, as the adoption of BWCs becomes increasingly widespread, a host of significant problems and questions have emerged, bringing into focus their effectiveness, ethical implications, and practicality. This research paper embarks on an exploration of the pressing issues surrounding the use of BWCs, delving into the complexities of their implementation. Furthermore, it seeks to contribute to the ongoing discourse by investigating how research can serve as a catalyst for addressing these problems and improving the situation, fostering a deeper understanding of the impacts and implications of this technology on modern law enforcement practices [17]

Individual disparities in officers' acceptance of their responsibilities and experiences are being debated, including issues related to captured data, recording device operation, and data review. There is also concern about whether BWCs will perpetuate the "Ferguson effect" [18].

The 'Ferguson Effect' is a theory that suggests an increase in violent crime and a decrease in proactive policing activities following highly publicized incidents of police use of force. The relationship between the Ferguson Effect and the use of body-worn cameras (BWCs) is complex. BWCs aim to enhance transparency and accountability in policing, potentially countering the chilling effect on officers' proactive activities. They offer an objective record of police interactions, improving public trust and protecting both officers and the public. However, concerns about surveillance and privacy, as well as potential impacts on police practices, make this relationship multifaceted and context-dependent. Researchers continue to explore this relationship [19].

This study examined how Angeles City, Pampanga police officers and the public perceive the use of BWCs using quantitative research methods. The study also identifies factors that may contribute to the acceptance of such devices, including their impact on officer behavior, citizens' reactions, familiarity, comfort and ease of use, incident report writing, and general perceptions [20].

A. General Objective

This study investigated the growing interest in body-worn cameras (BWCs) within law enforcement, driven by demands for transparency and better police-citizen relations. Focusing on perceptions in Angeles City, Pampanga, it used quantitative methods to examine factors influencing BWC acceptance and their impact on officer behavior.

B. Specific Objectives

This study comprehensively examined the implementation and impact of Body-Worn Cameras (BWCs) in law enforcement, with a specific focus on the perspectives of police officers and the general public in Angeles City, Pampanga. This research investigated how the use of BWCs influences various aspects of policing and community interactions, shedding light on their effectiveness, acceptance, and potential implications for transparency and accountability within the law enforcement context.

1. To gather socio-demographic information about the respondents.
2. To assess the respondents' perception of using Body-Worn Cameras (BWCs) for report writing.
3. To gauge the respondents' perception of using BWCs for presenting evidence in court.
4. To measure the respondents' perception of using BWCs in terms of citizen reactions.
5. To evaluate the respondents' perception of using BWCs regarding police officer behavior.
6. To examine the respondents' perception of using BWCs in terms of familiarity, comfort, and ease of use.

ISSN (Online): 2455-3662
EPRA International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research (IJMR) - Peer Reviewed Journal
Volume: 9| Issue: 10| October 2023|| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2013 || SJIF Impact Factor 2023: 8.224 || ISI Value: 1.188

7. To analyze the respondents' general perception of using BWCs.
8. To determine if there is a significant difference in perceptions about BWC use when respondents are grouped by category.
9. To identify any significant differences in perceptions about BWC use when respondents are grouped by socio-demographic profile.

II. METHODS

A. *Study Design*

In the study's design, we utilized descriptive surveys as a valuable methodology to examine perceptions of body-worn cameras among both the police and the public. These surveys enabled the collection and analysis of extensive data through the use of closed-ended questions. They were instrumental in facilitating a thorough comprehension of the subject matter and providing a comprehensive overview of interactions between the police and the public. To compare existing data and identify variations in attitudes and levels of agreement between the two groups, we employed descriptive comparative research. This approach proved especially beneficial in studies focusing on the utilization of body-worn cameras in law enforcement contexts.

The primary research tool used in this study was a survey questionnaire consisting of 21 questions. This questionnaire was adopted from a previous research study conducted by White, Todak, and Gaub in 2018, titled "Examining Body-Worn Camera Integration and Acceptance Among Police Officers, Citizens, and External Stakeholders: Police Body-Worn Cameras." The use of this established questionnaire allowed for the comprehensive exploration of perspectives related to body-worn camera integration and acceptance among various stakeholders, enhancing the validity and comparability of the data collected for this research.

Moving on to the study participants, public respondents completed their survey responses via Google Forms, resulting in a total of 84 responses from individuals aged 18 to 65. These responses were gathered online, with participants specifying their location within Angeles City, Pampanga. In contrast, police participants, aged 18 to 65, took part in the study through face-to-face interactions. It's essential to note that the researchers did not provide any form of compensation or incentive to the participants in this study.

B. *Study Participants*

For participant selection, we employed convenient sampling to survey police officers in Angeles City due to practical constraints in accessing this specific group. Simultaneously, we utilized cluster sampling to select residents of Angeles City to ensure representation from diverse neighborhoods and demographics. This method allowed us to efficiently gather data from distinct clusters within the city, thereby enhancing the overall comprehensiveness of our study. These sampling techniques were chosen based on the accessibility of each group and our desire to obtain a comprehensive understanding of local law enforcement's perspectives and the residents' diverse opinions and experiences within different areas of the city.

C. *Sample Size*

The study's sample size was determined through the use of the G-power statistical program, specifically designed for power and sample size calculations, which includes tests involving the Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient. The significance level was set at 0.05, resulting in a calculated requirement for a sample size of 219 police officers. Angeles City, with a population of 462,928, served as the reference population for this calculation. Furthermore, a sample size of 84 respondents from the general public and 84 police officers was considered adequate for detecting a medium effect size in a t-test.

Researchers employed two distinct sampling methods to investigate perceptions regarding body-worn cameras: convenience sampling for police officers and cluster sampling for the general public. This involved dividing the population into clusters and subsequently selecting these clusters at random for study. The choice of these methods was influenced by the practical considerations related to both police accessibility and the convenience of researchers during the sampling phase.

D. *Inclusion Criteria:*

The study on public and police perceptions of body-worn cameras in Angeles City included respondents aged 18 to 65, encompassing both males and females. The inclusion of participants with varying educational backgrounds and income levels ensured the creation of a diverse and representative sample. This diversity accounted for the demographic factors that could potentially influence individuals' perceptions, contributing to a comprehensive understanding of the issue.

E. *Exclusion Criteria*:

To maintain the study's integrity and validity, a set of exclusion criteria was established. These criteria included the following aspects:

1. Age Restriction: To focus the demographic group on those most likely to interact with law enforcement agencies, respondents outside the age range of 18 to 65 were excluded.
2. Gender Specification: The study included only male and female respondents to simplify data analysis and prevent potential complexities.

ISSN (Online): 2455-3662
EPRA International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research (IJMR) - Peer Reviewed Journal
Volume: 9| Issue: 10| October 2023|| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2013 || SJIF Impact Factor 2023: 8.224 || ISI Value: 1.188

3. Limited Educational Attainment: Respondents with limited educational backgrounds were excluded to ensure meaningful responses from participants with the cognitive capacity to engage with the study effectively.
4. Income Level Deviation: Extreme outliers in terms of income levels were excluded to prevent their data from skewing the overall results.

These criteria were implemented to maintain the integrity and validity of the study, thus yielding accurate and relevant findings that contribute to the broader discourse on law enforcement practices and community relations.

F. *Withdrawal Criteria*

Participants in the study on public and police perceptions of body-worn cameras in Angeles City had the option to withdraw from participation under several conditions. These conditions included:

1. Voluntary Withdrawal: Participants could choose to withdraw from the study at their own discretion.
2. Non-Compliance: Participants who failed to adhere to the study protocols could be withdrawn.
3. Ineligibility: Participants who no longer met the inclusion criteria could be withdrawn.
4. Personal Discomfort: If participants felt personal discomfort or concerns about the study, they could request withdrawal.
5. Unresponsiveness: Participants who became unreachable or unresponsive for an extended period were subject to withdrawal.
6. Ethical or Safety Concerns: If unforeseen ethical or safety concerns arose, participants' continued involvement could be reconsidered.
7. Risk to Health or Well-Being: If continued participation posed a risk to their health or the well-being of others, withdrawal was possible.

These withdrawal criteria were established to ensure the study adhered to ethical and scientific standards while safeguarding participant rights and maintaining the study's integrity.

G. *Study Procedures*

The research methodology adopted a comprehensive data collection process to achieve its objectives. Surveys were the primary tool used to gather socio-demographic information and delve into respondents' perceptions of Body-Worn Cameras (BWCs) in specific contexts. These structured questionnaires focused on understanding respondents' perspectives regarding the use of BWCs, particularly for report writing and their role as evidence in court proceedings.

Additionally, surveys assessed respondents' perceptions of BWCs concerning citizen reactions and the behavior of police officers in connection to this technology. The level of familiarity with BWCs, comfort in their usage, and the perceived ease of operating such devices were also explored.

The research aimed to provide an overall perspective on the general perception of BWCs, drawing insights from the collected survey data. This holistic approach contributed to a deeper understanding of the collective stance on the adoption and application of BWCs in law enforcement.

To gain deeper insights into the data, statistical tests were employed to explore significant variations in perceptions among respondents when categorized and grouped based on their socio-demographic profiles. This analytical approach facilitated a nuanced analysis of how different demographic factors may influence perceptions of BWCs, enhancing the research's depth and comprehensiveness.

H. *Ethical Considerations*

The study on public and police perceptions in Angeles City regarding the use of bodyworn cameras was conducted with careful attention to ethical considerations. These considerations encompassed several key aspects:

1. Respect for Cultural Norms and Confidentiality: The research was conducted with due respect for cultural norms and a commitment to maintaining the confidentiality of information, as suggested by Whitney (2020).
2. Ensuring Safety and Preventing Harm: A safe environment was provided to respondents, with measures in place to ensure their safety and prevent any potential harm during the study, aligning with the principles highlighted by Wei et al. (2021).
3. Transparency and Informed Consent: The study was conducted with transparency and openness to scrutiny. Respondents were provided with information about their rights and responsibilities, as emphasized by Schoenherr et al. (2015).
4. Adherence to Ethical Standards: Data collection and analysis adhered to ethical standards and guidelines, maintaining the integrity of the research.
5. Responsible Use of Research Results: The results of the research were shared widely and used responsibly, with a consideration of potential implications, as advised by Laird (2021).

I. *Consent*

Consent forms were incorporated into the survey questionnaires to outline respondents' rights, obligations, and the voluntary nature of their participation. These forms also addressed issues related to anonymity, confidentiality, benefits, and risks. Nonconsenting respondents were excluded from the study.

ISSN (Online): 2455-3662
EPRA International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research (IJMR) - Peer Reviewed Journal
Volume: 9| Issue: 10| October 2023|| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2013 || SJIF Impact Factor 2023: 8.224 || ISI Value: 1.188

J. *Consent Process and Participant Information*

The consent process for the study on public and police perceptions of body-worn cameras in Angeles City, which explored the growing interest in body-worn cameras (BWCs) within law enforcement, was meticulously conducted to ensure ethical and informed participation by the respondents.

Before participating in the study, individuals within the specified age range of 18 to 65, representing both males and females, were approached and informed about the research objectives, methods, and potential implications. They were provided with a clear and detailed explanation of the study's purpose, which was to examine factors influencing BWC acceptance and their impact on officer behavior, driven by the demands for transparency and better police-citizen relations.

The informed consent process was an integral part of this study. Each prospective participant was given the opportunity to review an informed consent document, which outlined their rights and the nature of their involvement. The document emphasized the voluntary nature of their participation, assuring them that they could choose to withdraw from the study at any time without consequences.

Participants were encouraged to ask questions and seek clarification on any aspect of the study, ensuring that they fully comprehended what their involvement entailed. They were also informed that their responses would be kept confidential and anonymous, with no personally identifiable information used in the research findings. After ensuring that participants were fully informed and comfortable with their participation, they were asked to provide their written consent, indicating their willingness to be part of the study. Their consent signified that they understood the research's purpose and methods, and they voluntarily agreed to contribute their opinions and experiences.

The consent process adhered to ethical guidelines, ensuring that participants were well informed, willing, and protected throughout their involvement in the study. This comprehensive approach was essential in maintaining the integrity and ethical standards of the research.

K. *Data Security*

Both police officers and public questionnaires included informed consent, researcher statements, and a clear presentation of respondents' rights, duties, and obligations. Respondents were encouraged to ask questions and had the option to withdraw their responses. Confidentiality measures were rigorously maintained, with no personal information being collected. Data was securely stored in a Google Drive folder for digital forms and a locked cabinet for printed questionnaires, with access limited to the researchers and their adviser. The study aimed to fulfill its objectives without compromising participant privacy.

L. *Treatment of Data*

The researchers employed various statistical methods to analyze the questionnaire responses:

1. Frequency, Percentage, and Ranking Computation: These methods were used to analyze questionnaire responses, providing insights into the prevalence of specific viewpoints among respondents.
2. Likert Scale: A five-point Likert scale served as a statistical tool to assess respondent perceptions. This scale offered a structured framework for articulating levels of agreement or disagreement, ranging from "Strongly Disagree" (numerical equivalent: 1.00 to 1.80) to "Strongly Agree" (numerical equivalent: 4.21 to 5.00). This scale facilitated a nuanced understanding of respondent perspectives and contributed to the depth of research findings.
3. T-Test: A t-test was used to compare public and police perceptions of body-worn cameras in Angeles City. This statistical analysis determined significant differences and indicated the need for further investigation.

These statistical tools and methods were employed to analyze the data systematically and derive meaningful insights from the research findings.

III. RESULTS AND DISCUSS

Table 1 provided an overview of our survey respondents, totaling 168 individuals. It revealed that 66.7% of the respondents were male, while 32.7% were female, indicating a significant gender distribution, with some respondents falling outside traditional binary gender classifications.

In terms of age distribution, Table 1 indicated that a majority, specifically 75%, fell within the 18-28 age group, highlighting a predominantly youthful demographic among the respondents.

The educational profile outlined in Table 1 showed a diverse range of qualifications among the respondents. Specifically, 50% were college graduates, 34.5% held college level degrees, 11.3% possessed post-graduate degrees, and 3.6% had high school diplomas, with vocational degrees being the least common.

ISSN (Online): 2455-3662
EPRA International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research (IJMR) - Peer Reviewed Journal
Volume: 9| Issue: 10| October 2023|| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2013 || SJIF Impact Factor 2023: 8.224 || ISI Value: 1.188

Gender of the Respondents	Frequency	Percentage
Male	112	66.7
Female	55	32.7
Others	1	.6
Total	**168**	**100.0**
Age of the Respondents	**Frequency**	**Percentage**
18 - 22 years old	69	41.1
23 - 28 years old	57	33.9
28 - 35 years old	29	17.3
36 - 45 years old	8	4.8
46 – 50 years old	4	2.4
51 – 55 years old	1	.6
Total	**168**	**100.0**

Table 1 offered insights into the income distribution within this respondent group. Notably, 16.7% earned between 0-5,000 Php, 22.6% earned 5,000-15,000 Php, 13.1% earned 15,000-30,000 Php, 40.5% earned 30,000-80,000 Php, 4.2% earned 80,000- 120,000 Php, and 3.0% earned 120,000-200,000 Php. This diverse income distribution reflected the financial backgrounds of the respondents.

Educational Attainment of the Respondents	Frequency	Percentage
High school	6	3.6
College Graduate	84	50.0
College Level	58	34.5
Vocational	1	.6
Post-Graduate	19	11.3
Total	**168**	**100.0**
Income of the Respondents	**Frequency**	**Percentage**
0 - 5,000 Php	28	16.7
5,000 – 15,000 Php	38	22.6
15,000 – 30,000 Php	22	13.1
30,000 – 80,000 Php	68	40.5
80,000 – 120,000 Php	7	4.2
120,000 – 200,000 Php	5	3.0
Total	**168**	**100.0**

Table 2 revealed the public and police opinions on body-worn cameras in report writing. Both groups strongly agreed, with mean ratings ranging from 4.23 to 4.55, and standard deviations from 0.68 to 0.99. The variances ranged from 0.46 to 0.98, indicating a low variance, signifying consensus on the advantages of using body-worn cameras in report writing.

Table 2.
Perceptions of the Public and Police on the Use of Body-Worn Camera as to Report Writing

Perceptions of the Public and Police on the Use of Body-Worn Camera as to Report Writing	Mean	Verbal Interpretation	Std. Deviation	Variance
The use of body worn camera will make the police officers spend less time completing paperwork.	4.23	Strongly Agree	0.99	0.98
Body worn camera recordings make more accurate accounts of incidents.	4.55	Strongly Agree	0.68	0.46
The body worn cameras improve quality of evidence collected by the police.	4.55	Strongly Agree	0.70	0.49
The use of body worn camera makes officers' job easier.	4.33	Strongly Agree	0.83	0.69
Average	**4.41**	**Strongly Agree**	**0.80**	**0.66**

Body-worn cameras in police report writing were widely accepted by both the public and the police, as they were perceived to have the potential to reduce bias, protect officers from false accusations, and promote good practices. However, it was recognized that further research was required to gain a deeper understanding of their implications for Educational Attainment of the Respondents Frequency Percentage High school 6 3.6 College Graduate 84 50.0 College Level 58 34.5 Vocational 1 .6 Post-Graduate 19 11.3 Total 168 100.0 Income of the Respondents Frequency Percentage 0 - 5,000 Php 28 16.7 5,000 – 15,000 Php 38 22.6 15,000 – 30,000 Php 22 13.1 30,000 – 80,000 Php 68 40.5 80,000 – 120,000 Php 7 4.2 120,000 – 200,000 Php 5 3.0 Total 168 100.0 crime, community relations, and individual privacy. While these cameras provided visual evidence, there was uncertainty about their impact on officer performance and report writing.

This finding suggested that the public and the police had similar levels of acceptance and support for the use of body-worn cameras in report writing. Both groups rated the use of these cameras positively, with mean ratings ranging from 4.23 to 4.55, and standard deviations ranging from 0.68 to 0.99. According to the data in Table 3, both the public and the police believed that body-worn cameras could help reduce bias in police reports and protect officers from false accusations. The data indicated that both groups perceived body-worn cameras as a means to protect citizens from police misconduct and encourage good practices among officers. Consequently, body-worn cameras were seen as beneficial to the public and to police officers, with the presence of the cameras potentially enhancing the accuracy of reports and ensuring the safety of civilians and officers. These cameras appeared to lead to more impartial and honest reports, reduced complaints against police officers, and a decrease in litigation and civil rights violations. This was considered a positive development for both police departments and the public.

Policy makers should take into account that both the public and the police generally support the utilization of body-worn cameras as a means to improve law enforcement. For researchers, this study underscored the importance of examining public and police opinions related to the use of body-worn cameras. The research indicated that, on average, the public and the police held similar opinions about the utility of body-worn cameras for report writing. The findings suggested that further research was necessary to explore how body-worn cameras were being used to enhance law enforcement, including their implications for crime, community relations, and individual privacy.

A comprehensive examination of the use of body-worn cameras in police report writing was carried out. The research findings revealed that police officers who used the technology displayed significantly higher levels of compliance with the law, and their behavior when interacting

ISSN (Online): 2455-3662
EPRA International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research (IJMR) - Peer Reviewed Journal
Volume: 9| Issue: 10| October 2023|| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2013 || SJIF Impact Factor 2023: 8.224 || ISI Value: 1.188

with citizens positively changed. The study also found that better records were created for the purposes of evidence collection, leading to higher officer accountability. The results of this study indicated that body-worn cameras provided a valuable resource for police forces in better understanding and responding to their environment [21].

Although the technology was considered easy to use and beneficial, there were no significant changes in the level of officer compliance when using the technology. The study noted that the technology was often difficult to maintain and that the report-writing process was not necessarily improved by using the cameras. The results of this study suggested that while body-worn cameras could provide visual evidence of incidents and interactions, their impact on evidence collection and report writing was not as significant as initially perceived [22].

Table 3 presented the findings of public and police perceptions of body-worn cameras in court, focusing on past survey responses. The data revealed a significant consensus among respondents regarding the positive impact of body-worn cameras. A substantial majority of participants expressed agreement with the notion that body-worn cameras facilitated the submission of evidence, aided in the prosecution of drug-related cases, and played a crucial role in domestic violence (DV) cases, particularly when victims were unwilling to testify. The standard deviation for these responses was measured at 0.72.

Table 3. Perceptions of the Public and Police on the Use of Body-Worn Camera in terms of use of evidence in court

Perceptions of the Public and Police on the-Use-of Body-Worn Camera in terms of the use of evidence in court	Mean	Verbal Interpretation	Std. Deviation	Variance
The use of body worn camera makes it easier to work with the prosecutor's office when submitting evidence.	4.52	Strongly Agree	0.72	0.51
The use of body worn camera make it easier to prosecute drug violation offenders.	4.44	Strongly Agree	0.72	0.52
The use of body worn camera helps to prosecute DV cases when victim is unwillingly to testify.	4.45	Strongly Agree	0.73	0.54
Average	**4.47**	**Strongly Agree**	**0.72**	**0.52**

Table 3 offered a comprehensive overview of the perceptions held by both the general public and law enforcement personnel regarding the utilization of body-worn cameras (BWCs) for presenting evidence in court. Survey results from the past revealed an average rating of 4.47 out of 5, signifying a substantial consensus that BWCs played a pivotal role in streamlining collaboration between law enforcement agencies and the prosecutor's office during the evidence submission process. Furthermore, respondents strongly believed that BWCs significantly simplified the prosecution of drug-related offenses and were instrumental in facilitating the prosecution of Domestic Violence (DV) cases, especially when victims hesitated to testify. The relatively low standard deviation of 0.72 indicated a high level of agreement among respondents, emphasizing the efficacy of BWCs as valuable courtroom evidence. This sentiment was further substantiated by a variance of 0.51.

These findings underscored the multifaceted benefits of BWCs as an invaluable tool for law enforcement professionals in the execution of their daily duties. BWCs expedited the process of evidence submission to the prosecutor's office and served as catalysts for more successful prosecutions in cases involving drug offenses and DV incidents. This positive consensus could be attributed to BWCs' reputation as impartial recorders of events and interactions, capable of providing an objective and accurate account of law enforcement encounters. Consequently, these recordings played a pivotal role as essential pieces of evidence in court proceedings, enhancing the integrity of law enforcement practices and simultaneously safeguarding the interests of both officers and the broader community.

The implementation of BWCs carried profound implications for the broader landscape of law enforcement, particularly in terms of bolstering accountability and transparency. These third-party recordings served as an essential mechanism for ensuring law enforcement officers' adherence to legal standards and procedures. Furthermore, they empowered prosecutors to navigate legal proceedings more efficiently, a particularly significant advantage in cases involving domestic violence, where victim testimony may be unavailable or limited.

The implications of these findings were substantial. Policymakers could consider the broader integration of BWCs into law enforcement practices, particularly in apprehending individuals involved in drug-related and domestic violence offenses. Leveraging the substantial video evidence generated by BWCs could result in more effective prosecutions, ultimately leading to improved conviction rates for these types of crimes.

From a research perspective, the present findings reinforced the compelling case for the continued use and exploration of BWCs. They highlighted the technology's instrumental role within the criminal justice system and laid the foundation for further investigations into its broader impact on conviction rates in cases involving drug and domestic violence offenses. Future research initiatives should delve deeper into how BWCs can not only safeguard the interests of crime victims but also protect the ethical and lawful deployment of this technology within the law enforcement community.

Moreover, the findings were consistent with prior research in this field. For instance, a study by McCarrick in 2018, encompassing 27 veteran police officers in the U.S. and U.K., documented a substantial improvement in the quality of evidence in drug-related cases attributed to BWCs. The

ISSN (Online): 2455-3662
EPRA International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research (IJMR) - Peer Reviewed Journal
Volume: 9| Issue: 10| October 2023|| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2013 || SJIF Impact Factor 2023: 8.224 || ISI Value: 1.188

officers in the study also reported a boost in the trust and reputation of law enforcement agencies among drug offenders, resulting in more favorable outcomes for prosecutors.

However, it's essential to consider contrasting research perspectives as well. It was found that BWCs may not have a significant impact on the prosecution of domestic violence cases [23]. This study, which included feedback from 15 prosecutors, revealed that while BWCs did provide supplementary evidence, the reluctance of domestic violence victims to testify remained a formidable challenge, thereby impeding case progress despite augmented evidentiary support. These differing insights underscore the complex interplay of factors within the criminal justice system and emphasize the necessity of a nuanced approach to technology adoption and its associated implications

Table 4 presented findings that allowed for the conclusion that the public and police held a generally positive view regarding the use of body-worn cameras for managing citizen reactions. These findings indicated that both the public and law enforcement officers shared the belief that body-worn cameras would enhance citizen cooperation and respect while reducing instances of aggression, resistance to arrest, and complaints against officers. This was supported by an average rating of 3.94 and a standard deviation of 0.99. The relatively low standard deviation suggested a considerable level of consensus among the respondents in their agreement with the utilization of bodyworn cameras. Additionally, the variance of 0.98 further underscored the consistency of opinions among the respondents regarding the benefits of body-worn cameras in managing citizen interactions.

In summary, the data from Table 4 revealed a positive sentiment among both the public and law enforcement regarding the potential advantages of body-worn cameras in shaping citizen behavior during interactions with the police. This alignment in perception, as reflected in the average score and limited standard deviation, indicated a robust consensus regarding the efficacy of body-worn cameras in promoting cooperation, respect, and reducing negative incidents in police-citizen encounters.

Table 4
Perceptions of the Public and Police on the Use of Body-Worn Camera in terms of Citizen Reaction

Perceptions of the Public and Police on the-Useof-Body-Worn Camera In terms of Citizen Reaction	Mean	Verbal Interpretation	Std. Deviation	Variance
By using body worn camera, citizens will be more cooperative.	4.14	Agree	0.90	0.80
By using body worn camera, citizens will be more respectful.	4.10	Agree	0.92	0.85
By using body worn camera, suspects less likely to resist arrest.	3.93	Agree	1.01	1.01
By using body worn camera, people will be generally less aggressive.	4.02	Agree	0.93	0.86
By using body worn camera, cameras hurt "policecommunity" relations.	3.75	Agree	1.07	1.13
By using body worn camera, cameras will increase citizen complaints against officers.	3.69	Agree	1.11	1.23
Average	**3.94**	**Agree**	**0.99**	**0.98**

The insights derived from Table 4 shed light on the prevailing attitudes of both the general public and law enforcement personnel towards the adoption of body-worn cameras (BWCs), painting a picture of generally positive sentiments. For the public, BWCs were viewed as instruments that could significantly enhance transparency and accountability in police interactions. Conversely, law enforcement officers perceived BWCs as tools that could uncover instances of misconduct within their ranks.

One of the key takeaways was the discernible impact of equipping police with BWCs on citizen responses. BWCs played a pivotal role in fostering a more open and constructive dialogue between police and citizens, resulting in a more cooperative demeanor among the public. This transformative effect extended to reduced rates of citizen complaints and a decrease in the use of force by police officers. The awareness of being recorded and monitored often prompted officers to conduct themselves with heightened respect during interactions with citizens. Studies consistently highlighted that citizens tended to exhibit reduced resistance and hostility when they were aware of being recorded.

These findings underscored the substantial potential of BWCs in substantially improving the dynamics between the public and law enforcement officers. The implications were far-reaching, potentially leading to a wider adoption of BWCs as a strategic tool to cultivate greater trust, cooperation, and understanding between police and the communities they served. Government agencies might have considered incorporating BWCs into their police force training programs to encourage officers to be more mindful of their actions and interactions with the public, ultimately contributing to enhanced professionalism and accountability.

Moreover, the findings also highlighted the prospect of BWCs positively influencing citizen reactions, suggesting the need for further in-depth research. Future studies should delve into the intricate dynamics of interactions between police officers and the public, with a focus on how BWCs shaped perceptions and assessments of these interactions. Additionally, there was a pressing need to explore the psychological effects of BWCs on both citizens and police

ISSN (Online): 2455-3662
EPRA International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research (IJMR) - Peer Reviewed Journal
Volume: 9| Issue: 10| October 2023|| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2013 || SJIF Impact Factor 2023: 8.224 || ISI Value: 1.188

officers, particularly in terms of their capacity to bolster trust and cooperation.

A study revealed [24] that the presence of BWCs led to increased citizen compliance with police officers and a notable decrease in the use of physical force or threats of force. Respondents in the study reported that BWCs enhanced police legitimacy, improved communication between citizens and officers, and reduced perceived conflict between the two groups. Importantly, the study documented a reduction in citizen-initiated complaints against police officers.

However, it was crucial to acknowledge contrasting research perspectives [25]. Their study concluded that while BWCs contributed to positive police-citizen interactions, they did not necessarily result in significant reductions in the use of force or citizen complaints about officer misconduct. These findings challenged the assumption that BWCs uniformly led to improved perceptions of police accountability and legitimacy among citizens.

In summary, the implications of these diverse research outcomes underscored the intricate interplay of factors influencing the impact of BWCs on law enforcement practices and citizen interactions. They emphasized the need for continued and nuanced exploration in this domain to maximize the potential benefits of BWCs while addressing any limitations or challenges they may present.

Table 5 indicated that the perceptions of the public and police generally viewed bodyworn cameras positively, with respondents agreeing that they reduced officer warnings, limited contact with citizens, increased discretion, and improved decisionmaking. The score of 3.93 suggested a general agreement, indicating that both the public and police viewed body-worn cameras as beneficial for officer behavior.

Table 5
Perceptions of the Public and Police on the Use of Body-Worn Camera in terms of Police Officer Behavior

Perceptions of the Public and Police on the Use-of Body-Worn Camera In terms of Police Officer Behavior	Mean	Verbal Interpretation	Std. Deviation	Variance
By using body worn camera, officers will be less likely to give warnings.	3.70	Agree	1.09	1.19
By using body worn camera, officers will have fewer contacts with citizens.	3.61	Agree	1.14	1.29
By using body worn camera, officers will feel like they have less discretion.	3.57	Agree	1.13	1.28
By using body worn camera, officers will be more cautious in making decisions.	4.20	Agree	0.85	0.72
By using body worn camera, officers will act more professional.	4.24	Agree	0.78	0.60
By using body worn camera, affects an officer's decision to use force.	4.23	Agree	0.85	0.72
Average	**3.93**	**Agree**	**0.97**	**0.97**

Table 5 provided a comprehensive view of the shared perspectives of both the general public and law enforcement professionals regarding the efficacy of body-worn cameras (BWCs) as tools for moderating officer behavior. It was evident that a consensus existed between these two groups, indicating a widely held belief that BWCs were indeed beneficial instruments for overseeing and regulating officer conduct. With a collective score of 3.93, this shared perspective underscored a high degree of agreement on the effectiveness of BWCs in monitoring and influencing officer behavior.

The findings illuminated a multifaceted role for BWCs within policing practices, emphasizing their potential to enhance law enforcement methods and bolster the safety of all community members. By serving as vigilant monitors of police interactions with the public, BWCs played a pivotal role in ensuring officer adherence to established protocols and the maintenance of professionalism during these engagements. Furthermore, BWCs contributed to incident recording, enabling meticulous scrutiny of officer behavior in situations where clarity was needed regarding the sequence of events during an interaction.

It was noteworthy that while a broad consensus existed regarding the positive utility of BWCs, concerns persisted among both the public and law enforcement regarding issues such as privacy and the legality of recorded interactions. Policymakers and implementers needed to take these apprehensions into account and institute the necessary safeguards to address them effectively.

The findings underscored the imperative for further research aimed at gaining a deeper understanding of the perspectives held by the public and police on the subject of BWCs. Future investigations might delve into the public's viewpoint regarding the circumstances requiring officer consent for recording, as well as their preferences regarding the handling of recorded footage. Additionally, there was a pressing need for policymakers and researchers to explore the potential of BWCs in reducing instances of police misconduct, accompanied by a thorough examination of the potential costs and resource implications associated with implementing BWCs on a larger scale.

Supporting these findings, a 2016 study from the International Criminal Justice Review revealed that a significant 89% of officers perceived BWCs as having a positive effect on their behavior. Officers articulated that these cameras augmented transparency and diminished the need for the use of force. Moreover, a comprehensive survey encompassing over 2,000 U.S. police officers in 2017 corroborated these sentiments, with officers who reported the use of body cameras citing reductions in civilian complaints, decreased use of force incidents, and improved evidence quality [23].

However, it was imperative to recognize contrasting viewpoints within the law enforcement community, as

ISSN (Online): 2455-3662
EPRA International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research (IJMR) - Peer Reviewed Journal
Volume: 9| Issue: 10| October 2023|| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2013 || SJIF Impact Factor 2023: 8.224 || ISI Value: 1.188

illustrated by a 2018 study. This research, comprising 150 law enforcement professionals in three California counties, revealed that only 13% of interviewed officers believed that BWCs reduced the necessity for using force. Many officers in this study viewed BWCs with skepticism, perceiving them as tools that could potentially be wielded against them [26].

In summation, the findings underscored the complexity of perspectives surrounding the role of BWCs in policing practices. They highlighted the necessity for ongoing research and dialogue to leverage the potential benefits of BWCs while addressing concerns and variations in perception among both law enforcement professionals and the public.

Table 6 revealed that the public and police generally approved of body-worn cameras, citing their ease of use, comfort, and adequate battery life. This consensus suggested they were comfortable with the use of these cameras and saw them as a beneficial law enforcement tool.

Table 6
Perceptions of the Public and Police on the Use of Body-Worn Camera in terms of Familiarity, Comfort and Ease of Use

Perceptions of the Public and Police on the Use of Body-Worn Camera in terms of Familiarity, Comfort and Ease of Use	Mean	Verbal Interpretation	Std. Deviation	Variance
It is easy to locate and retrieve video for a specific event when using body worn camera.	4.26	Strongly Agree	0.78	0.61
The body worn camera easy to use.	4.15	Agree	0.87	0.75
The body worn camera is comfortable to wear.	3.93	Agree	0.96	0.92
The battery life of the camera is adequate.	3.94	Agree	0.92	0.85
It is easier to download data at the end of shift when using body worn camera.	4.02	Agree	0.88	0.77
Average	**4.06**	**Agree**	**0.88**	**0.78**

Table 6 offered a comprehensive overview of the favorable perspectives shared by both the general public and law enforcement regarding the utilization of body-worn cameras (BWCs). This collective positive perception primarily hinged on the notions of familiarity, comfort, and ease of use associated with these devices. The inherent value of BWCs in providing video evidence to corroborate police accounts of incidents and enhance accountability resonated with a broad spectrum of individuals.

Early research had suggested that BWCs contributed to a reduction in citizen complaints against police and a decline in instances of physical force utilization by officers. Simultaneously, they facilitated the creation of more precise records of police interactions, amplifying public support and trust in law enforcement. Furthermore, police officers who utilized BWCs reported an improved ability to exercise discretion effectively, equipping them to de-escalate situations with confidence.

The public had been enthusiastic about embracing BWCs as a valuable addition to crime prevention efforts. These devices empowered the public by ensuring that their concerns were considered transparently, enhancing public safety, and promoting police awareness of their surroundings. The mere presence of BWCs encouraged officers to respond promptly to calls for assistance and to maintain heightened situational awareness.

These findings served as a call to action for policymakers, advocating for the widespread integration of BWCs into police departments nationwide. Comprehensive policies should be developed to stipulate the terms and conditions governing the use of BWCs, ensuring their appropriate use while safeguarding the rights of individuals who may be captured in recordings.

To further refine our understanding of the effectiveness of BWCs in law enforcement activities, future research should delve into potential unintended consequences, including the potential for increased racial profiling. Only through a holistic understanding of the implications of BWCs could these devices be optimally leveraged for their intended purpose.

It was found that a significant 81 percent of police officers reported a high level of satisfaction with BWCs due to their perceived contributions to increased security, improved evidence gathering, and enhanced communication. Officers also noted feeling more motivated and professional when wearing BWCs [27]

Conversely, certain challenges associated with BWCs, including psychological stress, potential privacy concerns, and a lack of trust. Out of the 104 officers surveyed, 32 percent reported feeling overwhelmed, citing decreased privacy and increased stress as contributing factors. Only 16 percent of the officers reported feeling comfortable with the presence of BWCs. The study emphasized the need for further research to strike a balance between the benefits of BWCs in monitoring crime-related activities and citizens' right to privacy [28]

Table 6 reinforced the positive public perception of BWCs in police officer usage. With an average mean response of 4.08, indicating strong agreement, and a standard deviation of 0.89, indicating clustered responses around the mean, this dataset underscored the consistent consensus among both police officers and the public regarding the benefits of BWCs. The variance of 0.80 further underscored the remarkable agreement among respondents, affirming their shared belief in the potential benefits of BWCs for enhanced officer training, job performance, safety, and overall job satisfaction.

ISSN (Online): 2455-3662
EPRA International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research (IJMR) - Peer Reviewed Journal
Volume: 9| Issue: 10| October 2023|| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2013 || SJIF Impact Factor 2023: 8.224 || ISI Value: 1.188

Table 7 presented a favorable public perception of police officers using body-worn cameras, with robust consensus and uniform responses. Both officers and the public were in agreement that these cameras had the potential to enhance training, job performance, safety, and job satisfaction, underscoring a positive correlation.

Table 7
Perceptions of the Public and Police on the Use of Body-Worn Camera in terms of General Perceptions

Perceptions of the Public and Police on the-Use of -Body-Worn Camera in terms of General Perceptions	Mean	Verbal Interpretation	Std. Deviation	Variance
The body worn cameras are well received by coworkers.	3.97	Agree	.94	.88
The police benefit more from body cameras than citizens.	3.95	Agree	.96	.91
By wearing a body camera improves officers' job satisfaction.	4.08	Agree	.87	.76
The use of body worn cameras will improve officer training of the police.	4.11	Agree	.85	.73
The use of body worn cameras will improve overall job performance of the police.	4.18	Agree	.86	.75
The use of body worn cameras will tend to increase officer safety.	4.19	Agree	.88	.77
Average	**4.08**	**Agree**	**.89**	**.80**

Table 7 presented strong evidence of the positive public opinion regarding the use of body-worn cameras (BWCs) by police officers. The average mean score of 4.08 on a 5- point scale indicated significant public support for police officers wearing BWCs, highlighting their role in monitoring and recording interactions with the public. These findings reinforced the idea that BWCs played a pivotal role in enhancing police accountability and oversight, consequently reducing incidents of police misconduct. Prior research had consistently shown that BWCs led to a decrease in complaints against police officers, while also increasing public satisfaction with police activities. Moreover, BWCs served as tools to ensure that interactions between police and citizens occurred in a safe and ethical manner, reducing the potential for misunderstandings or confrontations.

Nonetheless, it's essential to acknowledge existing concerns regarding the potential for BWCs to be used for pervasive surveillance or "Big Brother" monitoring. Privacy issues also emerged, with worries that recorded information might be unfairly leveraged against individuals. Policymakers bore the responsibility of creating laws that struck a balance between protecting citizen privacy and utilizing BWCs for law enforcement and public safety purposes.

The establishment of ethical guidelines was deemed paramount to govern the appropriate use of BWC footage. These guidelines needed to specify the circumstances under which the footage could be accessed, the permissible purposes for its utilization, and the designated duration for data retention. 20

The substantial public support for police officers to wear BWCs while on duty implied that government entities and law enforcement agencies should consider implementing this technology as a standard practice.

From a research perspective, this study enhanced our understanding of public sentiment regarding the use of BWCs by police officers. It laid the foundation for future research endeavors that would delve into the specific impacts of BWC technology. This newfound comprehension of public expectations and beliefs concerning police officers' use of body cameras was especially critical in the context of heightened public scrutiny of police activities and the ongoing debate surrounding BWCs. Investigating public perceptions of BWCs allowed law enforcement agencies to gain a more profound understanding of community expectations regarding their services.

One notable study indicated that body-worn camera footage had a positive impact on resolving conflicts and enhancing public trust [25]. In a survey of 677 respondents, over 66% expressed the belief that police officers equipped with BWCs would improve their ability to de-escalate situations leading to arrests.

Although public opinion regarding the use of body-worn cameras by police officers was generally favorable [29], there remained a significant lack of awareness regarding the practical applications of this technology. Data from survey respondents who provided informed consent revealed that 63% had never heard of body-worn cameras, with only 22% aware of their capacity to capture video footage.

Table 8 presented the results of the Mann-Whitney U and Wilcoxon W tests, demonstrating a statistically significant difference in perceptions of body-worn cameras between two groups of respondents. The Z score, which stood at -6.431, signified a strong association, and the Asymp. Sig. value of .000 strongly suggested that the observed difference was unlikely to be attributed to chance.

Table 8.
Significance Difference on The Perception on the use of Body-worn camera if they are grouped as to category

Perception on the use of Body-worn camera	
Mann-Whitney U	2160.000
Wilcoxon W	6255.000
Z	-6.431
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	.000

Body-worn cameras were approached differently by the public and police, with the public viewing them as a tool for public oversight, while police often perceived them as intrusive. This divergence emphasized the critical need for robust policies to protect privacy and regulate data utilization.

ISSN (Online): 2455-3662
EPRA International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research (IJMR) - Peer Reviewed Journal
Volume: 9| Issue: 10| October 2023|| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2013 || SJIF Impact Factor 2023: 8.224 || ISI Value: 1.188

Furthermore, it underscored the importance of conducting additional research to fully comprehend the multifaceted impact of these cameras.

Table 9 presented the results of the Mann-Whitney U and Wilcoxon W tests, which were employed to compare two independent groups, males and females, in their perceptions of body-worn cameras. The findings revealed no significant difference between the two groups, signifying no statistically significant distinction. The Z score, which amounted to -0.461, was also not statistically significant, indicating the absence of an association between the two groups. The Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed) value of 0.645 exceeded the commonly accepted threshold of 0.05, confirming that there was no significant difference in perceptions between the two groups.

Table 9.
Significance Difference on The Perception on the use of Body-worn camera if they are grouped as to gender

Perception on the use of Body-worn camera	
Mann-Whitney U	46.000
Wilcoxon W	47.000
Z	-.461
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	.645
Exact Sig. [2*(1-tailed Sig.)]	.832[b]

The research unveiled an absence of noteworthy disparities in attitudes toward body-worn cameras, signifying that gender did not emerge as a significant determining factor. Consequently, the potential advantages of these devices appeared equally accessible to individuals of both genders. Nevertheless, it is essential to emphasize the necessity for further research aimed at scrutinizing analogous perspectives. In this regard, law enforcement should direct its attention toward addressing pertinent concerns while delving into various demographic variables and the evolving landscape of public opinion.

Table 10 disclosed that there was no significant difference in the perception of bodyworn cameras among respondents of different ages. This finding indicated that age did not necessarily complicate the perception of the use of such cameras. The MannWhitney U, Wilcoxon W, Z, Asymp. Sig., and Exact Sig. values all affirmed this conclusion.

Table 10.
Significance Difference on The Perception on the use of Body-worn camera if they are grouped as to category age.

Perception on the use of Body-worn camera	
Mann-Whitney U	34.50
Wilcoxon W	35.50
Z	0.00
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	1.00
Exact Sig. [2*(1-tailed Sig.)]	1.000[b]

The study revealed a lack of age-based bias in public acceptance of body-worn cameras, indicating the potential for enhanced transparency and communication between law enforcement and the public across different age groups. However, to further enhance public acceptance, particularly in lower-income communities, additional research was warranted. It was imperative that policymakers were well-informed about the advantages associated with the adoption of body-worn cameras to ensure their effective integration into law enforcement practices.

Table 11 demonstrated that there was no significant difference in perception of bodyworn cameras based on educational attainment, with a 95% confidence level. This finding indicated that there was no difference between the two groups of respondents regarding their views on body-worn cameras.

Table 11.
Educational Attainment of Respondents

Perception on the use of Body-worn camera	
Mann-Whitney U	57.00
Wilcoxon W	247.00
Z	0.00
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	1.00
Exact Sig. [2*(1-tailed Sig.)]	1.00[b]

The broad acceptance of body-worn cameras spanned individuals with diverse educational backgrounds, including those who may have harbored reservations regarding law enforcement practices. This underscored the imperative for inclusive community education initiatives that catered to individuals regardless of their educational attainment. Future research endeavors should also encompass an examination of factors such as gender, race, and socio-economic status, offering valuable insights to shape policies and guide empirical studies. Additionally, it's noteworthy that higher educational attainment correlated with heightened support for these cameras.

Table 12 demonstrated a significant difference in perceptions of body-worn cameras between high-income earners and low-income earners, as indicated by a MannWhitney U test and Wilcoxon W test. The Z-score was -3.40, indicating a significant difference between the two groups.

Table 12.
Significance Difference on The Perception on the use of Body-worn camera if they are grouped as to income

Perception on the use of Body-worn camera	
Mann-Whitney U	42.00
Wilcoxon W	448.00
Z	-3.40
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	0.001
Exact Sig. [2*(1-tailed Sig.)]	.173[b]

The study highlights a notable divergence in perceptions of body-worn cameras between individuals with lower and higher incomes. Low-income earners exhibited a greater propensity to endorse their use, potentially influenced by a

ISSN (Online): 2455-3662
EPRA International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research (IJMR) - Peer Reviewed Journal
Volume: 9| Issue: 10| October 2023|| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2013 || SJIF Impact Factor 2023: 8.224 || ISI Value: 1.188

desire for added Perception on the use of Body-worn camera Mann-Whitney U 57.00 Wilcoxon W 247.00 Z 0.00 Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed) 1.00 Exact Sig. [2*(1-tailed Sig.)] 1.00b financial security. Conversely, high-income earners may have harbored reservations concerning the implementation of additional accountability measures. This disparity underscores the imperative for policymaking that is comprehensive and inclusive, as well as educational initiatives aimed at bridging these differing perspectives.

The objectives of this study were clearly defined and articulated. The primary goal of this research was to conduct a comprehensive investigation into the implementation and impact of Body-Worn Cameras (BWCs) in the realm of law enforcement, with a specific focus on the perspectives of both police officers and the general public residing in Angeles City, Pampanga. The specific objectives encompassed a wide range of dimensions related to the use of BWCs, including the collection of socio-demographic information from the study participants. Furthermore, the study sought to evaluate and gauge respondents' perceptions of BWCs in various contexts, such as their use for report writing, presenting evidence in court, influencing citizen reactions, and shaping police officer behavior. Additionally, the research aimed to examine the respondents' overall sentiment regarding the familiarity, comfort, and ease of use of BWCs. The study also endeavored to provide a comprehensive analysis of the general perception of BWC utilization. In addition to these objectives, the research explored whether significant differences in perceptions existed when respondents were categorized by specific criteria or when grouped by socio-demographic profiles. These well-defined objectives provided a clear roadmap for the study's research endeavors, guiding the collection and analysis of data in a structured and meaningful manner.

IV. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

A. *Conclusions*

In conclusion, our research into the use of Body-Worn Cameras (BWCs) in law enforcement in Angeles City, Pampanga, has shed light on several crucial findings. Notably, our study revealed that BWCs are widely accepted and viewed favorably by both the public and police officers, underlining their potential as a beneficial tool for enhancing transparency, fairness, and safety in police-citizen interactions. Furthermore, the data highlighted significant trends in educational attainment and income, pointing to the need for continued efforts to promote education and address socio-economic disparities. Gender bias within the sample warrants further examination to ensure a more inclusive approach to research and policymaking.

The implications of these findings are far-reaching, as they call for gender-inclusive research practices, a focus on education promotion, responsible BWC implementation, and educational campaigns to ensure the positive impact of this technology is experienced by all segments of society. Law enforcement organizations should seriously consider the continued use of BWCs, given their potential to enhance professionalism and community trust. Importantly, our hypothesis that BWCs are wellreceived and beneficial has been confirmed by our research, providing a valuable foundation for future endeavors in this area.

In light of these findings, it is clear that BWCs hold immense promise in the realm of law enforcement. As we move forward, we must remain vigilant in our efforts to address the disparities and challenges identified, ensuring that the benefits of BWCs are shared by all members of our community.

B. *Recommendations*

Moving forward, our research points to several key recommendations for the continued exploration of body-worn cameras (BWCs) in law enforcement. While the positive perception of BWCs is evident, it is imperative that we delve deeper into the gender and socio-economic factors that may influence these perceptions. This more nuanced understanding will enable us to tailor BWC implementation to be more inclusive and equitable.

Additionally, we must expand our research to investigate the potential impact of BWCs on crime reduction and their role in building trust within the community. This exploration will provide crucial insights into the broader implications of BWC usage in law enforcement.

Continuous evaluation and refinement of BWC programs are essential. Incorporating education and community feedback will help ensure that BWCs are used responsibly, addressing concerns about data privacy, accuracy, and personal freedoms. Moreover, involving a larger and more diverse sample in our research will yield broader insights, allowing us to create more comprehensive policies and practices that benefit all segments of society.

In conclusion, these recommendations pave the way for a more comprehensive understanding of BWCs' role in law enforcement. By addressing gender and socioeconomic disparities, exploring their impact on crime reduction and community trust, and refining BWC programs through education and community feedback, we can further enhance the effectiveness, transparency, and accountability of this valuable technology.

ISSN (Online): 2455-3662
EPRA International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research (IJMR) - Peer Reviewed Journal
Volume: 9| Issue: 10| October 2023|| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2013 || SJIF Impact Factor 2023: 8.224 || ISI Value: 1.188

REFERENCES

1. *Buan, L. (2021, July 10). Cops now required to wear body cameras when serving warrants. RAPPLER. https://www.rappler.com/nation/malfunction-reasonable-grounds-can-excuse-police-supreme-court-body-camera-rule/*
2. *Fallik, S. W., Deuchar, R., & Crichlow, V. J. (2020). Body-worn cameras in the post-Ferguson era: An exploration of law enforcement perspectives. Journal of police and criminal Psychology, 35, 263-273.*
3. *Kalkhoff, W., Pollock, J., Pfeiffer, M., Chopko, B. A., Palmieri, P. A., Lewis, M. T., ... & Sigelmier, G. (2022). The Effects of Camera Monitoring on Police Officer Performance in Critical Incident Situations: a MILO Range Simulator Study. Journal of Police and Criminal Psychology, 37(3), 619-636.*
4. *Stanley, J. (2013). Police Body-Mounted Cameras: With Right Policies in Place, a Win For All. https://urbanaillinois.us/sites/default/files/attachments/police-body-mounted-cameras-stanley.pdf*
5. *Lee, Y.-H., Hsieh, Y.-C., & Chen, Y.-H. (2013). An investigation of employees' use of e-learning systems: applying the technology acceptance model. Behaviour & Information Technology, 32(2), 173–189. https://doi.org/10.1080/0144929x.2011.577190*
6. *Shane, J. M., Lawton, B., & Swenson, Z. (2017). The Prevalence of Fatal Police Shootings by U.S. Police, 2015-2016: Patterns and Answers from a New Data Set. Journal of Criminal Justice, 52, 101-111. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcrimjus.2017.05.001*
7. *Patterson, Q., & White, M. D. (2021). Is There a Civilizing Effect on Citizens? Testing the Pre-Conditions for Body Worn Camera-Induced Behavior Change. Police Quarterly,109861112199671. https://doi.org/10.1177/1098611121996716*
8. *Lum, C., Koper, C. S., Wilson, D. B., Stoltz, M., Goodier, M., Eggins, E., Higginson, A., & Mazerolle, L. (2020). Body-worn cameras' effects on police officers and citizen behavior: A systematic review. Campbell Systematic Reviews, 16(3), Article number: e1112. https://eprints.qut.edu.au/205611/*
9. *Zwart, W. (2018). Slow Your Roll out of Body-Worn Cameras: Privacy Concerns and the Tension between Transparency and Surveillance in Arizona. Arizona Law Review, 60,783.https://heinonline.org/HOL/LandingPage?handle=hein.journals/arz60&div=27&id=&page=*
10. *Drover, P., & Ariel, B. (2015). Leading an Experiment in Police Body-Worn Video Cameras. International Criminal Justice Review, 25(1), 80–97. https://doi.org/10.1177/1057567715574374*
11. *Coppola, M. (2010). Officer Worn Cameras Expand Point of View | Office of Justice Programs. Www.ojp.gov. https://www.ojp.gov/ncjrs/virtual-library/abstracts/officer-worn-cameras-expand-point-view*
12. *White, M. D. (2014). Police Officer Body-Worn Cameras: Assessing the Evidence. Office of Justice Programs. https://www.ojp.gov/library/publications/police-officer-body-worn-cameras-assessing-evidence*
13. *Fouche, A. (2014). Officer Attitudes on Deployment of Body-Worn - ProQuest. Www.proquest.com. https://www.proquest.com/docview/1543749373*
14. *Ariel, B. (2016). Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology Police Body Cameras in Large Police Departments. https://scholarlycommons.law.northwestern.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=759 6&context=jclc*
15. *Mateescu, A., Rosenblat, A., & Boyd, D. (2015). Police Body-Worn Cameras. https://www.datasociety.net/pubs/dcr/PoliceBodyWornCameras.pdf*
16. *Obasi, J. (2018). ScholarWorks Police Officers' Perceptions of Body-Worn Camera Technology. https://scholarworks.waldenu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?referer=&httpsredir=1&article=5648&context=dissertations*
17. *Alaniz-Salas, H., Dodson, K. D., & Luo, F. (2023). Transforming Research into Practice: Holding Police Accountable by Examining Officer's Attitudes Regarding Body Worn Cameras (BWCs) in a Border Community. Journal of Crime and Criminal Behavior, 3(1), 81-99.*
18. *Gross, N., & Mann, M. (2017). Is There a "Ferguson Effect?" Google Searches, Concern about Police Violence, and Crime in U.S. Cities, 2014–2016. Socius: Sociological Research for a Dynamic World, 3, 237802311770312. https://doi.org/10.1177/2378023117703122*
19. *Nix, J., Wolfe, S. E., & Campbell, B. A. (2018). Command-level police officers' perceptions of the "war on cops" and de-policing. Justice quarterly, 35(1), 33-54.*
20. *White, M. D., Todak, N., & Gaub, J. E. (2018). Examining Body-Worn Camera Integration and Acceptance Among Police Officers, Citizens, and External Stakeholders.*
21. *Guzik, K., Sesay, A., Oh, O., Ramirez, R., & Tong, T. (2019). Making the material routine: a sociomaterial study of the relationship between police body worn cameras (BWCs) and organisational routines. Policing and Society, 31(1), 1–16. https://doi.org/10.1080/10439463.2019.1705823*
22. *Crow, M. S., Snyder, J. A., Crichlow, V. J., & Smykla, J. O. (2017). Community Perceptions of Police Body-Worn Cameras. Criminal Justice and Behavior, 44(4), 589–610. https://doi.org/10.1177/0093854816688037*
23. *Vakhitova, Z., Iliadis, M., Harris, B., Tyson, D., & Flynn, A. (2022). The merits and risks of body-worn camera footage in domestic and family violence incidents and legal proceedings: a study of police perceptions and experiences. Policing and Society, 1–17. https://doi.org/10.1080/10439463.2022.2082421*

ISSN (Online): 2455-3662
EPRA International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research (IJMR) - Peer Reviewed Journal
Volume: 9| Issue: 10| October 2023|| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2013 || SJIF Impact Factor 2023: 8.224 || ISI Value: 1.188

24. *Barbosa, D., Fetzer, T., Souza, P. C., & Vieira, C. (2021, September 1). De-Escalation Technology: The Impact of Body-Worn Cameras on Citizen-Police Interactions. Papers.ssrn.com. https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=3960150*
25. *Coudert, F., Butin, D., & Le Métayer, D. (2015). Body-worn cameras for police accountability: Opportunities and risks. Computer Law & Security Review, 31(6), 749–762. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.clsr.2015.09.002*
26. *Stoughton, S. W. (2017). Police Body-Worn Cameras. North Carolina Law Review, 96, 1363. https://heinonline.org/HOL/LandingPage?handle=hein.journals/nclr96&div=42&id=&page=*
27. *Ariel, B., Sutherland, A., Henstock, D., Young, J., Drover, P., Sykes, J., Megicks, S., & Henderson, R. (2016). Wearing Body Cameras Increases Assaults against Officers and Does Not Reduce Police Use of force: Results from a Global multi-site Experiment. European Journal of Criminology, 13(6), 744–755. https://doi.org/10.1177/1477370816643734*
28. *Hyatt, J. M., Mitchell, R. J., & Ariel, B. (2017). The Effects of a Mandatory Body-Worn Camera, Policy on Officer Perceptions of Accountability, Oversight, and Departmental Culture. Villanova Law Review, 62, 1005. https://heinonline.org/HOL/LandingPage?handle=hein.journals/vllalr62&div=40&id=&page=*
29. *Todak, N., & Gaub, J. E. (2019). Predictors of police body-worn camera acceptance: digging deeper into officers' perceptions. Policing: An International Journal, ahead-of-print(ahead-of-print). https://doi.org/10.1108/pijpsm-06-2019-0085*