UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Santa Barbara

Competing Demands in Police Positioning: Institutional Logics in Law Enforcement

Recruitment Videos

A dissertation submitted in partial satisfaction of the

requirements for the degree Doctor of Philosophy

in Communication

by

Matthew Neil Giles

Committee in charge:

Professor Karen Myers, Chair

Professor Howard Giles

Professor Linda Putnam

September 2023

The dissertation of Matthew Neil Giles is approved.

_____

Howard Giles

_____

Linda Putnam

_____

Karen Myers, Committee Chair

September 2023

VITA OF MATTHEW NEIL GILES

September, 2023

EDUCATION

Bachelor of Science in Communications, Brigham Young University Hawaii, December 2012

Master of Arts in Media, Culture, and Communication, New York University, May, 2015

Doctor of Philosophy in Communication, University of California, Santa Barbara, September 2024

RESEARCH

PUBLICATIONS

**Giles, M.**, Pines, R., Giles, H. (2020) Testing the communication model of intergroup interdependence: The case of American and Canadian relations. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology.*

**Giles, M.,** Metzger, M., Dunbar, N., Burgoon, J. (2020) The impact of culture in deception and deception detection. In V.S. Subrahmanian, J. Burgoon, &N.E. Dunbar (eds.) *Detecting Trust and Deception in Group Interaction.* Springer.

Dorn, B., Dunbar, N. E., Burgoon, J. K., Nunamaker, J. F., **Giles, M.**, Walls, B, Chen, X., Wang, R., Ge, T., & Subrahmanian, V.S. (2020) A system for multi-person, multi-modal data collection in behavioral information systems. In V.S. Subrahmanian, J. Burgoon, &N.E. Dunbar (eds.) *Detecting Trust and Deception in Group Interaction.* Springer.

Dunbar, N.E., Dorn, B., Hansia, M., Ford, B., **Giles, M.**, Metzger, M., Burgoon, J. K., Nunamaker, J. F., & Subrahmanian, V. S. (2020) Dominance in groups: How dyadic power theory can apply to group discussions In V.S. Subrahmanian, J. Burgoon, &N.E. Dunbar (eds.) *Detecting Trust and Deception in Group Interaction*. Springer.

**Giles, M.**, Giles, H., Bernhold, Q. (2019) Cultural festivals as intergroup settings: A case study of Pacific Islander identities. *Journal of Multicultural and Multilingual Development*.

Dunbar, N.E., Bernhold, Q., Adams, A., Zamanzadeh, N., **Giles, M.**, Gangi, K., Coveleski, S., Giles, H., Fujiwara, K. (2018) Micro-level lies about ingroup Affiliation: Exploring the strategic synchrony hypothesis. *Journal of Nonverbal Behavior.*

**Giles, M.**, Pines, R., Giles, H., & Gardikiotis, A. (2018) Towards a communication model of intergroup interdependence. *Atlantic Journal of Communication, 26*, 122-130.

**Giles, M.** (2015). The myth of colorblindness: Racial narratives in Ferguson news coverage. *Canadian Journal of Cultural Studies: eTopia. 11*, 33-58.

CONFERENCE PRESENTATIONS

**Giles, M.** (2023, May). *Navigating institutional complexity in the context of police recruitment social media.* Paper to be presented to the Organizational Communication Division of the International Communication Association. Toronto, Canada.

**Giles, M.** (2022, November). *Intergroup attitudes and peer judgment in non-traditional family settings.* Panel discussion at the International/Intercultural Communication Division of the National Communication Association. New Orleans, LA.

**Giles, M.** (2021, May). *The Communication Model of Intergroup Interdependence: Testing Group Heuristic Formation.* Paper presented online to the Intergroup Communication Division of the International Communication Association. Gold Coast, Australia.

**Giles, M.** (2020, October). *Recruiting for the blue team in the context of #BLACKLIVESMATTER: A mixed methods content analysis of policing identity online.* Paper presented online at the Organizational Communication Mini Conference: Tampa, FL.

Martinez, L.V., **Giles, M.** (2020, October). *Religious conversion and organizational identification: Exploring the process of organizational assimilation with the communication theory of identity.* Paper presented online at the Organizational Communication Mini Conference: Tampa, FL.

**Giles, M.**, Myers, K. (2020, November). *Counterflows: Explaining Police and Firefighter Actions and Consequences for the Communicative Constitution of Organizations Following Policy Changes.* Paper presented online to the Organizational Communication Division of the National Communication Association. Indianapolis, IN.

**Giles, M.** (2019, October). *Interpreting mediated representations of identity: Building identification.* Paper presented at the Organizational Communication Mini Conference: Rutgers, NJ.

**Giles, M.** (2019, May). *Conceptualizing occupational identity of police officers: A synthesis of intergroup and organizational theory.* Paper presented at the Organizational Communication Division of the International Communication Association. Washington, D.C.

**Giles, M.**, Pines, R. (2019, June) *Intergroup interdependence*. Paper presented at the 2nd International Conference on Intergroup Communication: Bologna, Italy.

**Giles, M.** (2019, May). *Identity in the Four Flows.* Paper presented at the Organizational Communication Division of the International Communication Association. Washington, D.C.

**Giles, M.** (2018, October). *Organizational oppositions and identity conflicts: Membership negotiation challenges for police officers.* Paper presented at the Organizational Communication Mini Conference: Rutgers, NJ.

**Giles, M.**, Pines, R. (2018, June) *Experimenting using intergroup interdependence theory*. Paper presented at the 16th Annual International Conference on Language and Social Psychology: Edmonton.

**Giles, M.**, Pines, R. (2018, May) *Intergroup interdependence as a new praxis for intergroup theory*. Paper presented to the Intergroup Communication Division of the International Communication Association. Prague, Czech Republic.

**Giles, M.**, Pines, R. (2017, June) *Intergroup interdependence*. Paper presented at the 1st International Conference on Intergroup Communication: Thessaloniki, Greece.

**Giles, M.** (2017, May). *The role of festivals in creating and maintaining social identities.* Paper presented to the Intergroup Communication Division of the International Communication Association: San Diego, CA.

**Giles, M.** (2016, June). *Festivals: Syncretic social identities in intergroup environments.* Paper presented at the 15th Annual International Conference on Language and Social Psychology: Bangkok.

**Giles, M.** (2016, June). *Constructing and deconstructing same sex attraction as an index of identity.* Paper presented at the 15th Annual International Conference on Language and Social Psychology: Bangkok

**Giles, M.** (2016, June). *The myth of colorblindness.* Paper presented to the Ethnicity and Race in Communication Division of the International Communication Association: Fukuoka

**Giles, M.** (2015, April). *Experiencing Ferguson on film: Narrative identity synthesis in the media spotlight.* Paper presented at the IS|CS Research Conference: York University, Toronto.

**Giles, M.** (2014, October). '*It was only a donation': When attitudes about same-sex marriage collide with corporate culture as viewed through Mozilla's Brandon Eich's resignation.* Paper presented to the Intercultural Communication Division: New York State Communication Association Conference, New York.

**Giles, M.** (2013, April). *The 2012 Festival of Pacific Arts in Honiara, Solomon Islands: Narrative identity construction in a post-civil war nation.* Paper presented at BYU Student Research Associate Conference, La`ie.

**Giles, M.** (2012, March). *'...and I'm a Mormon': The LDS media campaign solution to a 'perception problem.'* BYUH Student Research Association Conference, La`ie.

TEACHING

Assistant Professor, Ringling College of Art and Design

Teaching Associate, University of California, Santa Barbara

Teaching Assistant, New York University

AWARDS

UCSB – Center for Black Studies Research Fellow, August 2019

UCSB – Interdisciplinary Humanities Center Fellow, October 2017

UCSB – Chancellor's Fellow, September 2015

NYU – Media, Culture, and Communication Flagbearer, April 2015

NYU – Mitchell Leaska Scholar, September 2014

BYUH – Student International Research Associate, February 2012

ABSTRACT

Organizations must continually work toward positioning themselves to develop a favorable identity with various audiences. Many organizations operate in complex environments with two or more potentially opposing logics—orientations that guide their mission, activities and relationships (Wallace, 1990). As organizations communicate and enact their logics, representations that appeal to some can be less favorably perceived by others. Police departments operate in such an environment causing them to manage these tensions in their communication for recruitment. This dissertation includes two phases to examine the depiction of opposing institutional logics in police department (PD) recruitment videos. These studies explored the nature and relationship of community-oriented policing (COP) and traditional enforcement (TE) logics, integrating an institutional logics perspective (Thornton & Ocasio, 1999) with a tensional approach (Putnam et al., 2016).

The purpose of Phase I was to determine whether police recruitment videos could be categorized into either TE, COP, both or neither. Do videos representing police logics demonstrate identifiable patterns? In Phase I, a codebook was developed incorporating audio, visual, thematic, and narrative elements. 312 PD recruitment videos were coded and analyzed. The analysis confirmed that the videos predominately demonstrated either the COP logic, the TE logic, or both. This last group demonstrated institutional complexity by attempting to present their department with more than one logic. My analysis yielded six primary themes for the COP logic (personalized engagement, self-differentiation from field, demonstrations of community-centric policies, internalization of COP as a process, and diversity as strength) and four primary themes for the TE logic (exciting storytelling, officer heroics, incomplete COP, and hierarchical orientation).

In Phase II, I sampled three videos from each of the COP and TE categories, and two videos from the mixed —-to investigate how the logics that often are in opposition to each other appear to interact when depicted in the same video representing the attitudes and behaviors of a PD. I found that, at times, videos presented a dualistic approach by grouping activities/units that pertained to one or the other logic and then presenting them before moving on the activities/units that represented the other logic in the department. This acknowledges that both logics exist but treats them as dualistic—present but separate. Other departments were noted to treat the logics as dialectics, by simultaneously presenting both logics—not as oppositional—but as choices that officers were expected to make, which were not necessarily mutually exclusive.

I found several strategies for how videos demonstrate the interplay of the logics, illustrating the importance of scene sequencing for narratives, humor for presenting counternarratives, and department orientation for conceptualizing the relationship between the logics. I identified three ways to represent multiple logics: 1) vacillation which draw in turn from either logic, 2) chunks which split and lump the logics into separate sections, and 3) attention-getters which present a drastically different introduction than the rest of the video. These results demonstrate that departments strategically use humor, cinematography, music, sequencing, as well as carefully selecting the actors to represent their department in various ways to attract the attention of potential recruits. The implications for theory and practice are discussed, before I turn to a review of the limitations and future directions for research in police recruitment and work.

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

# CHAPTER ONE - INTRODUCTION

In recent years, dangerous and deadly incidents between police officers and community members have called attention to police practices and competing interests in resolving these conflicts (for a review, see p. 30-3x below). Some claim that reactive and authoritarian traditional enforcement (TE) strategies (e.g., Weisburg & Eck's (2004) standard model of policing, Wilson's (1968a) legalistic and watchman styles of policing) historically used by PDs to harshly treat individuals they deem as suspects are the root of the problem. As a result, TE tactics are being questioned and criticized by many segments of society. In situations where PDs values and officer performance have remained static in the face of dramatic national change, some departments resist pro-community cultural shifts and retain an enforcement stance that fosters distrust and aggressive interactions between police and the community (Tyler & Jackson, 2014). At the same time, other PDs have responded by affirming their commitment to community-oriented policing (COP) which emphasizes police officer involvement in the community and mutual problem-solving. However, these affirmations by some departments do not necessarily signal dramatic changes in the way that police officers do their work or in the way they communicate their mission to various audiences (Gau & Brunson, 2015).

The image of many PDs has suffered. Public confidence in police officers dropped to 52% in 2015, even lower than previous record-breaking slumps (60-65%) that followed the race riots of the early 1990s (Jones, 2020). Notably, Black and White citizens perceive police very differently, with 84% of Whites reporting that they feel confident that police are acting in the best interests of the public, but only 56% of Blacks (Gilberstadt, 2020). These clashes are indicative of tensions between two very different goals for police work: enforcing laws

on citizens and/or working with citizens to inspire cooperation. Efforts to reconcile these two goals by bringing the community into the department's decision-making are stymied by ineffective implementations of community review boards (Dailey et al, 2006). While these issues are unique to PDs, many organizations face similar issues (tensions) in how they view their work and how they interact with various stakeholders.

Organizations are embedded in competing demands, tensions, and paradoxes (Lewis & Smith, 2014; Putnam et al., 2016). Tensions emerge when organizational members encounter some level of competing demands as they attend to the different pressures that dictate their behaviors or encounter opposite goals (Putnam & Fairhurst, 2018). For example, competing demands surface when an organization must increase productivity without increasing payroll, or when an organization feels pressures to achieve different goals for different stakeholders. Competing demands can also result from the differences between contrasting expectations (Lewis, 2000), an evolving climate (Fairhurst & Putnam, 2014), or any time that organizational members face dilemmas (Cameron & Quinn, 1988). Tensions often grow or decrease according to an organization's ability to respond to competing demands simultaneously (Trethewey & Ashcraft, 2004).

These types of clashes are not inherently negative because tensions can be productive, helping to clarify how an organization approaches their work (Lederach, 2003). Struggles between opposites can manifest as new values and practices enter fields bringing with them new ideas, while others become less favored and shift the landscape, adding complexity to the field. This institutional complexity is constantly emergent, unraveling and reforming to reshape the field (Scott, 2008). The institutional complexity faced by an organization is a function of the organization's position within the field, such that those which are more

2

"central" to the field are more highly embedded in the institutional pressures which influence their form and function (Greenwood et al, 2011). In addition to position, an organization's structure and leadership influence the degree to which it is sensitive to certain prevailing trends within the field as opposed to others. When organizations are expected to respond to the competing demands of multiple stakeholders simultaneously, the level of institutional complexity that they face increases. This dissertation applies two divergent, but complementary theoretical frameworks-- institutional logics, and the tensional approach--to understand the nature of these competing demands and how organizations respond to and communicate them.

The institutional logics framework (Thornton & Ocasio, 1999) broadly asserts that competing demands emerge from opposing societal expectations and institution-wide scripts about how work should be done (Friedland & Alford, 1991). An institutional logic is a type of rationality or a collection of rule-bound choices among alternatives of action (Wallace, 1990). By "providing individuals with vocabularies of motives and with a sense of self" (Friedland & Alford, 1991, p. 251), institutional logics inspire compliance with the existing worldviews most prominent in the environment. These logics originate in environments where people establish and rely upon shared rules of engagement to work together fluidly and reliably, such as when members of a shared occupation work together to achieve complementary tasks (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983). When these rules are shared across multiple organizations across an entire institution, they become self-reinforcing and self-replicating, but as organizations intersect across fields, the interaction between multiple legitimated scripts or rationalities increases the level of institutional complexity. The solution to one problem or situation may be different when approached from a different institutional

logic, leading to a clash between different societal-level values. This often positions competing demands as emergent at the macro level, resulting from opposite social forces occupying the same institutional space (Ocasio et al., 2017).

In contrast, the tensional approach generally situates competing demands as inherent to the process of organizing itself, with the struggle over opposites resulting from social interactions and organizational practices (Putnam et al., 2016). It focuses on the points of connection between clashing issues or ideas and explores how organization occurs when individuals attempt to harmonize these tensions. Taken broadly, the term tension is used to describe the competing demands faced by organizations and the anxieties faced by individual members as they encounter dilemmas in their organizational lives (Schad et al., 2016). Competing demands can be considered constitutively, focusing on their emergence in discourse, as the result of interactions, due to changes in socio-historical conditions, and as indicators of ongoing struggles over meaning (Putnam et al, 2014). During these interactions, struggles over meaning shape the organization as they establish their own rationality within the institutional field.

I combine these two frameworks for studying the competing pressures faced by organizations to navigate multiple logics. My approach juxtaposes the positivist binary orientation employed with institutional logics against the dynamic interplay inherent in the tensional approach. In my analysis, I first use institutional theory to identify the underlying rules of engagement which are informed by the institutional logics in the field. I then apply a tensional approach to explore how the organizations position competing logics and identify what type of competing demands emerge. This study responds to a call from within the field

of institutional scholarship to systematically study the ways that organizations respond to competing demands (Goodrick & Reay, 2011; Pache & Santos, 2012).

As an institution, policing is constantly mired in competing institutional logics (Reiner, 2000) as officers face tensions at all levels of the organization. Competing demands are placed on officers individually and departments collectively as officers are asked to fulfill the roles of community advocate and criminal enforcer, to both prevent crime and catch criminals, and to protect citizens' civil rights by violating the civil rights of suspects (Koslicki, 2020; Van Maanen, 1973). Police departments are expected to enact the will of the public, manage conflict in civil governance with elected officials, respond to complaints from aggrieved individuals, prevent crime, catch criminals, and foster positive relationships with the community, local businesses, protesters, and most everyone (Gau, 2015). Especially in the context of policing during the COVID-19 pandemic, officers continually faced competing expectations to protect the right to public assembly while being expected to enforce public health protocols (see for review Sharma et al., 2021 for an analysis of government interventions in Europe). As officers engage in these overwhelming and often competing tasks, they almost universally enact either of the two most prominent institutional logics in this field, COP and TE. The COP logic encourages service, humility, collaboration, and collectivist thinking, while the TE logic centers on legalistic enforcement, honor, hierarchy, and personal privilege.

In this context, PDs today face a recruitment and retention crisis (Wilson, 2010; Smith, 2022; Wenus, 2022). Police departments need to hire candidates who are qualified despite noncompetitive salaries, dedicated to the department in the face of public distrust, and adaptable to changing job roles, yet comfortable in a rigidly structured organizational

hierarchy (Jordan et al., 2009). All of these requirements are met by a potential workforce that struggles to meet restrictive hiring criteria due to increased debt, and a potential candidate pool threatened by obesity and drug usage (Derby, 2008).

My work investigates how the organization's conceptualization of the relationship between competing institutional logics in their field can impact their communication and their public image and institutional positioning. To study this interplay, I analyze the way that PDs represent themselves in the recruitment videos that they distribute on social media, as well as the relationship that is construed between the different institutional logics in these videos. The way that the department chooses to depict the occupation in their recruitment media reflects the department's conceptualization of each logic as well as the relationship and compatibility of the logics to each other. I closely analyze a selection of videos which use different strategies for presenting competing logics according to the department's paradigm for connecting them. This reveals the affordances of different treatments of multiple logics.

To fulfill the aforementioned goals of this study, the following Chapter Two reviews four bodies of literature relevant to this study: the first three of which provide the theoretical foundation for examining dynamics in the policing profession. These are (a) the role of organizational identity and humor from a social identity theory perspective, (b) an exploration of institutional complexity and the insights of institutional logics (c) a review of the tensional approach from a constitutive perspective, and (d) scholarship on policing to elaborate the unique challenges faced by PDs when engaged in institutional positioning work. The chapter concludes with the proposed research questions that guide this study. Chapter Three presents both methods and results of Phase I in which I use existing typologies

of police logics to examine narratives and behaviors depicted in police recruitment videos. I group the videos accordingly and identify common characteristics and ideals communicated in each type. On the basis of the findings of Phase I, Phase II in Chapter Four presents findings from analysis of videos from three groups—those that relied primarily on TE logics, those that primarily used a COP logic and those that used both. From that I describe how they communicated their logics using various narrative techniques intended to attract potential recruits. Chapter Five, I describe limitations of the two research phases, provide a research agenda and, in conclusion, discuss implications for these studies to extend knowledge about logics and how they are communicated to audiences. I also discuss limitations and directions for future research.

# CHAPTER TWO - LITERATURE REVIEW

### *Social Identity and Logics in Organizations*

Social identities communicate who we are and the values that we stand for. They are foundational with all social entities developing and projecting identities that distinguish them from others and guide their goals and activities (Ashforth & Mael, 1989; Tajfel, 1982). Like individuals, an organization's identity is the basis for how it is perceived in society. Many factors create and shape an organization's identity including the goals it sets, their formal-informal communications, as well as their daily practices and other behaviors. An organization's identity emerges due to incidents that were not part of its strategic plan, for example, factory accidents causing harm to individuals, worker layoffs or discriminatory practices that surface over time. Social identity also can be intentionally crafted and nurtured such as when it supports the success and wellbeing of organizational members or when the organization problem-solves with members of the community. Thereafter, the organization becomes not only associated with these activities, but recognized as being part of them. For organizations, their social identity is foundational because "organizations use their established identity programs and identity messages within networks of activities and projects, including mission statements, articulations of value and ethics, and marketing materials" (Cheney et al., 2014, p. 695-696).

According to social identity theory (SIT; see critique Demirden, 2021), organizations (like individuals) categorize themselves and their members as being distinct from others who are not part of their organization or of their workgroup (Ashforth & Mael, 1989). By promoting an "us versus them" image, they can attract and retain members and customers who share similar values, and also unite against others whose values and practices are

perceived to differ (Harwood et al., 2005). Through various communications, organizations can *position* themselves and their members as unique and potentially preferred to the competition (Davies & Harre, 1990). Positioning was first conceptualized by marketers as a technique used by brands in which a brand differentiates features and benefits of its own brand to elements of others (Trout & Ries, 1986). As organizations operate and communicate, they too engage in positioning by distinguishing themselves from some organizations which simultaneously links their organization to others in the minds of stakeholders, including potential members (Van Langenhove & Harre, 1995). While some elements of an organization's identity—its values and standard practices--may appeal to some groups (those in its in-group), they may be less attractive to others (those in the out-group) whose values differ. Thus, by communicating elements of identity—it attracts some, but repeals others. One of the most significant ways leaders develop their organization's identity and position it relative to others is by communicating the logic under which they operate.

As one framework for studying these competing demands, institutional theory highlights the divergent pressures from field-level actors (Greenwood et al., 2011). The institutional perspective on organizing draws heavily from sociology, positing that there are overarching sets of principles that inform how actors interpret and interact in their social environment known as *institutional logics* (Friedland & Alford, 1991). Haveman and Gualtieri (2017) define institutional logics as "systems of cultural elements (values, beliefs, and normative expectations) by which people, groups, and organizations make sense of and evaluate their everyday activities and organize those activities in time and space" (p. 7). Institutional logics are the underlying rules and beliefs that constitute an organization's guiding principles and

frame member behavior (Friedland & Alford, 1991). As socially constructed sets of instructions and patterns for interacting with others, logics establish what is considered legitimate behavior at the individual, organizational, and institutional level (Friedland & Alford, 1991; Thornton & Ocasio, 2008). Embodied in practices and ideas, logics shape the rules of the game (Dunn & Jones, 2010) by providing a set of assumptions which "constrain and enable the potential agency of actors" (Suddaby & Greenwood, 2005, p. 37). By "providing individuals with vocabularies of motives and with a sense of self" (Friedland & Alford, 1991, p. 251), institutional logics inspire compliance with the existing worldviews most prominent in the environment. These logics originate in spaces where people establish and rely upon shared rules of engagement to work together more fluidly and reliably, such as members of a shared occupation working to achieve complementary tasks (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983).

Professional organizations are often structured around one dominant institutional logic which guides behavior by providing actors with established rationales for behavior and vocabularies for communication (Barbour & Lammers, 2015; Thornton, 2004). Institutional complexity results when organizations face incompatible logics simultaneously, requiring them to split their efforts or resources to attend to competing demands. In the context of organizational change, logics are often conceptualized as functionally antagonistic, with one logic being replaced by another which is more adaptive in a new environment. For example, Thornton (2002) outlined the development from editorial logics in publishing to a market logic. Similarly, Rao et al. (2003) investigated underlying institutional logics in the culinary field and documented how the playful and experimental nouvelle culinary style of cuisine replaced the more meticulous and strictly defined style of haute cuisine.

These changes can develop over decades as social ideals slowly shift, but they often result from a market jolt or external force which establishes the demand for a new dominant logic. Demonstrating this, Thornton and Ocasio (1999) describe how a wave of acquisitions in the educational textbook publishing field drove a sharp shift from Editors in Chief as the highest-ranking authority within a publishing house to CEOs and executive boards calling the shots. Investigating a likewise sudden shift, Scott et al. (2000) explored the shifting trends in organizational structure and management as the medical field reoriented around logics of corporate healthcare in the 1990s during a period of deregulation and insurance conglomeration. These periods of change create an environment wherein multiple logics are co-present in the field because one is overtaking the other. However, for many fields, there are multiple logics at play with institutional actors navigating between different paradigms simultaneously. Encouraging an institutional logics approach to exploring how organizations move through conflicted spaces, Schneiberg and Clemens (2006) argue, "an appreciation of both the heterogeneity and relative incoherence of fields is crucial for empirical explorations of institutional change" (p. 210). Sometimes these institutional environments are fragmented and make conflicting demands of organizational actors (D'Aunno et al., 1991). When different subgroups within a field attempt to shape the field for their advantages, such as by changing the governing regulations in the field, asserting new rights, or critically reinterpreting narratives, agreement between groups may not be possible (Berman, 2006). This approach highlights when multiple institutional logics are in conflict as opposed to others which pluralistically coexist together (Bucher & Strauss, 1961; Jones, 2001; Seo and Creed, 2002; Lounsbury, 2007).

Institutional fields intersect across institutional spheres, and as such are "subject to multiple regulatory regimes, embedded within multiple normative orders, and/or constituted by more than one cultural logic" (Kraatz & Block, 2008, p. 243). The presence of multiple logics can result in varying levels of conflict within the field, ranging from relatively peaceful hybridization, wherein one logic comes to incorporate some component of another logic from a parallel field (Townley, 2002); transition, where organizations abandon one logic in favor of a dominant logic because of a shift in culture or unsustainable tension between the two (Suddaby & Greenwood, 2005); or even conflict, where different subgroups within the occupation engage in activism for a shift in dominant logics (Bucher & Strauss, 1961; Lounsbury, 2007).

With attention to the different forces which increase institutional complexity, I examine how organizations depict multiple logics when engaged in self representation. After discussing how each logic is represented, I will next consider how the logics are presented together as complementary or inconsistent. When these logics are presented as competing, the way that the organization treats the relationship between these logics has an important influence on how the two logics can be depicted. The section below explains how organizational communication scholarship has coalesced around the topic of the competing demands that constitute them, outlining the underlying theories and the guiding movements which impact the field today. One commonly used means of establishing in-groups and out-groups and connecting or contrasting differing logics is humor. Humor and its functions related to social identity are next described.

### *Social Identity and Humor*

Humor is useful for building in-group affiliation, especially when disparaging humor is employed (see Ford et al., 2018). I use social identity theory (SIT; Tajfel & Turner, 1986) to analyze the effects of disparaging humor perceptions of group typicality. SIT explains the underlying psychological processes which result in prejudice. By focusing on intergroup interaction, this theoretical framework explores how an individual positions both themselves within their own social group and how they perceive that social group relative to others. Group memberships are often core to individual identities, providing the members with a set of socially informed rules and resources for interacting with the world. SIT asserts that because group members want to succeed, they likewise desire for their group to be successful, resulting in pressure to evaluate their own group positively. Intergroup humor has been demonstrated to enhance and reinforce the morale of ingroup members while decreasing the morale of outgroup members against whom it is directed (Abrams & Bippus, 2011; Barron, 1950). Organizational messaging often uses humor to frame membership in the organization in a positive light, and the way in which an organizational member mentally organizes their own group memberships is reflected in which different types of humor they appreciate (Granfield & Giles, 1975). This has significant implications on the effects of using different types of humor.

Because disparaging humor implicitly derogates the outgroup, any time an organization uses this type of humor, they increase the vitality of the ingroup at the expense of an outgroup (Giles et al., 1976). This highlights the significance of the relationship between the organization and the outgroup target of the joke. When this joke comes from a small department and targets big city departments where officers must slog through rush hour

13

traffic, the relationship between these two groups may adjust for the members of the organization. However, this adjustment has no significant effect on any intergroup dynamics which are salient in the interaction between officers and members of the community. However, when organizations disparage members of an outgroup with which they regularly interact, prospective members are faced with either lowering their opinion of the target outgroup or lowering their opinion of the organization. This approach might fail to attract organizational members who identify with some aspect of the depicted outgroup such as ethnicity or even their status as citizens interacting with law enforcement.

Ford and Ferguson (2004) demonstrated that disparaging humor reinforces "negative stereotypes and prejudice at the individual level." They likewise assert that disparaging humor maintains "cultural or societal prejudice at the macrosociological level" (p. 80). This study extends their analysis, demonstrating how the characteristics of some types of humor allow for group-level derogation. Studying disparaging jokes is a fruitful context for theory building and understanding the intricacies of intergroup relations. Humor is commonly used in persuasive messaging, but the role of humor in persuasion is far from simple.

Humor often is used to attract and retain the attention of audiences. Communication and marketing research on humor has identified a three-step process model for humor which describes the process by which a viewer is (1) aroused, (2) experiences tension, (3) and has that tension reduced so that they can then enjoy arousal (Monro, 1951; Speck, 1991; Weinberger & Gulas, 2019). However, for a viewer to process humor, they must first shift out of a realistic processing mode and into a mode of play (McGhee, 1979; Meyer, 2000; Piaget, 1962). Initially, the viewer must experience a disruption from normalcy by being

surprised as a result of an incongruity. Subsequently, that disruption must be resolved in a way which restores equilibrium in a surprising way (Speck, 1991).

In some situations, humor also can be used strategically when negative or uncomfortable information is presented as a buffer against cognitive and emotional strain. This is effective because the processing of humor requires the individual to utilize cognitive resources that cannot be used to process other information, which can be helpful when an organization needs to present information but desires to avoid scrutiny about certain issues. When the positivity generated by humor outshines the negativity, humor can also help to reframe messaging in a more positive light (Yoon & Tinkham 2013). In sum, humor elicits positive emotions of happiness and mirth, helping to neutralize the negative emotions (Chan 2011; Martin & Ford, 2018).

Humor has been found to work in three different pathways: First, "Ahhhh" humor (safety humor) provides relief to audiences (Martin & Ford, 2018; Morreall, 1983) This construction of humor depends on the viewer first experiencing heightened anxiety due to the initial stimulus that causes arousal, followed by a quick release of that anxiety and a feeling of security once the threat has been neutralized. No longer experiencing tension, the viewer enjoys their newfound sense of security. The second type, "Ah-Ha" humor (incongruity resolution) results from the cognitive realization that things are being combined in a non-normative way (Shultz, 1976; Yus, 2017). This construction of humor depends on the viewer recognizing that something doesn't fit with normal circumstances and experiencing a sense of confusion, followed by the pleasure of mastering that confusion. Third, is "Ha-Ha" humor (disparagement) that puts down a victim (Ford, 2015; Monro, 1951; Parrott, 2016; Purpel, 1981). This construction of humor depends on a triadic relationship between the joke teller,

the joke hearer, and the victim. The person who hears the joke is being recruited to join

groups against the victim, is offered humor as payment, and demonstrates acceptance with

laughter. In discussing disparaging humor, Freud (1960) suggested that by conveying

messages in this form, the joke teller and hearer can misdirect attention away from the way

that the joke victimizes its subject to the technique of the joke, or its wit. This allows this

form of humor to rationalize what is otherwise socially unacceptable behavior without

accepting responsibility for enjoying the humor at the expense of the victim (Zillmann &

Cantor, 1976). Humor has also surfaced as a way to manage tensions competing demands,

particularly in challenging norms, opening up meanings, and serving as serious playfulness

(Putnam et al., 2016).

### *The Tensional Approach*

The interaction between oppositional forces is a generative site of study for

communication scholarship. The tensional approach focuses on the points of connection

between competing issues or ideas (Putnam et al., 2016). Taken broadly, the term tension is

used to describe the struggle between competing demands, goals, and directions that

organizations face. Tension can be considered constitutively, focusing on their emergence in

discourse, as the result of interactions, due to changes in socio-historical conditions, and as

indicators of ongoing struggles over meaning. This framework positions competing demands

as inherent to organizations, emerging through relational dynamics, and grounded in real

world experience. As a process-oriented field, organizational communication provides

valuable insights into the nature of these interactions (Poole et al., 2004). The tensional

approach is dynamic, requiring an ongoing and recursive processual response. Because of the

universality of tension, the literature that approaches the topic comes from a broad range of

groups, often resulting in heterogenous approaches to the phenomenon of interconnected opposites. However, any theoretical framework which focuses on the specific aspects of an issue that compete delineates two categories: things which engage in a struggle of opposites and things which are consistent and removed from competing demands. When studying interactions across an institutional field, oppositions are indicators of difference and the unmatched nature of contrasting elements, while the areas without the same tensions outline institutional consistencies and organizational synergies (Schad et al., 2016).

Drawing on scholarship from a variety of different literatures into one metatheoretical framework, Putnam et al. (2016) elaborate a constitutive approach to tension, describing different classifications of competing demands which emerge in organizational life. These competing demands, or oppositional elements that "foster a tug-of-war experience" (Cameron & Quinn, 1988, p. 2) are known as contradictions. Paradox denotes "persistent contradictions between interdependent elements" (Schad, et al., 2016, p. 6). Tension results from the--se contradictions, or competing pulls, on organizational members or clashes of ideas for how to solve complex problems or operate in ambiguous circumstances (Fairhurst et al., 2002; Fairhurst & Putnam, 2014).

### *Hallmarks of the Tensional Approach*

Putnam et al.'s (2016; Fairhurst & Putnam, 2019) constitutive approach advanced how scholars study the interaction of opposing forces in innovative ways. The constitutive approach considers how communication constitutes competing demands, ones that can be seen as complementary or mutually exclusive. The paradox literature describes contradictions as oppositional elements (Schad et al., 2016), but does not inherently explicate the constitution of opposites or the nature of their struggles. The constitutive situates tensions

17

as inherent to the juxtaposition of different ideas, such as clashes between career goals and personal satisfaction inherent to work/life balance. Using a constitutive approach, the applicable frame shifts from members' experience of discomfort to tensions as "routine building blocks of organizational life that are not necessarily negative" (Woo, 2019, p. 75).

This approach to tension pivots the focus away from the psychology of individual cognition or the large-scale institutional logics towards organizational discourse, social group interactions, and organizational behavior. This perspective is empowered by its ability to investigate communication as a force which does more than transmit information, focusing instead on the power of communication to enact organization (McPhee & Zaug, 2009). Through this organizational enactment competing demands are created, resolved, or in any other way, engaged. This framework elevates the role of organizational communication in shaping organizational structures (Cooren & Martine, 2016). By focusing on the process through which competing demands are developed, this perspective offers insights into the way that tensions evolve over time in organizations and institutions through communicative acts. The constitutive approach asserts that communication can create competing demands, reduce tensions, or manage contradictions, given that people experience tension as a communicative phenomenon (Putnam et al., 2016). From this standpoint, organizational communication is the fundamental medium through which tensions move and develop throughout an institution.

Tensions emerge between different institutional logics which are in tension due to institutional change or the influence of multiple logics. In these situations, the struggle between logics is generative because it demonstrates how an issue can develop over time despite a lack of change in other areas of the organization. Juxtaposing the tension between

inclusion and exclusion, Koschmann and Laster (2011) described how a neighborhood association benefited from the group's inclusive response to divergent members. Longtime friends and neighbors in the association perceived ignorance and ill intentions from the group of White male investors who contributed to gentrification in their community. However, when the investors were allowed to speak in meetings, the diversity of voices stimulated new feedback, increased group participation, and sparked innovation amongst the association. By allowing members to participate, communicate, and thereby constitute the organization in ways that are not dictated through the hierarchy, new opportunities emerge. A similar dynamic emerges when workgroups are given greater agency in how to resolve conflicts. When workgroups are given flexibility in their approaches to conflict resolution, productivity increases, but managers cite increased difficulty in leading the team (Canales, 2014).

When considering the role of struggles within an organization, many organizational behaviors can be framed according to their tensional interactions. Having defined tensions and outlined some of their pertinent interactions, I now explore how different types of tensional interactions, referred to by Fairhurst and Putnam (2019) as oppositions (e.g., dualism, duality, contradiction, dialectic, paradox, etc.) to conceptualize the relationship between interacting forces in different ways. Does one overtake another? Do they exist on a spectrum? In what follows, I outline various components of the constitutive approach and elaborate different ways in which organizations can position the relationship between opposing forces by reviewing different examples from organizational communication literature. I expound the way that tensions can be cast as either as a dualism or as a duality. Over time, a dialectic might emerge when competing forces push and pull on each other in a dynamic interplay that connects them. This push and pull between the two concepts can

create situations wherein they reflexively define the other, or become paradoxical. When they become paradoxical, the competing oppositional demands reflect on each other and develop into a seemingly absurd or surprising situation. They exist simultaneously, persist over time, and become almost logically impossible to align in a complementary way. For example, to give an order to both stop and go is paradoxical since it is difficult to do both simultaneously. To illustrate, I consider the example of the competing dynamic between *stability* and *flexibility* within organizational communication and management literature.

### Dynamics at Play in Organizations

The most historically common conceptualization of the dynamic between stability and flexibility has been a dualism where flexibility intrinsically comes at the cost of stability (Poole & Van de Ven, 1989), such as allowing employees to set their own schedules versus requiring  designated work hours. In this regard, the concepts of stability and flexibility are seen as bipolar due to what is considered an inherent contraction where one cancels out the other (Gupta et al., 2006). These implicit premises can presume types of solutions to problems in which the two are cast as interdependent on each other or a duality (Farjoun, 2010). Many solutions are difficult to conceptualize in a dualistic model because they do not allow for an increase in flexibility to synergistically increase stability (Feldman & Pentand, 2003). However, when these two concepts are considered in terms of duality, they are not mutually antagonistic, but instead represent twin characteristics of an organization (Schulman, 1993; Roe & Schulman, 2008).

Compared to dualism, *duality* describes the relationship between two distinct concepts that are interdependent, instead of positioning them as oppositional (Giddens, 1984; Jackson, 1999). Assuming that stability and flexibility must be in opposition can be a limiting outlook

20

for organizational leaders. In the case of high reliability organizations such as utility networks and emergency services, flexibility to respond to changing circumstances cannot be gained at the cost of stability (Sutcliffe & Vogus, 2003; Weick & Sutcliffe, 2007). Likewise, studies in communication and technology illustrate how new communication technologies introduce new avenues for organizational control while also providing organizational members increased freedoms and new opportunities (Orlikowski, 2002). Although reconceptualizing these ideas in ways that are complementary can be advantageous, duality does not assume a lack of tension between the two ideals.

Ways of responding to or managing a tension aid in casting them as a dualism, a duality, dialectic, or a paradox. Responses would include *selection* tactics such as favoring one role or over the other (Seo et al., 2004) or *separation* approaches, also called source splitting in which competing poles are divided and assigned to different people, units, times, or functions. These approaches manage competing expectations by engaging them according to different standards in distinct situations. Other either-or tactics include defense mechanisms such as subverting tensions by simply avoiding possible conflicts, repressing them, or illustrating ambivalence via lukewarm treatment of the tensions.

However, when engaging in a duality, individuals often attempt to meet separate demands through both and approaches--vacillating between opposites, integrating them, balancing them, or reframing (Sutherland & Smith, 2011). Therefore, making a duality in which oppositional forces exist as part of an integrated system. The ways in which these forces interact at the boundary line between them highlights the points of contention between the two. In turn, the way in which these forces act independently of each other outlines the *unified whole* of the integrated system (Smith & Lewis, 2011).

21

When organizational members can balance these competing ideals, they experience improved job performance through informational and instrumental support, increased workplace motivation, and increased social capital when attempting to meet goals (Sias, 2009). However, this balancing act requires physical, mental, and emotional labor for both the members attempting to integrate the roles and those who work with them (Horan et al, 2021). Describing the experience of Black women facing inconsistent expectations to perform professionalism, Ferguson and Dougherty (2021) outline an unsustainable duality which eventually results in paradoxical situations. Because professionalism is conceived as a characteristic of Whiteness, these women can perform professionalism perfectly without ever being socially afforded the status of professional (Jackson, 2002).

A *dialectic* involves the process of unifying opposites through an ongoing, dynamic interplay which draws on different approaches for managing oppositions, namely, more-than approaches which connect them, place them in dialogue with each other, and open them up to new meanings through reflexive positioning. In the previous example, the standards produced by White men become adapted and reproduced in some fashion by Black women professionals. As the dialectic unfolds, the societal standard for professionality never fully synthesizes with the professionalism exhibited by these women because of the material reality of their skin. At times, these women enact an approach which transcends the original oppositions that they face in the oppressive duality. By resisting conformity to the exclusive and racialized standards of professionalism, some of these women explained that they experienced a sense of pride, power, and agency as they renegotiate their position (Jackson, 2002). However, in most situations, the dialectic in which these Black women engage does not synthesize the two logics into a new definition and approach to professionalism which

22

merges the influences of both sides, as in Hegelian dialectics (1969). Instead, this dialectic is inherently Bakhtin (1981), wherein the dynamic interplay of opposites provokes continued dialogue without integration. Despite being constituted in the back-and-forth of oppositional forces, dialectics are not simply iterations of contradictions. Due to the continual influence of inconsistent elements engaging with each other, dialectics focus on the ways that opposites mutually define each other rather than develop separately (Putnam et al., 2016).

Despite the growing momentum behind tension-based and paradox research in organizational communication (Fairhurst & Putnam, 2018; Farjoun, 2018), *paradox* as a construct remains under-explored relative to its utility (Collinson, 2014, 2020). The constitutive approach to tensional research orients itself around the interdependent nature of mutually exclusive opposites. These opposites can reflexively define each other, which can create a self-replicating problem, where efforts to untangle the opposites and solve problems recreate the same issues. Organizational members experience tensions in all aspects of their organizational life, ranging from structured trainings to informal conversations, in memos and organizational texts, and even in their own expectations and identities (Schad et al., 2016). In turn, they respond to these tensions in their own communication and behavior. It is through micro level interactions that competing demands at macro levels are reified and systematically recreated in the organization's membership negotiation and institutional positioning. Organizations continually develop in a process through which organizational practices evolve into matured systems, processes, and outlooks. Paradoxes emerge from these social interactions as the organization responds to contradictions and creates structures which reinforce them, becoming embedded in routines and structures, often with unexpected results (see Rice, 2008; Rice & Cooper, 2010).

Paradoxical processes can create vicious cycles and double binds for organizational members attempting to fulfill the competing demands of oppositional institutional logics. In vicious cycles, members' self-reinforcing patterns are enacted which spiral out of control, while double binds describe the circumstances which trap organizational members between unattainable alternatives (Putnam, 2019). Ferguson and Dougherty (2021) describe how their participants found themselves constantly increasing their self-monitoring as they attempted to embody unachievable notions of professionalism which were specifically unavailable to them due to cultural biases inherent to the standard by which they were judged. Attempts to communicate across groups about the problems experienced by those encountering a paradox demonstrate an apparent inability to master the skills necessary to resolve paradoxes (Cunha & Bednarek, 2020).

In the next section, I introduce the context for this study: PDs. As I will discuss, PDs must recruit young men and women into an industry that has been the target for intense scrutiny and controversy in recent years. One tool used by many PDs is a recruitment video that is posted on their department website or in social media to attract attention and encourage individuals to apply. Because recruitment videos are intended to describe and show what policing is like in their department, they communicate to potential recruits the logic(s) under which they operate.

### *Competing Demands of Policing*

Police officers have always faced competing demands as a defining feature of their work. Describing what he called an "impossible situation," Thurman Arnold (1930; 1940) explained that American society places uncanny demands on police to enforce the law while constantly making new laws to enforce – and during this time, American society keeps

breaking the same laws. Citing the new problems in post-WWII America, Arnold outlines emerging tensions of their modern era: continual modifications in established law; unending emergence of new laws; social inequality; and bad public conceptions about police. Many decades later, the same problems plague officers in the impossible situation they now find themselves. Tensions permeate policing, given the police officer's uniquely empowered occupational opportunity to engage in competing institutional logics. In some police academies, officers are trained with materials to specifically address the tensions or "psychological roadblocks" (Perez, 1997, p. 4) encountered by police officers in their work, such as conflicting goals, the paradox of coercive power, and due process versus justice.

Officers face two competing goals, commonly described as the guardian/warrior dynamic (McLean et al, 2020). The two logics which are most consistently in conflict for PDs can be described as *traditional enforcement* (TE) and *community-oriented policing* (COP). The TE logic comprises many ideals which are fundamental to many policing behaviors, and represent the existing dominant perspectives which are most found within the institution of policing. This logic is heavily structured by centuries of historical policing practices which were prone to corruption, low efficacy in preventing crime, and a lack of oversight or consequences for officer's bad behavior.

The dynamic interaction between officers and the few community members with whom they interact can often be the site of tensional interactions (Loftus, 2009). In an extended program of research chronicling cross-race police/citizen encounters during traffic stops, Giles and colleagues (see Barker et al., 2008; Dixon et al., 2008) assert that communication skills are undertrained in police, especially in intergroup contexts. Under TE paradigms, police officers primarily interact with community members in negatively valanced situations

such as traffic stops. Most police-community interactions involve enforcing the law, controlling the behavior of community members, or responding to emergencies in which violence or criminal activity has occurred (Mentel, 2012). Given these activities are associated with a TE logic, community members are likely to only understand the role of police officers as enforcers. Their communication with and about police, reflect their being associated with a negative event. Thus, they fear their interactions may result in negative outcomes for themselves or others (e.g., arrest, search, or physical harm). Police officers themselves are likely to feel distanced and disconnected to community members. Conversely, while COP can be a goal of the department, those interactions may be limited with individuals from only some groups, such as students in classrooms or organized groups that ask for a police officer to discuss an issue with their group. Additionally, when resources are limited, TE activities must often be prioritized over COP activities. Overall, these types of engagement focus on and reinforce a TE logic.

### *Environment of Policing*

The police killing of George Floyd in 2020 ignited new fire into the national conversation on police and race in America. The ensuing riots and protests attracted global attention and the subsequent police response shifted the conversation from racism to concerns about the role of police in civil society. In the modern climate of hyper partisan politics, civil rights awareness, and increased media attention, PDs face intense and increasing public scrutiny. Like any other organization that may be viewed unfavorably by a large group of society, PDs struggle to retain current officers. Many current officers have left their departments or the profession looking for better opportunities (Rhodes & Tyler, 2019), often in response to public criticisms making the job increasingly dangerous and less attractive. In addition, many

departments are challenged to attract new recruits who meet the stringent hiring standards for physical and mental wellness (Derby, 2008, Jordan et al., 2009). Adding an additional layer of complexity, departments remain plagued by diversity issues despite both national and local programs incentivizing recruits from minority groups. This is an inherent issue of communication, as departments represent themselves to their audiences and attempt to create messaging which attracts candidates who are qualified and contribute to diversity in the workforce.

Policing is a field in flux (see Katz & Maguire, 2021); policing as an American institution has changed drastically over the past 40 years and will continue to change as it attempts to adapt evolving societal logics involving expectations for police/community interaction. Modern concerns over unequal treatment of community members by PDs have shifted the focus from individual responsibility of "good cops" and "bad cops" to systemic perspectives which implicate entire departments for their policies and the actions of individual officers. This perception of police is fueled by "mediated vicarious experiences with police officers [which] shape people's trust of law enforcement" such as persuasive social media posts, viral recordings of traffic stops, and critiques of departmental responses (Dixon et al, 2021). Resulting in (and stemming from) a lack of trust between police officers and local citizens, this fracture erodes the ability of officers to resolve conflicts in the community and is evident throughout the national landscape of policing (Giles et al., 2021).

It is within minority communities of color, however, wherein this disconnect is made most evident (Alexander, 2010; Gau & Brunson, 2012; Gnisci et al., 2016). For these groups, the nationally publicized anecdotes and individual interactions between members of the community and officers are even more powerful in shaping perceptions of the police because

they match these individual's lived experiences in previous interactions. Another significant source of messaging for citizens about policing comes from media depicting the police, including department produced materials such as recruitment videos (for a model depicting the factors constituting civilian attitudes towards police, see Choi & Giles, 2012). In inner city populations such as the Los Angeles metropolitan area, African Americans are stopped at twice the rate of Whites (Chang & Poston, 2019), even though officers are less likely to find weapons or drugs when searching an African American suspect (Poston & Chang, 2019).

This aura of mistrust is itself constitutive: It creates an environment wherein minority groups are the least likely to engage in community programs instituted by the police which are intended to build partnerships between members of the community and police (Lai & Zhao, 2010). This leads to a cumulative effect wherein members of minority communities are more likely to believe that police racially profile people and are less likely to apply for policing jobs because they want to avoid being perceived as racist themselves (Scheer et al., 2018). This perception of social group betrayal is likewise illustrated in the way that survey participants responded when asked about their family's perceptions of a career in policing. Black recruits indicated that their family would not approve of their job selection as a patrol officer at nearly three times the rate of White recruits (Scheer et al., 2016). Although this problem is especially significant for minority members of the community, the same issue persists across demographic lines (Rhodes & Tyler, 2019). The Chicago Police Department, for instance, had over 20,000 applicants in 2018, but less than 4,000 just three years later in 2021 (Tucker & Nickeas, 2022).

Although support for police continues to drop among all demographic categories across the United States (U.S.),  particularly troubling for recruitment efforts is the precipitous drop of support among people between the ages of 18–29 (Jones, 2020). For departments trying to diversify their ranks, the perception of police legitimacy police is even lower among non-Whites (Kahn & Martin, 2016), especially those in communities that have experienced a history of problematic policing practices such as broken windows policing, stop-and-frisk searches, or identification checks (Bryant-Davis et al., 2017). For officers on patrol, this perceived lack of legitimacy is directly related to compliance during community interactions or enforcement stops (Tyler & Fagan, 2008). To improve their relationships and image with diverse members of the community, many PDs have turned to a COP approach.

As the institution of policing has undergone cycles of reform, the way that law enforcement agencies conceptualize their relationship to the community has taken many different forms. Throughout the 1960s and 70s, community leaders and chiefs of police from across the country posited that previous reform attempts were inherently flawed--specifically because of the lack of community connection (Greene, 1987). This led to the conceptualization and eventual sporadic implementation of a new orientation towards police work, known as "Community Policing." This approach (logic) to crime-reduction involves three highly interrelated critical components: (1) decentralization of the police hierarchy as the ultimate authority for officers; (2) citizen involvement to identify, track, and react to any problems addressed by the department; and (3) problem-solving which allows for diverse approaches to different problems and requires a non-legalistic orientation towards enforcing the law (Skogan, 2006). COP was one of Wilson's three (1968a) logics which define the field of policing, a typology which has remained influential in the field since its inception and is

29

relevant in describing foundational aspects of policing in the 21st century (Liederbach & Travis, 2008). Wilson trichotomized policing logics into the Watchman, Legalistic, and Service styles based on the relationship between members of the department and the community. This foundational work has been refined, critiqued, and adapted by researchers to study different facets of policing, such as department structure (Hassell & McGuire, 2003), recruitment and retention (Jolicoeur & Grant, 2018); and organizational culture (Zhao et al., 2010). The logic that PDs draw upon in defining themselves, and their communication that that logic (or logics), plays a significant role in the recruitment of new police officers. Because my analysis focuses primarily on the way that PDs communicate their relationships and engagement with community members, I focus my attention on the aspects of policing described by Wilson's Service style which fit within Skogan's definition of COP relative to either the legalistic or watchman styles (e.g., Gant & Schaible, 2022; McLean et al., 2020).

As a policing logic, COP employs a service orientation by placing a lower emphasis on criminal detection and legalistic enforcement, instead addressing the underlying causes of criminal activity (O'Neill, 2014). It encourages lawful behavior by consent of the governed, working with community members to address the needs of the community, as a whole (Groenewald & Peake, 2004). This police orientation relies less on machismo and physical enforcement of the law than traditional perspectives on policing (Miller, 1999). When departments successfully integrate a problem-oriented policing approach based on feedback from community members, COP builds partnerships with community stakeholders, empowers citizens to interact with the police more effectively, and positions the department to incorporate whatever interventions would be most valued by the community (Goldstein, 1979).

This central focus on successful communicative practices enables officers to build

trusting relationships within the community, thereby allowing officers to integrate into the

community itself (Skogan, 2008). In community policing, officers seek alternative

resolutions for disputes than the formal reactionary processes. (Ericson et al., 1993). For

example, when officers operating under the COP logic were having problems with a group of

teenagers at the yearly May Day parade, they identified, targeted, and then recruited some

local youth to influence their friends towards peaceful behavior in discrete ways which are

not face-threatening for their peer group (Porsché, 2021). The goal for these officers was not

to punish criminals, but to create a supportive community environment in which crime would

not be committed. The success of this effort is aided or impeded by the pre-existing

relationship with the community, which is most likely to be positive when the racial and

social composition of the community is mirrored in the PD (Kearns, 2017). Thus,

departments that operate under a COP logic prioritize diversity in their ranks and interactions

with diverse groups of people in the community.

In COP, police and citizens work together as co-producers of the services that are

exclusively done by police under other models (Wilson & Cox, 2008). COP recognizes the

fact that under any system of policing, most police work involves maintaining order,

participating in nonenforcement tasks, and providing social services (Stein & Griffith, 2017).

Successful COP programs integrate the best aspects of problem-oriented policing (Goldstein,

1979) in which officers are empowered to investigate a criminal issue and then create a

solution to help the community solve the problem, which may or may not involve law

enforcement. For example, if there is a constant problem of drivers speeding through a

residential area, instead of simply targeting each violator with a fine, a problem-oriented

policing approach might hold a town hall meeting about the viability of shaping traffic flow via adjusting speed limits along more desirable routes, or the placement of crosswalks in the area (Scott & Maddox, 2010). Similarly, instead of imprisoning teens for taking drugs, a problem-oriented policing approach may implement drug awareness programs for parents, find and punish dealers selling to kids, and support community programs aimed to combat teenage drug usage (Champion & Rush, 1997).

Rather than rely on the threat of enforcement by the outside force of the PD, COP – itself a *communicative process* as well as a philosophy (see Hill et al., 2021) -- is most effective when the collective maintains order in the community due to mutual benefit and obligation. Under this logic of policing, the community is jointly responsible for reducing crime and improving its residents' standard of living (Walker, 1998). This responsibility is not simply foisted onto the community, but in an ideal circumstance, the community gains both informal and formal access to administrative procedures such as decision-making, funding information, and access to policy creation (Skolnick & Bailey, 1988). Thus, instead of police existing apart from the community and policing as external to the community, the department integrates with the community—the community accepts oversight, and the department incorporates the community's input (Cordner, 1997).

This logic reflects a dramatic shift away from policing such as law and order policing or watchman style PDs (Maguire & Mastrofski, 2000). Transitioning to attitudes and behaviors that reflect a COP can be a daunting adjustment for the department, as it can destabilize officers' expectations and understanding of their role. It can also require new methods by which officers are assessed, as COP's lack of focus on arrest statistics or typical metrics introduces ambiguity for officers focusing on career advancement (Wycoff & Oetmeier,

1994). Additionally, individuals who have aspired to enter a career in law enforcement influenced by the TE logic, might be dissuaded by a less authoritative style. Despite these challenges, there is significant benefit gained by both the PDs and the communities when COP logics are adopted, such as increased community involvement, lowered crime rates, and increased retention for officers (Paoline et al., 2000).

Although these positive effects of COP can be observed in the relationship between officers and the community, tracking an organization's implementation of community policing is a difficult task. Mastrofski (2007) described COP as "a process rather than a product" (p. 5), because administrative decentralization, community engagement, and proactive problem solving are demonstrated in how the department approaches police work more than any one outcome which could be standardized and measured across departments. Recognizing that no one objective measure can assess how closely a PD has aligned itself with the COP paradigm, some policing reformers have explicitly outlined the structural changes necessary for a PD to productively engage in community policing (Mastrofski & Ritti, 1995).

Asserting that these changes are inherently visible to those inside and outside of the organization, Maguire (2003, p. 11) explains that "If police organizations truly are moving toward community policing, we should find evidence of structural change for either of two reasons: because it is an explicit element of the reform prescription, or because it is an implicit result of the change in the way police do business." Maguire (2003) outlines five key structural variables which are integral to community policing: exposure to functionally different organizational subunits (Walker & Katz, 1995), equality within the organizational hierarchy (Langworthy, 1986), the presence of unsworn citizen employees ("civilianization")

(Crank, 1989), flexibility of procedure (Reiss, 1992), and efforts to combat bureaucratization (Mastrofski, 1994). Each of these variables indicate one key aspect of the department's ability to approach police work creatively, ranging from the authority given to new members of the organization to the ability of citizens to elicit unique responses from the department to react to individual problems.

Admittedly, any department engaged in COP efforts inevitably retains remnants of the traditional policing logic. Additionally, although most departments embrace COP to different degrees (in an analysis of 567 police recruitment videos, Simpson (2022) found community-oriented behaviors to be present in many, but less salient as more traditional tactic), some policing organizations attempt (or present themselves as attempting) to perform COP, even if they do not subscribe to the underlying tenets of the logic (Wilson & Cox, 2008). Recognizing the impact of COP on transforming the community/police relationship, rewarding funding opportunities are available from the Federal government for COP expenditures (Chappell & Gibson, 2009). Likewise, because COP has been demonstrated to reduce property crime and interpersonal crime (Skogan & Hartnett, 1997), improve job satisfaction for officers (Fridell, 2004), and positively correlates to employee tenure at the department (Skogan, 2004), there are institutional pressures to implement COP. Simultaneously, due to reduced fear of officers (Bayley, 1988) and improved relationships between the community and its officers (Skogan & Fridell, 2004), communities value COP as well. Although reorienting to a COP logic might be attractive to many, PDs face pressures from multiple audiences each of which would like to position the department with different logics (Koslicki, 2020). Additionally, long-standing institutional pressures are at work

controlling, even undermining, departments' decisions to adopt or not adopt COP and position themselves accordingly (Manning, 2010).

### *Institutional Perspective on Policing*

In an environment in which many policing organizations seek to competitively position their department to stakeholders and especially potential recruits as COP, institutional forces can intervene and interfere with these efforts. Lammers and Barbour (2006) describe institutions as "constellations of established practices guided by enduring, formalized, rational beliefs that transcend particular organizations and situations" (p. 357). Underlying institutional logics, or "established and taken-for-granted patterns of practices and communication" emerge across the profession (Lammers & Garcia, 2014, p. 196). As an institution (Abbott, 2005), policing is demarcated by extra-organizational influences on patterns of communication and conduct (Lammers & Garcia, 2009). As such, policing is "an institution [which] works as an influence on the organizational members' expectations of each other, their behaviors, [and] their work conditions" (Lammers & Garcia, 2009, p. 380; Van Maanen, 1974).

Structural pressures from within the policing profession unify departments across the country, such as national quasi-grassroots campaigns proclaiming that "Blue Lives Matter" and institutional organizations such as the International Association for Chiefs of Police and the National Fraternal Order of Police (Lennard, 2016). Likewise, external forces reduce variation among PDs, treating them as a collective. These include federal programs from the U.S. Department of Justice that provide financial support for COP programs and anti-terror efforts from Homeland Security (Mastrofski et al., 2007). Likewise, the treatment of police on U.S. news and entertainment media remains similar across national contexts, with

minimal differentiation across primetime entertainment television (Perlmutter, 2000) and news coverage (Klahm et al., 2011).

In the context of these homogenizing forces in policing work, departments often share at least some similar practices and concerns. For example, all departments across the country tend to seek funding from the same sources. Consequently, PDs often choose to model their own reforms after those undertaken by other successful departments (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983; Mastrofski & Willis, 2010). Over time, this imbues struggling organizations with the same logics that inspired the reform in the first department, spreading across the network of other PDs (King, 2000). Notably, PDs are part of highly transitive networks, both for geographical and institutionally political reasons. Manning (2006) observes that there is significant overlap between PDs in terms of the physical areas in which they work. In many places around the country, citizens find themselves under the jurisdiction of the state Highway Patrol, the city's PD, transit police, and the county's Sheriff department, all which have the mandate to enforce the law in any jurisdiction (den Hayer, 2016).

In this environment, PDs must distinguish themselves to compete for previous resources and public favor. While departments may prefer one logic over another, they must appeal to a variety of stakeholders including those who prescribe to the long-standing institutional stance of the TE logic. At the same time, departments that are committed to positioning their organization's mission and practices as working in cooperation with and serving their communities may seek to break away from the institution's long history of enforcement logics. To add further complexity, in contexts of low public trust of police officers, some departments might purposely inspire fear of hostility due to anti-police sentiment (Maguire et

al., 2016). They employ these tactics because they fear an ever-impending "crime wave" because of social backlash against the police (MacDonald, 2015).

These competing demands about the nature of police work is pertinent to how recruitment and policing is done in an organization because (a) nationwide staffing is one of the most challenging issues currently facing the American law enforcement profession (Wilson et al., 2010); (b) the institutional nature of policing as a profession causes an intrinsic "us versus them" dynamic in police community relationships (Hill & Giles, 2021); (c) perceptions of police as an institution have a dramatic effect on citizens' adherence to the law (Gau & Brunson, 2010; Giles et al., 2021a), willingness to participate in COP programs (Mazerolle et al., 2013), compliance with officer demands (Choi & Giles, 2012; Jonathan-Zamir et al., 2015). In order to study how PDs communicate their underlying logics as portrayed in their recruitment messaging, the current study examines recruitment messaging, via recruitment videos produced by departments to gain a better understanding of the logics they present and how they manage tensions associated with those logics.

### *Police Recruitment Media*

Adapting to social dynamics, PDs are putting greater effort into their digital presence to do outreach to the community and reach a wider audience online than would be available through traditional methods (Haro-de-Rosario et al., 2016). When departments build an online presence, they have the opportunity to communicate their identities as organizations and create positive engagement with the community. Content from departmental social media is inherently value-laden, and this platform provides an opportunity to demonstrate how their departmental values align with those of the community (Meijer & Thaens, 2013). Across the country, PDs are now producing and posting content to tell the public about their values,

work life, and connection to the community (Crump, 2011; Giles et al., 2021b)—in short, position themselves and communicate the logic(s) under which they operate.

One of the most important types of online material used by departments to share messages about themselves is online recruitment videos (Scheer & Wilson, 2021; Wilson & Grammich, 2009). Police departments produce, participate in, and disseminate recruitment videos via social media to attract recruits and publicly represent (position) themselves. Videos are one of the most effective recruitment methods for attracting new applicants (Koslicki, 2018) in a highly targeted fashion (Wilson et al., 2010). Studying departmental culture, Sycz (2014) found that the organizational values and beliefs depicted in recruitment materials closely matched those of both the existing members of the organization and the recruits that they aim to recruit. Jolicouer and Grant (2018) assert that departments use visual indicators to depict police/community relations in recruitment media, such as the uniforms (polo shirts, uniforms, tactical gear) worn by officers.

Departments share these videos on social networking sites like YouTube, Instagram, and Facebook, collecting likes, comments, and shares. Because departments invest considerable resources in these videos and because recruitment is such a crucial function, many departments choose to feature exciting scenes which can attract and hold the viewers' attention. In projecting this adrenaline-filled image, these videos engage viewers and often emphasize exciting aspects of policing to capture the attention of possible recruits (Aiman-Smith et al., 2001), which may or may not offer a realistic view of their department's policing logic or behaviors. This can result in recruitment materials that do not actually demonstrate ideal policing behaviors, but candidates may form impressions that influence their desire to apply and subsequently shape the rest of their entire organizational

38

membership experience (Walker et al., 2008). In this way, the department's videos can inhere both permanence and transmissibility because they can be viewed multiple times by multiple people at multiple points in time (Taylor & Van Every, 1993).

These videos are complex narratives, composed of a variety of individually distinct scenes representing different aspects of policing within the department (Wilson & Grammich, 2009). As these departments depict a version of organizational life in their recruitment videos to attract recruits, they also communicatively position themselves within the larger social environment which consists of competing law enforcement agencies, other careers, the local community, and the larger institution of policing itself. This is an inherently socially comparative process which highlights the distinctive cultural differences between departments (Chan et al., 2003).

Targeted candidates who are actively seeking employment are motivated to process complex narratives about the organization (Chandy et al., 2001; Petty & Cacioppo, 1986). The decisions about how to attract these candidates is dependent on the logics by which they operate, but frequently they are mindful of the complexity of the audiences (Koslicki, 2018). To manage these tensions, they communicate through endorsements about the organization from current members (Collins & Stevens, 2002), descriptions of the most appealing aspects of the job (Barber, 1998), and messaging which portrays the department's unique organizational identity (Collins & Stevens, 2002). Exploring how law enforcement agencies represent themselves as a group, Areillo and Gumbhir (2016) found that PDs' depictions of positive and negative interactions with community members were related to the department's COP efforts.

Strategic representations of the department enable recruits to evaluate features of the department and allow potential recruits to consider their own fit with the organization through social identification (Tajfel & Turner, 1979). Mobilizing SIT, Cable and Turban (2003) found that portrayals of an organization in recruitment materials is an attempt to communicate its values. Because SIT asserts that self-concept is rooted in social group membership (Tajfel, 1982), the characteristics and social status depicted in recruitment materials conveys information that affords individuals an opportunity to assess their fit within the department (Ashforth & Mael, 1989; Tajfel, 1982). Social identity is commonly targeted in recruitment videos when the department mobilizes a sense of in-group/out-group dynamics with questions like "Do you have what it takes to join the Newport Beach Police Department?"

As recruits conceive themselves as potential in-group members, they are inclined to be attracted to departments that will enable them to fulfill their identity goals (Born & Tarris, 2010; Hemphill & Kulik, 2016). For recruits who conceptualize police as tough crime fighters or community servants, recruitment videos that strategically invoke identities relevant to them are intrinsically appealing. For recruits with strong civic engagement and organizing skills, videos centered around COP will likewise be appealing. To categorize recruitment media based on their paradigm for policing, previous researchers have either tracked aspects of Wilson's three policing styles (1968b) or collapsed many aspects of the Watchman and Legalistic styles of policing into one construct with better parity, such as militarism (Koslicki, 2018), authoritarianism (Laguna et al., 2010), or willingness to engage in use of force (McCauley et al., 2008).

To identify trends which indicate how departments interact with the community members they serve, policing researchers have tracked a variety of variables affecting PDs'' public behaviors, such as: organizational structure and institutional positioning relative to other government agencies in the area (Maguire & Mastrofski, 2000; Maguire, 2003); level of individual officer authority (Crank, 1994); officer appearance based on clothing and body armor (Jolicouer & Grant, 2018); pride in the department's arrest record (Smith, 1984); and authoritarianism (Koslicki, 2017). Tracking the relationships between individual community members and police officers, researchers have operationalized community policing in terms of visibility and accessibility to community members (Banton, 1964); time spent with community members (Goldstein, 1987); implementation of community programs (Cordner, 1997); departmental adherence to re-structuring (Kochel, 2012); and citizen perceptions of police legitimacy (Mazerolle et al., 2013).

While institutional forces promote homogeneity among policing organizations, I propose that PDs use distinctive strategies to position themselves in recruitment videos. By promoting certain aspects of their organizational logic in these recruitment videos, they attempt to attract desired candidates. Since police work often involves elements of TE and COP, however, many behaviors work in tension with one another. Further, because departments often attempt to communicate with diverse stakeholders in these videos, rather than project the influence of one logic, they may attempt to project both TE and COP through various strategies. On this basis, I ask two RQs which guide this study, and these relate to Phases 1 and 2, respectively:

**RQ1: What institutional logics are most prominently demonstrated in police department recruitment videos? Do videos illustrate one single institutional logic or more institutional complexity?**

**RQ2: How do recruitment videos cast these competing logics or manage their interrelationships (e.g., either-or, both-and, and more-than strategies)?**

# CHAPTER THREE - PHASE I

## Overview of Methods

To study how PDs implement the emergent logic of COP relative to the dominant logic of TE, I apply a thematic analysis to generate data about how organizations represent themselves in police recruitment media. This study explores policing recruitment videos because this medium gives PDs full control over the representation of policing that they choose to share with multiple significant audiences, such as possible recruits, other PDs, members of the community, and officers already employed by the department. By taking a grounded in action orientation (Bisel, 2009), I contribute to an understanding of how organizations produce strategic messaging to navigate institutional logics (Friedland & Alford, 1991; Thornton & Ocasio, 1999). The videos provide definitions for what police work means which can be referenced and internalized by officers in the department. Likewise, they can be understood by potential recruits and other audience member to demonstrate the department's expectations for interaction. Consistent with the growing body of institutional logics research, I adapt the approach used by Southall et al. (2008) to operationalize the institutional logics as observed in promotional messaging created by the NCAA. These authors identified institutional logics in (1) statements made by the organization, (2) the proportion of time spent discussing topics pertinent to the logic, (3) centrality to brand image, and (4) demonstrated influence in organizational operation. Using these two approaches, I extend theory on institutional positioning by integrating techniques associated with thematic analysis and categorization theory (Grodal et al., 2020).

In Phase I of this research, I categorize videos according to their representation of the underlying logics of COP, TE, both, or neither. In doing so, I further refine existing

categories of policing by identifying communication, behaviors, and other qualities that distinguish each of the categories. I then categorize the videos according to the dominant logic in the video. The reader should be alerted to the fact that the analytical procedures to be described at some lengths are complex and challenging to convey in any simple fashion.

### *Sample*

I collected a database of 312 recruitment videos hosted on YouTube which were posted by PDs and were available during 2017-18, including videos which were created between 2005-2018. I collected the videos in three ways: (1) a search of YouTube for any videos which were found by searching for the string: "police recruitment [JURISDICTION] [STATE]" where the jurisdiction included a list of every town, city, county, and state in the country using the 2010 U.S. Census data; (2) for each YouTube search, a google search was performed to find the department's website, which was scanned for videos which had not been indexed; (3) a full search of any YouTube accounts which were operated by PDs to find any videos which had not been encountered in the previous two searches. This yielded a total of 393 videos.

Of the 393 videos, 81 were removed from the sample because: they could not be verified as having been produced by the department that they represented (n=33); they were for non-traditional PDs such as universities (n=21) or transportation systems (n=11); or they had been created for television audience at an undisclosed time point and were later uploaded to the internet (n=26). The total viewing time of those analyzed amounted to 12 hours and 38 minutes.

### *Units of Analysis*

For Phase I, I analyzed shots within videos. Within film studies, *shots* are the basic

building blocks for constructing film narratives. This refers to one single constant take from

one camera, uninterrupted by any cuts or edits (Bordwell et al., 2020). One or multiple shots

make up a scene, which usually takes place in one location and involves one action. One or

more scenes comprise a sequence, edited together to comprise a single unified event or

complete story, often demarcated by a new setting, or shift in tone. Within the video itself, an

*event* is the next largest unit that I use, often having numerous shots but those shots work

together to tell a portion of the unfolding storyline. Although the video is composed of many

different individual shots and events, they all constitute the whole unit—the video—the

categorization of which is my objective.

Within Phase II, the interplay between individual shots becomes more significant because

competing demands emerge at the points of interaction between logics, wherein the

organization is constituted in communication resolving the emergent tension. This can

happen at any level of granularity for the video, ranging from the single still frame to the

entire video itself, and even happen between levels, i.e., a single shot could be difficult to

reconcile with an entire event.

In Phase II, I scrutinize possible ways to identify the type of competing demand and

depict the relationship between the logics and their underlying affordances. It is through this

process that the department elaborates how they perceive the underlying relationship between

COP and TE, which can range in terms of interdependence, conceptually distinction, or not

oppositional; to mutually incompatible; to push-pull tensions between them. I closely

examine a set of videos which illustrate the affordances inherent to the different ways in

which organizations depict competing demands among institutional logics. Operationalizing institutional logics, Besharov and Smith (2014) elaborated a typology of institutional logics by categorizing instances of multiple institutional logics according to their interdependent compatibility and centrality. My approach is informed by their framework for analysis which focuses on the way that the logics overlap, and subsequent types of oppositional relationships emerge. They applied their findings to explore the role played by the centrality of the logic in emergent organizational conflict. Adapting their frame of analysis, I explore the tools and tactics used by PDs to attend to the competing demands which emerge in the interplay between multiple institutional logics according to logical centrality, narrative, and the level of harmony inherent to the depiction of the logics.

### Phase I

In the earliest systematic studies of policing, Wilson (1968a) trichotomized what he called policing *styles* into the Watchman, Legalistic, and Service categories based on the relationship between the department, the community, and local governance. For the purposes of this study, styles can be considered analogous to logics, described as "departmental policies and organizational codes, implicit and explicit" (Wilson, 1968b, p 83). One of the key benefits of thematic analysis is the flexibility to incorporate different types of data and methods when investigating complicated narratives (Ryan & Bernard, 2003). To explore the different messages about police work, the message features, and recruitment strategies which communicate nuanced departmental values, I employ thematic analysis as a "flexible and useful research tool, which can potentially provide a rich and detailed, yet complex account of data" (Braun & Clarke, 2006, p. 5), especially well-suited to informing policy development. Themes can be described as systematically recurring patterns of discourse

46

identified by the researcher in a dataset. Ryan and Bernard (2003) explain that "You know you have found a theme when you can answer the question, what is this expression an example of?"

In my analysis of recruitment videos, I thematically analyzed indicators of each of these three styles but found that the ways in which the watchman style of policing was depicted in organizational media positioned the organization very similarly to the legalistic style. Further, the two styles were so commonly depicted in combination together that attempts to distinguish between them revealed little more than idiosyncratic differences inherent to the specific presentation within that video. In order to overlay past research on how the underlying logics found in policing affect the different representations of policing in their public media, I reviewed this research and watched all of the videos in the sample to determine how elements of the policing typologies identified in previous research were represented in the recruitment videos. Recruitment videos are inherently multimodal, including talk, text, pictures, drawings, gestures, facial expressions, embodied maneuvers, and many more, all of which may interrelate in different ways (LeBaron et al., 2017). The departments' policing style was primarily conveyed through three elements of the videos: (1) officers' embodied behavior/appearance on the screen (i.e. tasks completed by officers, the nature of the citizen/officer interaction, the types of uniforms worn and equipment used) (Kendon, 1990; LeBaron et al., 2016; Orlikowski, 2002); (2) language cues (i.e. written descriptions of ideal officer candidates, different types of verbal encouragement to apply, job expectations as described in the videos) (Heath et al., 2010; Streeck et al., 2011); and (3) stylistic/affective components (i.e. special effects, music, overall tone of the ad, narrative development).

Outlining my codebook around these three elements of each video, I integrated constructs from Wilson's *Typologies* (1968b). I likewise matched audio and written phrases from the videos which could clearly be associated with statements from Wilson, such as the legalistic characteristic of universal standards for enforcement, as opposed to having "different standards for juveniles… drunks, and the like" (Wilson, 1968a, p 172). I then conducted a literature review to identify how other researchers have operationalized different styles of policing, and integrated their existing definitions and coding formats, as illustrated in Table 1 below. After conducting a pilot study using 108 of the 312 recruitment videos from the sample, I collapsed the categories of *legalistic* and *watchman* types into one larger subclass of policing, *traditional enforcement*. Although there are significant distinctions between the two categories, within recruitment videos, they are seldom depicted in any way which represents the two categories as distinct.

[ INSERT TABLE 1 HERE ]

In order to holistically examine the various components in these videos and how they illuminate the presence, absence, or existence of other message features which interfere with successful community policing, I use a phronetic iterative approach (Tracy, 2013), which alternates between pre-existing theoretical models and emergent readings of qualitative data to address a practical problem. Tracy and Hinrichs (2017, p. 1) explain that "*Phronēsis* is generally translated as 'prudence' or 'practical wisdom.' As such, the context or practice from which this wisdom comes is of prime importance." The iterative component is essential to this method of research, involving a systematic recursive process which allows existing theory to determine and frame meanings. Throughout this process, this was essential for the development of my research. Diverging from a purely grounded approach, this methodology

requires the researcher to visit and revisit the data, connect it with emerging insights, and progressively refine the focus and interpretation of results (Miles et al., 2013). The collapsing of the three types into a more parsimonious two category model is an example. Addressing the practical problem which continues to be labeled by the Police Executive Research Forum (PERF) as the "Recruitment and Retention Crisis" (Shultz, 2019), I also use this thematic analysis when considering practical recommendations for PDs.

**Coding the Videos for Logics**

Based on the literature review described above, I developed an initial codebook which included exemplar behaviors and the logics that represent. I trained 34 coders between the ages of 20-30 to label all behaviors seen on screen and make coding decisions based on how they perceived an average American 20- to 30-year-old viewer (the target demographic for police recruiting in the U.S.) would perceive the department's representation of policing in conjunction with the conceptual definitions and operationalizations provided in the codebook.

Coders were trained with a sample of the videos and given the complexity and inevitably prolonged nature of this process; different coders were used at different times during the analytical process. They completed code sheets by (a) identifying the behavior exhibited on screen during each scene and (b) classifying the behavior or other element of the video according to the type of task which the video demonstrates as being part of an officer's job. For example, any scene where an officer is handcuffing someone who has been detained, chasing a suspect, or sparring with an opponent, falls within the larger umbrella of *hostile interaction with a suspect*. Likewise, helping an elderly person cross the street, fixing a bike, or work at the department's donation drive all demonstrate different forms of *community*

*service*. In training and in the actual coding analysis, each video had its own code sheet with a complete list of all officer behaviors, timestamped to each scene. Coders individually watched videos and then compared their results for scenes which could be miscategorized to increase coding clarity. They discussed disparity in their coding until they reached agreement. The result was a code sheet for each video in which different elements of the video, coded scene-by-scene, that fit into COP or TE were identified. As they trained and over the course of the coding process, the definitions were adjusted based on discussions which arose during team meetings.

Once the research assistants (RAs) had completed coder training and the groups reach agreement about codes without extensive deliberation, the actual coding began. I organized the research assistants into coding groups of three to four people. Each researcher received between five and 15 minutes of videos to review and ode before meeting with their group, including a few videos which were unique to that group as well as one that was coded by all coders across all groups. Having all the groups code one video helped to ensure consistency—each time that the research group met, at least one video had been coded individually by each RA, and would then be discussed and checked for consistency across the group. When groups met, they discussed the video and compared their individual coding sheets. When a coding team found a scene where they disagreed about how it should be coded, they identified whether they could reach consensus between themselves. If not, they marked the scene, and we discussed it at the weekly meeting attended by all research assistants from all coding teams.

For each disputed scene, I asked each RA to watch and code the scene before any discussion between the groups. After comparing our results, I would do one of three things:

(a) redefine a previous code to make the definition clearly inclusive of that scene, (b) create a new code which is defined to include/represent that scene, or (c) review the definition for the code to resolve confusion. As coders gained experience and familiarity with the process, we periodically re-coded previously-completed videos to ensure consistency and verify that all videos in the dataset would be coded the same way at any point in the process.

Because each time that there was confusion between any of the coders, a clarification or expansion to the codebook took place, I eventually created codes which had never been considered by Wilson. For example, one scene which was disputed by members of a group included scenes from the SWAT World Challenge, an annual competition between SWAT teams from around the world, featuring corporate sponsored tactical competitions and training workshops. During this recruitment video, one scene featured teams of officers in full combat gear joking around with other teams of officers. Given that SWAT did not exist as a concept when Wilson outlined the different policing frameworks, many of the behaviors on screen had never been explicitly mentioned by researchers using Wilson's typology. However, the presence of SWAT teams had been operationalized by previous researchers to demonstrate legalistic policing (Kraska, 2007). Extrapolating from that classification, the presence of multiple teams of combat specialists physically competing together would represent comparable logics to SWAT teams on their own (TE).

As such, each time that I encountered a new behavior or message feature that was not already present in the list of codes, I identified the behavior on the screen, compared it to similar scenes, and categorized it into the COP or TE typology, or a third category which could not be classified as either. This third category was labeled as "Indistinguishable" and was used for any features which did not illustrate any one logic but were present across the

51

sample. This was an important factor in realigning the codebook because many of the

policing activities featured in recruitment materials are fundamental to all police activity in

any typology, such as driving a police car or taking to citizens[1]. Likewise, if activities which

are inherent to all of Wilson's policing paradigms are coded as being representative of any

one of Wilson's three categories, comparisons between types lose their validity (See

Jolicouer & Grant, 2018 for a discussion on productive distinctions between types).

After coders and I had classified all codes according to their relationship to either the

COP or TE logics I refined the code definitions for individual shots to better align with the

data across the sample. For example, when coders first encountered snowmobile patrolling,

the previous code for "Beach Patrol" was expanded into the more inclusive "Wilderness

Patrol." Eventually, all forms of vehicle patrolling where officers were not demonstrated to

be interacting one-on-one with community members were collapsed into "Patrol" and placed

in the "Indistinguishable" category because the various forms of non-standard patrols did not

indicate any one institutional logic explicitly. In another coding meeting, one team of coders

sought clarification about how we had been coding officers participating in volunteer

organizations. One member of the team did not feel comfortable using the code for

"community service" to describe an officer serving as a Girl Scouts leader. She argued that

because this involved volunteering outside of work hours, it did not fit with the other tasks in

the "community service" code because all of those tasks were completed as part of the

officer's paid workday (i.e., playing basketball with teenagers, cleaning up after a disaster,

---

[1] In Jolicouer & Grant's (2018) analysis, it was their overly-broad classification for the watchman typology that interfered with their ability to interpret results from their analysis. Using their experience as a guide, I have been able to refine my codebook to focus on behaviors and message features which clearly indicate one institutional logic, even if some message features are present across categories.

helping a parent find a missing toddler), but volunteering on their own time demonstrates the officer's personal character without illustrating how the officer engages with the community professionally. After deliberation, volunteering was classified as a new code, separate from the existing community service work code, because volunteering indicated an extra-organizational personal commitment distinct from the completion of tasks assigned during a typical workday. During Phase Two analysis, I will focus on how distinct combinations of codes within any one video work together to represent the institutional logics differently.

**Video Categorization**

At the conclusion of Phase One coding, each video had been coded at the shot level with a code sheet containing a timestamped list of codes representing the actions taken by officers on screen, the uniforms worn by police, and the usage of firearms. When determining how to categorize videos with depictions of both COP and traditional policing, I looked for thematic consistency, evidenced in the recurrence, repetition, and forcefulness of their representation (Owen, 1984). Most videos contained a larger proportion of shots depicting either COP or traditional policing and could be clearly sorted into either of those two labels. For videos that were not readily categorized by my coding team, I reviewed them individually and was able to sort most of these edge cases based on overarching presentation of policing behaviors, the interactions with citizens or the amount of time portraying one logic or the other. However, some of the videos either contained so few scenes, demonstrating any one consistent institutional logic or contained enough oppositional depictions of the two logics that neither one was prominent. Examples from each significant category will be elaborated in Phase II.

At the conclusion of Phase One, I sorted the videos into three categories: those primarily representing the institutional logic of COP (n=43), those primarily representing the

institutional logic of traditional policing (n=130), and those which fell in the middle or those which did not clearly represent either paradigm (n=139). Even though it was possible to classify videos based on the dominance of particular logics or a mixture of them, most videos contained some degree of both logics. For the videos in this last subsection, 37 of them engage with multiple competing demands in ways that encourage multiple audiences to see their priorities reflected in the organization's institutional positioning. The presentation of each of the three video types and how they managed competing demands between the logics became the focus on Phase II.

## Phase I Results

I began by responding to RQ1 which asked about which institutional logics are most prominently demonstrated in PD recruitment videos by identifying the following groupings from my sample: COP (n=43), TE (n=130), and those which had both or those which did not clearly represent either logic (n=139). This last group demonstrated institutional complexity by attempting to present their department with a mixture of logics. My analysis of completed code sheets and research team meeting notes yielded six primary themes that I posit to be facets or characteristics of communicating the institutional logic of COP and four for TE. Below, I outline how these themes combine different fundamentals of each logic with other messages features to demonstrate how the department adapts the institutional logic in their self-representation.

### *Community Oriented Policing*

When depicting the institutional logic of COP, the most prevalent themes included: (1) modeling personalized engagement, (2) self-differentiation from the norm, (3) demonstrating

community-centric policies, (4) organizational structures which make COP a process instead of a goal, (5) long-term orientation to community relationships, (6) diversity as a strengthening feature.

### *Modeling Personalized Engagement*

The most common way in which departments attempt to depict COP is through demonstrations of officers engaging with members of the community respectfully while fostering a friendly environment. Each video that was classified as illustrating the COP logic demonstrated positive interactions between officers and members of the community. These interactions were widely present across the entire sample of videos, including many which clearly depicted the TE logic. For the videos categorized as demonstrating COP, these positive interactions looked different than the rest of the sample. In videos which most clearly illustrated COP logics, interactions between members of the community and police took place in situations where community members were explicitly welcomed into a supportive environment. For example, officers in Gig Harbor (2017) are depicted engaging with different segments of the community and accommodating their behavior towards members of each individual group – handing out stickers to toddlers, dialoguing with a parent, teaching bike safety to a youth, and shaking the hands of a senior citizen. This wide variety of behaviors conveys the message that officers adapt their approach to different situations relative to the community members with whom they interact. Expressing the importance of tailoring behavior to the individual, the Decatur, GA (2009) PD emphasized how important it is "to actually sit down with a citizen or a business owner and discuss ways to resolve a problem in the area." Chief Pennington of Atlanta, GA PD (2011) drives this

point home, explaining that "my officers go out each and every day, wearing that badge proudly, to represent every neighborhood, all walks of life..."

One striking way in which some departments depict their connection to the community is through positive interaction between officers and citizens who are members of groups who have experienced minoritization. In the Austin, TX (2013) video, officers cheer along with dancing participants at a pride parade to illustrate their progressive culture. When motorcycle cops from the Norman, OK (2015) video walk around giving fist-bumps to bikers, the department shows that they have targeted their outreach efforts towards non-normative groups. When the South Salt Lake, UT (2015) PD shows police officers hanging out at an urban park during a neighborhood BBQ, the department demonstrates that the community being invoked in COP involves everyone who lives in the area and not just the affluent. Although positive interaction between citizens and the police were illustrated in the majority (84%) of the sample, videos categorized as COP demonstrated enough context to recognize the relationship between officers and citizens. By adding another dimension to the relationship between an officer and a citizen having a positive interaction, these departments emphasize the interactive and intimate nature of building community/police interactions.

*Self-Differentiation from the Norm*

Videos which reflected the COP institutional logic often differentiated themselves from other departments by directly addressing how they are tackling problems inherent to the TE paradigm. Commonly, officers in COP recruitment media talked about how they had to readjust their perspective away from harmful behaviors, which made them better officers: "I came in thinking that catching bad guys was all I was going to do all day. That's definitely not the case. Most of it is actually going out and helping people rather than catching bad

guys. Although that wasn't something I expected, it is something I enjoy doing" (Irving, TX, 2015). This willingness to adjust to better suit the community's needs is reflected in most of the COP recruitment materials. The Sparks, NV (2013) PD explains that "we're not afraid of change and if we find a better way to solve a problem then we'll do that."

Many videos featuring the COP logic rely on the notion of traditional policing by directly making comparisons to "how things are normally done" (Hillsborough, WA, 2015) or in the implicit comparison made by multiple departments which each stated that "we do things differently around here." In this way, the COP logic is outlined in relief, chipping away at vague referent without having to explicitly define problems in traditional policing or declare a position against a specific policy. When a department institutionally positions themselves relative to this unnamed heuristic category of undesirable policing, two distinct but interrelated objectives are met. First, the department reifies the traditional policing framework by aligning themselves as colleagues and peers engaged in similar behavior with some distinctions. Second, by describing themselves relative to TE, they demonstrate their distinctiveness and directly outline the existence of contradictions between the two logics. When these departments draw on this culturally-relevant heuristic category referencing some form of undesirable police behavior, they rhetorically reaffirm the validity of the department's adherence to the COP institutional logic. The Richmond, TX (2009) PD explains that "we seek men and women that desire to know and support community members in addition to protecting and serving them. If you understand this difference... please take a look at our department."

*Demonstrating Community-Centric Policies*

Another prominent theme represented in COP videos involved explanations of community-centric organizational structures which are having a positive effect on the community. Although these were featured in only one quarter of the COP videos (24%), these statements were found almost exclusively in COP videos; they were found with rare exceptions in the TE sample. To demonstrate how the program implemented by the police is positively affecting the community, the Huntington, WV (2010) video features a community elder who leads the citizen Crime and Safety Committee. He explains how officers are friendly and approachable, allowing them to be helpful. Likewise, demonstrating the department's engagement in a partnership with the community, the Irving, TX (2015) PD shows officers putting in hours at the Police Activities League where officers are paid to coach young people in sports, help with homework, and provide enriching activities.

They also depict officers partnering with a local organization to assist with the Special Olympics, participating in a donation drive with cheering community members. Programs aimed to address specific needs in the community are another way in which departments illustrate the COP logic. The Appleton, WI (2010) PD explains the implementation of a 40-hour crisis intervention training (CIT), which allows officers to better serve vulnerable citizens in a mental health crisis and reduce conflict in the community. When a supervisor from the Sheboygan, WI (2015) PD mentions that officers' duties include spending time each day to engage with the community, the video depicts officers setting up a children's summer program teaching fishing and water safety. Illustrating this principle, the Farmers Branch, TX (2017) PD shows a montage of officers checking in with business owners and citizens, hosting community outreach events, and hosting Coffee with a Cop at a local business.

During these scenes, a voice-over explains: "Farmers Branch police officers proudly serve our citizens with an unwavering commitment to community policing principles and problem solving. Our officers partner with our citizens to keep them informed and engaged in the process of keeping our city safe." These depictions of the department engaging in community events do more than simply indicate that there is a positive relationship between the department and the community. The way that these departments represent COP documents the positive impact that these behaviors have on the lived experiences of community members.

*COP as a Process*

The Sparks, NV (2013) PD explains that "the department empowers employees to participate in guiding the direction of the department" and then directly links this to various community policing efforts. In the Belton, ID department, one officer mentions that their department does not use "traditional review standards" and that officers are not given quotas for citations - but are instead expected to meet high standards for service and report to their supervisors about their daily community-building activities. By elaborating on the community-centered criteria by which an officer's career performance will be evaluated, the department demonstrates how community-oriented policing is a process in which the department engages according to concrete standards for success – not the amorphous goals which plague the COP efforts which are ineffective (as demonstrated by Rao et al., 2017). When the Euless, TX Police Department (2013) describes their decision-making process in assigning officer duties, they depict the same officers returning to the same neighborhood repeatedly throughout the year as they attend events in the different seasons at a park. This

illustrates how officers build relationships through neighborhood beats to support community building.

### *Long-Term Orientation to Community Relationships*

When demonstrating the key benefits of working for the department, most COP organizations focused on long-term career goals and quality of life. COP videos were less likely to explicitly describe the material benefits of joining the department compared to traditional policing videos. Elements such as the starting salary, benefits package, sign-up bonus, and take-home vehicle are commonly announced in recruitment media, but COP departments focus on more long-term and less immediately tangible deliverables. One common message involved "growth in your career" (Irving, TX, 2015). The Atlanta PD (2011) explains that "your decision to become a member of the Atlanta PD will be the smartest move you will ever make, for both your career and your family. Your most important and gratifying police work is ahead of you, with the Atlanta PD." This long-range perspective typifies the way that videos demonstrating the COP logic orient recruits towards a long-term relationship between their work, their family, and the community.

### *Diversity as a Strengthening Feature*

Although many departments claim diversity as an important characteristic of the department, videos in the COP category directly linked the diversity of the department to the benefit and welfare of the community. In the Sparks, NV (2013) video, a female officer from the department talks about her experience while scenes of women on the force play on the screen. She explains that "only by having a diverse organization are we truly going to be the best for our community." In the Richmond, TX (2009) video, one scene features four women

posing in uniform while standing shoulder to shoulder, with one of the women describing her prospects in the department. She says, "I look forward to advancement, to moving up as a supervisor here, and I know that this place provides me the opportunity to do that." Officers describe the match between the diversity of the department and those that they serve, explaining that representation matters to people in their neighborhoods. Describing this link, an officer explains that "one of the reasons I chose Sheboygan was because of the diversity, not just in the community, but in the department as well." By showing how the race of an individual directly affects their work with members of the community, departments move beyond tokenization to illustrate how diversity connects community members to the department. Officer Lugo of Cambridge, MA (2015) describes her story as the first Latina officer in the department, referencing friends and family from underrepresented neighborhoods who see her as a unique link to otherwise unattainable resources. She turns directly to the camera and switches to speaking Spanish, entreating other people who do not see themselves reflected in the department to join her in changing that.

### Traditional Enforcement

One common feature to emerge from this category of videos was that the individuals being arrested we mostly white males. The fact that many of the agencies were in areas in which Black Americans were dominant is, arguably, a fascinating reflection of the way policing is publicly portrayed here. This demonstrates a purposeful decision-making process regarding optics for the department, which reflects the nature of these videos as crafted texts designed by the department for promotion. In this context, when depicting the institutional logic underlying the traditional enforcement perspective, themes which were clearly depicted

61

in many of the videos include: (1) exciting and dramatic storytelling, (2) threatened officers as brave heroes, (3) incomplete examples of COP, and (4) demonstrations of hierarchy.

*Excitement and Drama*

These videos focus on overtly tough, hyper-masculine, militarized and exciting depictions of life as an officer. Most of the videos in this category open with breathtaking policing action on the screen such as a SWAT raid in progress (Boynton Beach, FL, 2015), the bomb squad remotely detonating a suspicious package (Enid, OK, 2011), or a police boat speeding through the harbor in an intense marine chase (Appleton, WI, 2010). These exciting scenes catch the viewer's attention by illustrating unusually high-tension moments that are unlikely to take place in any officer's career. These videos combine elements such as sensational visuals, dramatic music, and special effects which depict aspects of working culture within a department.

One key factor in these videos involves the impact of professional and semi-professional video production, where the recruitment budget for the department dictates what opportunities are available. Many of these videos use outdated paradigms for recruitment which focus on attracting viewer attention instead of providing recruits with a realistic understanding of their upcoming work (Wanaus, 1991). In the professionally produced video from Boynton Beach, FL (2015), the video cuts back every thirty seconds to a scene where officers decked out in different uniforms are backlit by dramatic lighting, illuminating their silhouettes with sniper rifles clearly profiled. The Myrtle Beach, FL (2016) video takes viewers on a long-distance foot pursuit of a suspect across the entire downtown district, showing off the local sights while officers demonstrate their strength and agility during the chase. These videos emphasize excitement through higher quality special effects and rely on

access to popular music which would be difficult to obtain by departments that are not paying a professional service. In Frederik, MD (2016), the camera shakes and the scene goes into slow motion for just a moment when officers tackle a suspect to the ground, with floating text appearing like a comic book with words like "POW!" and "WHAM!" When officers detain a man who is yelling after having been shot by a taser, a chat bubble that says "AHHH!!!" appears above his head.

TE videos often evoke a sense of excitement with footage from body-mounted cameras, resulting in videos which look practically identical to gameplay footage from first-person shooter video games. Both the Belton, TX (2009) and Avondale, AZ (2012) explicitly make the comparison, talking about getting the bad guys in video games as opposed to in the offline world. High energy rock & roll music was common throughout these videos. Although most videos do not have song credits, among the few TE videos that did give credit to an artist for the featured music were rock & roll song titles such as *Heartbreaker*, *Inferno*, and *Shredded*. Amped-up music keeps the tension high while dramatic stories play out on the screen. During the Midland, TX, (2014) video, officers investigate a terrorist who builds a bomb in his apartment, evades arrest, and is eventually taken down by a bicycle cop in a parking structure. Bicycle cops performing extraordinary feats is common throughout the genre, demonstrating the bravado of officers even if they're participating in the demasculinized task of bike patrol. Yuma, AZ (2007) features two bicycle cops staking out a car thief, pursuing him through the neighborhood, riding their bikes *up* a flight of stairs in pursuit, and eventually launching themselves from their bikes to tackle the suspect. The best way to describe the feel of the videos in the TE logic is that they feel *cool*.

*Heroes Protecting Against the Threat*

These videos glorify imposing heroic figures who catch the bad guys and thereby restore order. However, this logic does not focus on what happens after an arrest is made. In most videos, order is simply assumed to be restored (if the situation in which citizens live is addressed at all), with most depictions of criminality "resolved" with the suspect in police custody. Sgt. Maurizio Inzerra from the Chicago, IL PD (2010) describes what is like working for the gang unit. Talking to new recruits, he explains "You got on this job to do what you like to do. *Trying* to catch the bad guy." His statements are supported by another officer who states, "You never know what you're up against… what's behind that door!" The focus in these videos is on the officer as the hero overcoming danger. The Louisville, TN (2008) video admonishes possible recruits that "it takes a special person to become a police officer...As your career takes off, your earnings will increase. Your standing in the community will strengthen. Your self-esteem will rise, and your future will shine." The word "hero" is common throughout the transcripts of these videos, and the Houston, TX (2012) PD dedicates the first 10 seconds of their video to a written definition of the word *Hero*. It reads: "Hero: a person of distinguished courage or ability, admired for his or her brave deeds and noble qualities." These videos commonly feature officers driving through areas with dramatic lighting or spectacular vistas with grand operatic music lending majesty to the heroic figure on screen (Las Vegas, NV, 2014). Hialeah, FL (2013) asserts the superiority of their officers, stating that: "Only a small selection of those who apply will qualify, but those that do will work with some of the best law enforcement officers in the nation." Likewise, the Huntington, WV (2010) video asserts that as a department, "we set the standards for all other law enforcement in this area."

This logic focuses on the physical demands of policing, defensive training, and the importance of split-second decision making. Officers are positioned as the key factor protecting everyday citizens from threats through their own outstanding crime fighting or in concert with their teammates and brothers in the department. Many of the videos offer textual explanations of which values make someone a good officer, with words appearing on the screen at semi-regular intervals. The Huntington, WV (2010) video features the words: "Honor, Pride, Duty. Do it. Live it." The verbiage didn't vary significantly between videos, with other adjectives such as "Effective. Efficient. Impartial" (Boynton Beach, FL) appearing across the screen. Las Vegas reminds applicants of the importance of "Integrity, courage, respect, and excellence" and Wichita, KS (2012) reminds candidates of integrity, discipline, and drive. Without any further explanation, an officer representing the Anchorage, AK (2008) PD tells viewers that "If you're dishonest or unethical, you have no place in the Anchorage Police Department. We don't have unethical cops in this PD." Justice and integrity are individual characteristics in this framework, rising above notions of procedural justice.

All of these core characteristics of officers are secondary to one important goal for many of the officers in these videos: survival. An officer from Enid, OK (2017) explains that "my focus is strictly going on that call and thinking what I need to know to get out of there. Obviously, you want to have a little fear in this job so that you are safe. If you don't have fear, you could find yourself getting complacent and getting hurt." The most important thing for officers in Anchorage, AK (2008) is to "get home at the end of the night" (Anchorage, AK, 2008). Officers from Burley, ID (2010) who were lateral hires into the department cite their thankfulness for officer survival training that wasn't taught to them in other

departments. Despite these threats, this logic demands that officers self-sacrificingly put themselves in the line of fire. Officer Skaggs of Enid, OK (2011) explains that "we had a situation here recently where another officer was shot at. Some people may decide that this is not the job for me. If that is the way that you feel, then this is not the job for you. That only made me want to work harder to get those types of people off the streets." Videos featuring memorials for fallen officers are not uncommon, with officers parading in formation during a funeral event in the Yuma, AZ (2007) video. These videos reinforce the message that policing is not just dangerous, but that the priority for officers needs to be about protecting themselves from literal death at every call.

One key component of traditional policing logics in recruitment videos is the us versus them dynamic which positions the department as facing off against criminal opponents. Catching *bad guys* is a big part of the modern policing narrative. In South Portland, ME (2009), officers explain that there really are *bad guys* out there and they are ready to protect against them. In Albany, NY (, the department explains that they "turn on the sirens, hunt down the bad guys, and lock them up." Bozeman, MT (2015) makes direct mention of the need to protect officers and their families from criminals, while the Anchorage, AK (2012) video features an officer and his family being stalked by an unknown assailant.

Survival against criminal opponents requires weapons, and weapons training is paramount to the TE paradigm. The arms master from the Huntington, WV (2010) video explains that his officers each go through 2000 rounds of handgun weaponry in a routine course, and that shooting as a skill "will deteriorate very, very quickly, without continual training within a very short time." One officer in the Bellevue, WA (2014) department explains that there are some key "necessary important skills for the job" such as learning to

shoot handguns, takedown techniques, and fighting. The Anchorage, AK (2010) video explains that officers shoot more than 7,000 handgun rounds during their time in the academy, and officers in the Oro Valley, AZ (2014) department explain that they train officers to work with Homeland Security and immigration to do high risk arrests. In the Chicago *Be a Star* (2010) video, one officer talks about what he considers rewarding in his job, explaining that "It's an unbelievable feeling to get somebody that's a criminal, that has hurt somebody. It's a great sense of pride. It's a very satisfying job." Often, this institutional logic positions officers as the ones who administer justice as opposed to the court system, with officers expected to "think on their feet" so that they can "quickly make the right decision" (Fayetteville, NC) and "make the right calls" (Athens, GA, 2011) when "dealing with life and death situations" (Columbus, MO).

*Incomplete COP*

COP is commonly discussed across police recruitment videos, even by departments which do not illustrate the logic in their recruitment materials. At times, these messages can appear incongruous with other message features of the video or simply demonstrate an example of police/citizen engagement which does not match with COP behaviors. In the Murfreesboro, TN (2011) video, an officer describes the importance of COP as a framework within the department while on screen images display a White officer stacking drugs and money on the back of a Black suspect who was handcuffed and forced against the hood of the car. Other officers talk about the importance of COP while demonstrating how much the community loves them. In the South Salt Lake, UT (2016) video, police officers describe coming out to their cruiser and seeing a plate of cupcakes with the words "Thanks!" written on each one. Likewise, in Enid, OK (2011) an officer recounts how much he enjoys receiving

67

correspondence from community members who tell him how much of a difference he made in their lives before referencing the department's single Community Police officer. When an officer explains the dynamic between the department and community members in Elgin, IL (2016), he explains that he appreciates when members of the community bring him candy and treats. In TE policing, good community members *should* love cops, and this dynamic is often stressed in TE videos and directly compared to anonymous other departments where the officers previously worked and the police were not so appreciated (Apex, NC, 2016).

*Demonstrations of Hierarchy*

One of the clearest ways that the TE logic manifests is through the implementation of hierarchy and demonstrations of power distance. Depending on the organizational climate, once power is established, maintenance of the dominant position in the relationship can require significant effort on behalf of the department. Thirty-six different departments opened their videos with an aggressive and challenging version of the question "Do you have what it takes to be a member of our department?" This question and others like it are rampant throughout the TE videos, and they are usually asked by a faceless voice-over while officers display feats of strength on the screen. This number does not include departments like Santa Barbara, CA (2017), who ask collegially, "Do you have what it takes to join our home team?" Likewise, the Decatur, GA (2015) department asks, "Do you have what it takes to serve our community?" In these interactions, the department demonstrates that the recruit should feel lucky to join the ranks of the department, indicating the imbalance of power in this professional dynamic.

Power distance is a group feature which differentiates high power individuals from low power individuals, while also referencing how functional/sustainable the inequality is for

members (Franke et al., 1991; Brockner et al., 2001). In the video for the Danbury, CT (2018) PD, they repeatedly demonstrate officers wielding power over their subordinates, whether it is the Chief of police forcing a lieutenant to muck out horse stables as a punishment or that same Lieutenant telling junior members of the organization to lie on his behalf.

Describing interactions with suspects, an officer in the Chicago, IL (2010) video "The Challenge" describes his approach: "If you're going to run, then I'm going to catch you. And we'll fight them until we win. And we always win." In response a fellow officer calls out "Let's rock and roll!" In another video from the Chicago PD, the video shows two White police officers pulling over a young Black driver. Leaning into the driver's side window, the officer confronts the driver: "The reason I pulled you over is because you failed to signal at the corner. Is that messed up? Do you have a driver's license? You don't? Too bad."

This paradigm towards dominating others is manifest in a variety of contexts for this department. Describing his department relative to the field of policing, he declares that the Chicago PD has been hailed by the U.S. justice department as the model for all other law enforcement agencies across the country. After he finishes this statement, the announcer explains that it extends beyond the U.S. – that law enforcement agencies around the world look to Chicago for how to do police work, and not just for taking out the bad guys, but because of their laudable community policing as well.

The Deer Creek, TX PD explains that, as officers with authority granted by others to govern over them, "The reason police take an oath of office is due to the authority granted them in their office to take life, liberty, and property." After sharing a quote from Abraham Lincoln about power being the true test of a man's character, he references a Bible quote to

explain the true source of their power. "In Romans 13:1 the Apostle Paul wrote that every person is to be in subjection to the governing authorities, for there is no authority except from God and those who exist are established by God." No longer quoting scripture, he shares his perspective that "God gives the responsibility of enforcing the law, and thereby maintaining justice, to his officer bearers."

### *Videos That Do Not Clearly Depict an Institutional Logic*

Videos in the *Neither* category of dominant logics were challenging to code, and could be categorized into three varieties: (#1) (n=29) videos which failed to clearly illustrate either of the two institutional logics; (#2) (n=73) videos containing inconsistent message components which made the department's depiction of the logics unclear by negating its own messaging; or (#3) (n=37) videos which demonstrated tactics by which a department's representation engaged in a push-pull of competing demands between the two logics. These videos will be elaborated in Phase II. Examples from the first two categories are discussed in detail below.

#### *Videos with No or Indistinguishable Logics Depicted*

Videos which failed to clearly illustrate either one of the two institutional logics often focused entirely on the application process or the simple fact that the department was hiring. A few videos featured a series of words on the screen set to music. For example, in the Seabrook, TX (2017) PD, the department's name, insignia, and recruitment website are featured in front of department vehicles with their lights flashing, set to rock'n'roll music in front of palm trees. One team of coders had asserted that the "tough and cool feeling music" demonstrated the TE logic, while another team did not believe that the music and lack of traditional formatting represented anything other than poor marketing skills. In their ensuing

discussion, the question hinged on whether or not that music on its own can characterize the department's approach to COP. Eventually, the team explained that the music could confirm a logic as a secondary factor, but on its own, it simply did not do enough to influence the theme of the video towards either logic. Videos such as these did not clearly position the organization's logic beyond their lack of clear and purposeful messaging.

*Videos Lacking Coherency*

Other videos contained inconsistent message components in which one institutional logic fail to emerge as a cohesive underlying framework. These depictions of police work usually feature an ungainly combination of different components without sufficient supporting evidence for either logic. For example, in the Oklahoma City, OK (2017) video, unnamed officers from the department discuss how rewarding the job is, the joy they feel in making Oklahoma City a safer place to live, and the benefit of being a protector for society. Each of these discourses could be found within either of the institutional logics. Many police officers who engage in COP stated that they express feelings of being rewarded in their work, making their city a safe place to live, and enjoying protecting their society because of the tasks they complete. However, officers from departments that engage in more TE methodologies find the work of putting criminals away to be rewarding because they value protecting the community and which depends on their uniquely heroic efforts.

The Schertz, TX (2015) department chose to represent itself with single word statements which appear across the middle of the screen, such as: dedication, integrity, courage, and community. This takes place over a constant stream of unvoiced and unfocused footage of officers doing tasks like collecting evidence, driving, attending community events, and

participating in SWAT drills. The department spends a few seconds highlighting the ceremonies honoring fallen officers in their recruitment media alongside a flag depicting "the thin blue line" of officers who protect society from violent chaos, while also using a similar amount of time showing police officers assisting at community events. The video does not clearly demonstrate any one logic, nor does it form a cohesively synthesized narrative that draws from both ideologies. An uncommonly long amount of time is spent with officers posing and posturing for still photos, while the single word statements that flash across the screen do not clearly link to scenes that take place directly before or after. For example, in the scene following the tagline *integrity*, officers in ceremonial uniforms salute off camera as part of a color guard. Following the phrase *commitment to excellence*, a bicycle cop rides through town wearing a polo shirt, but after the words *dedication* and *service* appear on screen, no related scenes are pictured.

These videos lack an immediately recognizable dominance between the institutional logic of COP and TE. This allows these themes to emerge during the video without building towards a larger interconnected narrative that illustrates the underlying logics that guide department policy. In coding meetings, research assistants commented about how "the video doesn't try to do very much" because while it demonstrated the existence of these various aspects which could be selling points for the department, the features of the department are not demonstrated as providing benefits for organizational members or perceived as intrinsically special. When videos do not demonstrate how they embrace either the institutional logic of COP or TE, the department's representation of organizational life loses some ability to draw upon the social currency and associated resources of either logic, leaving the viewer unable to orient around demarcated cultural touchpoints.

### *Theme Summaries*

Across the sample of videos categorized as COP, only a few videos touched on all six themes of (1) modeling personalized engagement, (2) self-differentiation from the norm, (3) demonstrating community-centric policies, (4) organizational structures which make COP a process instead of a goal, (5) long-term orientation to community relationships, (6) diversity as a strengthening feature. By far, the most obvious way to recognize the COP institutional logic involved the self-identification of the department as being distinct from their peers in the institution of policing. Although many departments self-identify as being a COP department, they demonstrate their orientation towards their community in how they tailor their COP approach for their communities. When departments demonstrate how they have transformed police work to build upon individualized relationships with members of the community, they more convincingly prove that they are successfully implementing COP.

For videos categorized as TE, many videos prominently illustrated all five themes of (1) exciting and dramatic storytelling, (2) threatened officers as brave heroes, (3) incomplete examples of COP, and (4) demonstrations of hierarchy. When a video opens with vivid imagery and exciting explosions, it is much more likely to inhere the logic of TE than COP. Beyond the exciting presentation of policing, the officers featured in these videos are most likely to be treated as heroes for protecting citizens from bad guys and defending the good guys. This defense is paramount – even more important than effective COP or conflict de-escalation.

## Preparing for Phase II

Based on the finding of Phase I, in Phase II, I analyzed a selection of videos that represent a dominant presence of either of the two logics as well as videos which engage with

both logics. This selection falls into different categories: (1) Videos exemplifying the COP logic; (2) Videos exemplifying the TE logic; (3) Videos which depict aspects of both logics and situate competing demands in ways which influence their messaging. My purpose is to extend understanding about how the PDs presented the videos in such a way as to attract and retain an audience's attention and to persuade them that how the department enacts policing would make it a desirable organization to join. This messaging typically involved presenting the logics in a way that managed TE-COP competing demands. Videos representing the TE and COP logics were randomly selected from the sample of videos which had been identified by coders as being primarily TE or COP, while videos which integrated the logics were selected for their unique ways of depicting multiple logics.

Videos in the COP category will be explored to demonstrate how this logic can be illustrated and not just invoked. I anticipate that the analysis will illustrate how the traditional enforcement logic interacts in ways which do not distract from the COP logic or the impact that it has on the video. These videos provide examples of different strategies for illustrating a department's positive relationship with their community. Videos which illustrate the traditional enforcement logic will be analyzed to decipher if and how many depictions of the TE logic supersede the COP logic because of their impact across multiple different modalities. By multiple modalities, I reference the multiple message components which convey this message simultaneously.

For example, consider a scene featuring an officer shooting their service pistol at a target at the range, with no audio other than light background music and a voice-over describing the importance of training. This scene can be compared to a scene featuring an officer aiming a SWAT rifle directly towards the viewer, with the piercing crack of each gunshot

74

accompanying red streaks and cracked glass on the screen while rock music plays. The TE messaging has a variety of opportunities to be presented and make significant impressions. By contrast, a video which presents the richest COP messaging possible would struggle to carry as much impact as the visceral experience of having bullets fired at the viewer, especially when it is accompanied by tone-setting music, action-packed sequences, special effects, and dialogic narratives.

These videos demonstrate how certain depictions of policing inherently illustrate the department's relationship towards the community and their vision of the career of policing within their department. The way in which departments engage with competing demands inherent in the different strategies for aligning two competing institutional logics elaborates different positions on policing tactics and priorities.

# CHAPTER FOUR - PHASE II

## *Overview*

RQ1 asked what institutional logics are most prominently demonstrated in PD recruitment videos and how they convey these logics. This resulted in the categorization of the videos as predominantly TE, COP, or mixed. RQ2 further explores how departments communicate organizational messaging, focusing on how they depict the wide variety of tasks which could be seen as oppositional.

RQ2: How are competing orientations in these logics represented as types of opposition? What types of oppositions (e.g., dualisms, inconsistent, dialectics, paradoxes) surface in the videos? How do recruitment videos cast these competing logics or manage their interrelationships (e.g., either-or, both-and, and more-than strategies)?

In this section, I identify what types of strategies were used to communicate to diverse audiences and demonstrate connection between the two logics. In this phase, videos in the COP category will be analyzed to understand how COP is illustrated and not just invoked. I anticipated that the analysis of competing demands would identify how the TE logics interacts in ways which do not distract from the COP logics or from the video itself. In conducting this analysis, I confirmed that these videos provide good examples of strategies for illustrating a department's positive relationship with their community, such as distinction from TE methods. Videos which illustrate the TE were analyzed to understand how many traditional techniques were used and how these videos cast COP logics when they are invoked.

In beginning this phase, I hypothesized that the analysis would demonstrate that many depictions of the TE logic supersede the COP logic because of their impact across multiple

different modalities. By multiple modalities, I reference the multiple message components which convey this message simultaneously. For example, consider a scene featuring an officer shooting their service pistol at a target at the range, with no audio other than light background music and a voice-over describing the importance of training. This scene can be compared to a scene featuring an officer aiming a SWAT rifle directly towards the viewer, with the piercing crack of each gunshot accompanying red streaks and cracked glass on the screen while rock music plays. The TE messaging has a variety of opportunities to be presented and make significant impressions. By contrast, a video which presents a rich COP message would struggle to carry as much impact as the visceral experience of having bullets fired at the viewer, especially when it is accompanied by tone-setting music, action-packed sequences, special effects, and dialogic narratives. These videos demonstrate how certain depictions of policing inherently illustrate the department's relationship towards the community and their vision of policing within their department. The way in which departments engage with the competing demands inherent in the various strategies for aligning the two competing institutional logics elaborates different positions on policing tactics and priorities.

## Method

To understand how PDs managed the competing demands between the TE and COP logics in the recruitment videos, I use an integrative analysis to ask questions such as: What types of events project institutional logics? How does the presentation of these events influence the messaging? How are the effects influenced by cinematography, narration, sequencing, actors used, etc.? How are the competing demands represented? Duality? Dualism? Dialectic? Contradiction? I draw on understandings derived from discourse analysis to label and then

77

describe the oppositional phenomena used in the videos, how the video tapes manage them, and then discuss their potential influence on audiences (Fairhurst & Putnam, 2019). However, I used narrative analysis to examine the overall narratives presented in the recruitment videos. Narrative analysis enables researchers to uncover storylines ranging from personal experiences to overarching societal change (Cortazzi, 1994). It has commonly been used by scholars in many disciplines enabling them to integrate disciplinary constructs and issues of focus (Franzosi, 1998). In the current study, I also draw on constructs commonly used in film and media studies. I begin this section by describing some of the unique affordances of film media which will be important in this analysis of video presentations and narratives. Although each of these media features were analyzed for all videos, each department's video is a unique production, and some media features were more impactful for some videos than others.

**Cinematography**

Describing the behavior taking place on screen and categorizing it according to the underlying institutional logics is a far simpler task than categorizing features which are relevant for the atmosphere and mood of the video, such as music, special effects, tone, or pacing. Within the overlapping fields of communication and media studies, film theorists have developed the study of film semiotics – the study of how meaning is created and expressed in film (Metz, 1974; Bordwell, 2020). In recruitment media, PDs align multiple institutional logics to present a chosen image of policing. The interaction of these different institutional logics can present inconsistent themes, and it is in the way that departments attend to these incongruities that project their organizational identity to new recruits. To navigate between different institutional logics, the department does not just choose what they

record with the camera, but how they film it and edit it. Describing the artistic style used when filming, choices in the video's *cinematography* can illustrate the department's orientation to different institutional logics. Likewise, the choices made by the department in the sequence of events as established by the video's *narrative structure* also helps to elaborate the department's orientation to police work. Each video represents one possible sequencing of the events which take place in the video, and this sequencing follows a set of constitutive rules or guidelines which provide insights into how the institutional logics interrelate. These rules and guidelines are influenced and controlled by whatever emerges in the presentation of these two logics. By analyzing the configuration of scenes created in the narrative structure of these videos, patterns emerge which illustrate the effects of various combinations of institutional logics

Cinematography also tells a story through the camera placement, lighting, and editing that affects the content which is being filmed. Influential classic Hollywood director Michal Chapman explains that the job of the cinematographer is to tell the audience where to look and when to look there (Glassman, 1992). Emphasizing the role of film editing in conveying information, Max Ophuls explains that "Moods and changes of pace can only be highlighted by corresponding camera action – a nervous, quickly moving camera for excitement, a slow, methodical camera for building tough story points" ('Mason-Bennet' 1949). Consider the impact that dark lighting, shaky filming, and a funeral dirge for background music would make on a scene featuring a department induction ceremony for new recruits as opposed to bright lighting, smooth sweeping shots, and upbeat music. The way that the content is filmed and edited communicates a message all on its own which can be even more significant than that content itself.

One framework for understanding messaging in film media employs the notions of connotative and denotative meaning. What the audience sees and hears conveys denotative meaning, while connotation involves the feelings and ideas evoked in the viewer (Metz, 1974). The events which take place on screen are the components of the story, and the way in which those components are organized comprises the storytelling itself (Barthes, 1957). Consider the following elements of film/videos and their effects:

**Slow-Motion Cinematography:** The slow-motion special effect emphasizes a moment by ramping up the anticipation of what is coming next (Bordwell et al., 2020). One type of scene which is common throughout the sample involves an officer placing a suspect under arrest in a crowded area. If a slow-motion effect was added which emphasized the cuffs being closed, that would emphasize the TE logic, while a slow-motion effect focusing on the thankful faces of the crowd would lean towards the COP logic.

**Narrative structure**: As an example, consider a scene meant to illustrate COP featuring a high school resource officer in classroom of teenagers. This scene takes on different meanings depending on what happens immediately afterword: If the next scene features the same officer playing basketball with the students, the first scene will be reinforced in its community policing message. However, if the next scene features an officer placing handcuffs on a teenager, the meaning derived from the first scene is impacted by the second, demonstrating a TE orientation.

To tell these stories, film creators also use metonyms, where a sign is presented to signify a much larger construct. By illustrating a single component of a larger idea, that individual component (sign) is intended as a representative substitution for the entirety of a related idea

(signified). Within PD recruitment materials, this is commonly done with uniforms substituted for the occupation that uses them, or landmarks used to represent an entire city. Scenes of officers playing with children metonymically represent the department's relationship with the community and stance on building relationships, while scenes looking up at officers from the POV of prisoners being locked into a cell function as a metonym for the department's stance on criminal enforcement.

The camera's positioning, movement, and special effects often use six primary ways that can affect the story telling (Salt, 1992):

1. Orientation: *Telling the viewer where to look.*

2. Pacing: *Speeding, slowing, or maintaining the action.*

3. Inflection: *Increasing intensity, suggesting emotions, or demonstrating importance.*

4. Focalization: *Increasing immersion and excitement by associating the movement of the camera with the viewpoints of characters.*

5. Reflexive: *Using camera movement to "play" with the audience.*

6. Abstract: *visualizing ideas and concepts.*

For PD recruitment media, each of these ways of manipulating the film can be used to either complement or detract from a scene's impact in representing an institutional logic. Using a few examples of departments applying cinematographic effects, I illustrate how the editing of a scene can either strengthen or weaken the impact of the institutional logic on the video's overall messaging. When the Newport Beach, CA (2013) video zooms in on an officer's hands loading a magazine into a gun he pulled from a rack in the back of a police van, viewers are *oriented* to focus their attention on the weapon as all other features of the film are rushed off screen. This focus on the weapon exaggerates the impact of the TE

81

messaging already present in a first-person POV shot of an officer rushing to gear up in a combat scenario.

When the Omaha, NE (2010) video features their K9 unit on screen, they employ a dramatic pause and slow-motion effect to highlight the impressive distance that the dog is jumping. By slowing down the pace to focus on this exciting moment, the department exaggerates the TE logic. Slow motion commonly decreases the pace while emphasizing the action taking place on screen.

When the Enid, OK (2016) video highlights their motorcycle unit, the camera is angled up at two officers from the ground as they zoom off on a car chase, passing the camera on either side. The positioning *inflects* a sense of prestige into the officers and their work, compounding the impact of the traditional enforcement logic already present in the scene. The Huntington, WV (2010) PD uses a similar technique to highlight their bicycle patrol unit, with officers quickly pedaling their bicycles on either side of the camera. Whether the shot was intended to convey the athleticism and prestige of the bike cops, or to glamorize a behavior which illustrates the COP logic, the shot's framing does not intensify either the TE or COP logics.

When officers from the West Melbourne, FL (2015) SWAT team burst into a house during a raid, a Steadicam fluidly follows the officers through the door and into an active shooter scenario. This helps the viewer feel as though they are part of the action, instantly creating a sense of immersion by *focalizing* the shot around the forward momentum of the SWAT raid. Likewise, when the camera pans around the happy crowd eating together at a community barbeque, the focalization keeps community members centered in the narrative.

**Music**

Communication and the language of music (see Harwood, 2017) has been widely

discussed and in intergroup settings (e.g., Giles et al., 2010; Harwood, 2018). Drawing on the

adrenaline-heavy machismo aspect of traditional policing, aggressive rock and rap music

could influence audience perception of otherwise neutral behaviors being depicted on screen.

Several studies have confirmed that music can affect audiences and in intergroup ways

(Harwood, 2018). Kellaris and Kent (1991) found that upbeat music played during a

commercial positively impacts purchase intent, and Brooker and Wheatley (1994) concluded

that faster music should increase both attention and liking for a brand. However, subsequent

research has demonstrated that music in persuasive media is most often one single

component in an interdependent array of other variables which influence viewers (Morris &

Boone, 1998). In line with dual-process models (i.e., Petty & Cacioppo, 1986), music is more

effective as a persuasive element when the audience is not highly involved and can function

as a positive peripheral cue (Vermeulen & Beukeboom, 2016). Although these features

should be expected to shape the audience's perception of the organization's positioning,

these features are almost exclusively paired with content that already invokes the same

institutional logics without the added special effects.

**Narrative Sequence**

Cohan and Shires (1988) argued "The distinguishing feature of narrative is its linear

organization of events" (pp. 52-53). The importance of the sequence of events within a video

is made evident by considering the difference between the storyline of a video and the

narrative which would emerge if the same scenes were shown in reverse order. By the same

token, the sequence of events within a smaller subsection of a video can be critical for

messaging. Transposing scenes within a video can dramatically alter the storyline, which is the vehicle by which institutional logics are elaborated. To illustrate this point, consider a scene featuring an officer driving at night during a storm. If the scene which directly follows the late-night drive features officers handing out emergency supplies during a natural disaster, the COP logic is inferred in both scenes. If instead, the next scene featured officers chasing after a suspect with flashlights in the rain, the TE logic permeates both scenes. Through this interactive process, the department's positioning is determined both cumulatively as well as retroactively, with each new message feature interacting with the amalgamated impact of both the COP and TE logics.

Each unique sequence in which a given set of scenes could be arranged allows for a different balance of the institutional logics. As competing logics develop throughout the video, the pattern of their interaction creates the structure for the department's orientation towards the community. As the department illustrates varying distinctive components of the job, tensions develop, and contradictions can arise in the juxtaposition of different logics. Logically, there are three main ways in which two scenes could possibly interact together. The scenes will either (a) complement each other by reinforcing an institutional logic together; (b) detract from the impact of either scene in representing their institutional logics; or (c) interact without any significant impact on either institutional logic. Further, because these videos are composed of dozens of scenes all interacting across the entire length of the video, each of these interactions could take place multiple times at different points, resulting in a wide variation of possible emergent patterns. In this phase, these different emergent patterns are analyzed to develop a typology of institutional logic interactions.

## Analysis Procedures

This phase examined the way that the emergent oppositional aspects of the videos (e.g., tensions, contradictions, dualities, dualisms, dialectics and paradoxes) demonstrate and shape the relationships between the logics as presented in the videos. Through understanding their representation of these oppositions, we gain insight into how the departments view the logics and how they position themselves to potential recruits and wider audiences since the videos could be viewed by a multitude of stakeholders. I used stratified random sampling choosing three videos from within each of the three categories: Videos that represent the COP logic, videos that represent the TE logic, and videos that do not neatly fall into either of the previous categories.

I began by watching the videos with the coding sheets created in Phase I to make note of any incidences that had been labeled COP, TE or indistinguishable. As I watched the video, I frequently paused and noted: (a) the sequencing of events; (b) actors including gender, race, position in the hierarchy, dress, and their activities; (c) character development; (d) music; cinematography and camera angles; and (e) whether the activity had been previously labels as COP, TE or indistinguishable. I used an integrative methodology which uses constant review and comparison from grounded theory combined with discourse analysis and analysis of film features (e.g., cinematography, narrative structure, narrative sequence, music) (Fairhurst & Putnam, 2019, p. 921). As I watched the videos, I made note of oppositions between logics that emerged either from disparate message components that were being presented simultaneously, or when they were juxtaposed by the narrative sequence of the video. After noting the emergence of these oppositions, I looked for indicators of the constitutive effects of tension by asking three guiding questions (1) How did departments

use discourses, organizational structures, narratives, and message components to reveal alignments of institutional logics? (2) What types of oppositional tensions surfaced in how the competing logics were represented among features of the videos? (3) How did videos represent ways these competing demands were managed in alignments? (Putnam & Fairhurst, 2019)? For example, when two different officers would elaborate oppositional frameworks on their role in "catching bad guys" in the same video, I would look for indicators of organizational structures and discourses which would support either of these perspectives. These could be co-present in the scene and indicate organizational structure, such as the officer's rank, assigned unit, and equipment/training provided by the department. This could also include message components which were co-present but indicated underlying organizational or institutional discourses about the occupation.

Likewise, this could include message components which were linked by the sequence of events in the video, such as the events which take place on the screen immediately before and after to frame the narrative. However, at times some aspects of the video are linked by narrative elements, such as an officer making a statement at one point in the video, and then making an oppositional one at a later point. Each time that a new possible opposition emerged, I noted and linked the other components from the video which either indicate support for one of the two sides in the opposition, demonstrate the organization's response to this opposition, or indicate possible sources for the opposition.

The reflexivity which is inherent in the integrative approach was essential for progress through this study. As new constructs emerged which contributed to either the competing logics or the department's positioning on the logics, I revisited literature throughout my analysis to explore them, such as the impact and usage of cinematographic effects. For

instance, in order to understand how PDs manage competing demands, I employ a tensional approach (Putnam et al., 2016) to categorize their efforts into either-or, both-and, and more-than strategies. An either-or strategy is one in which competing demands are treated as independent, usually to subvert tension. These strategies include defensive mechanisms (may be enacted through projection, repression, withdrawal, regression, reaction forming, ambivalence),  selection (selecting or privileging one pole over the other), and separation (decoupling the logics).  A both-and strategy approach attempts to use parts of both TE and COP logics. Strategies may include paradoxical thinking (identifying valuable differences between the poles, reducing anxiety and fear), vacillation/spiraling inversion (shifting between poles at different times), and integration and balance (developing a middle ground or seeking equilibrium).  Finally,  in a more-than strategies, performative practices are employed in such a way to engage competing demands and avoid closure of options before it is time to do so. This may include reframing and transcendence (situating the competing logics in a new relationship), connection and dialogue (engaging multiple viewpoints and engaging in paradoxical thinking), and reflective practice and serious play (trial-and-error, engaging in humor, irony, and play). For a more in-depth review of these strategies, see Putnam et al. (2016).

<div align="center">Phase II Analysis</div>

## TE#1: Midland, Texas

Midland, TX PD's 2016 recruitment video has a runtime of 3:01. The video features the TE institutional logic, with excitement and drama throughout the video, heroic officers overcoming threats, and no COP representations. However, the depictions of the TE logic become increasingly extreme as the action-packed video progresses.

**Event I**

Opening with a dramatic techno baseline music at 240bpm. All-caps text flashes and fades, saying 'THE TIME HAS COME.' Before the music hits the point where it drastically speeds up and gets louder, two slow moving shots introduce the department. The first shot slowly pans past four White men wearing dark sunglasses and full camouflage, hunkered down in combat formation. Three of the men have sniper rifles pointed directly at the camera. The next scene frames the officer so that his gun is visible at the bottom of the screen in what is known as a Cowboy Shot or an American Shot. These shots get their name from the dramatic U.S. Depression Era Western films which ironically framed the characters centered around their guns. This older officer in glasses walks around in a public shopping center while scanning the population with his hands on his hips. He isn't smiling or talking with anyone, and his expression is unchanged throughout. Words flash on the right side of the screen, displaying "Community Relations." While these two shots illustrate disparate aspects of the job, this depiction of community relations clearly lacks the hallmarks of COP. Because the department explicitly labels this activity as community-oriented work, the viewer is able to see how the department defines COP.

In this video competing demands are made salient through the parallel depictions of different behaviors on the screen that includes symbolic text composed of narratives which reveal how logics are framed and communicated (Putnam et al., 2016). By displaying these social interactions that highlight few oppositional aspects between them, the TE logic is prominent and has a dramatic effect on the video's narrative. In both scenes, officers select the TE logic, rise above the community, and observe the scene dispassionately while being poised for action, if necessary. The department manages the competing demands of TE and

COP by depicting unbalanced examples of both logics, neutralizing the COP messaging while ostensibly demonstrating both.

### Event II

Once the scene cuts to the next shot, the music ramps up immediately. From an over-the-shoulder shot angle, the camera follows closely behind a man wearing a black balaclava running from the police. His escape is cut off by two patrol vehicles with lights flashing converging in a pincer formation. He darts from side to side until officers throw their vehicle doors open and point weapons at him from a secure position behind the door while the two spotlights illuminate the suspect. He raises his hands above his head and begins to lie down on the ground. The video cuts to a K9 shot with a dog running full speed towards the suspect. The dog leaps and bites the man, swinging him around and towards the ground. Increasing the immediacy of the scene, the camera bounces to a first person POV of a suspect being attacked by the dog. Looking straight down, the dog violently shakes his head from side to side after biting down on the man's arm.

These two scenes clearly echo the TE logic by illustrating dramatized versions of violent interactions. During these dramatic scenes, the video is cut so that viewers can be more immersed in the action alongside the actors on the screen via first-person or over-the-shoulder shots. The pursuit of suspects by car and on foot represents the TE logic due to the inherent danger in car chases. The potential harm to everyone on the scene, including those uninvolved in the pursuit, makes car chases an unappealing method for resolving problems from a COP perspective. Likewise, although K9 units have a level of social acceptability, the attack taking place on the screen is deceptively harmful. Unlike domestic dog bites, police K9s are trained to bite differently and latch securely, as well as bite repeatedly while tearing

from side to side until the suspect is motionless. In both scenes, the camera angles that put the viewer in the perspective of the suspect keeps the scene exciting while clearly demonstrating the department's tactical prowess. Both of these scenes work to subvert competing demands and prioritize one logic while ignoring and minimizing the other.

## Event III

The next narrative event features officers investigating crimes in the lab and on sight at the crime scene. The pumped-up music from the previous narrative event continues through the scenes, keeping the pace of the video going while demonstrating otherwise mundane daily tasks. The scene features a female detective looking for evidence at the scene of a crime. Keeping the viewer involved, the word "Detectives" is edited onto the wall behind the officers as though it could have been painted on the wall itself. Shifting from the detective to the only other woman in the video, a CSI technician runs tests on the evidence back at the lab.

In this video, the only two women featured are both doing work that takes place behind the scenes and separate from the action. The females are traditionally attractive, with the detective wearing makeup, heels, and her service weapon. The styling of these women within the context reveals an absurd paradox where the woman is dressed performatively in divergent ways in order to highlight her attractive features as well as her position as a battle-ready law enforcement officer. As a detective investigating an inactive crime scene while surrounded by uniformed officers, her footwear demonstrates that the work is safe and inactive enough to do in heels. However, the presence of her service weapon demonstrates that she needs to be ready to use that weapon at any time. If it is essential to always wear a service weapon in order to not be caught unaware, the detective's heels seem incongruous.

This seemingly absurd outcome stems from two different pressures faced by women in the department to perform their gender identity as socially expected while also performing their organizational role as active-duty officers, and may be described as a form of projection. That being an either- or approach to managing competing demands which occurs through highlighting tensions in the gender role that ultimately repress the COP through these subverting tensions.

**Event IV**

In stark contrast to the white collar feel of detective work, the SWAT scene features a squad of men wearing a full camouflaged protective gear with rifles drawn and advancing on a target while shooting multiple bullets each second. Switching to a view from the inside of a home, the front door is framed in the center of the shot with the words "Fulfill your purpose" digitally added in all-caps. When a fiery explosion blasts the door into wood scraps, the words "Fulfill your purpose" likewise explode across the screen, looking like glass shards from the nearby window. Officers start streaming through the door with guns aimed towards the camera and down the hallways. As the smoke from the explosion clears, the camera shifts for two close-up shots of White male SWAT team members looking sternly at the camera with weapons drawn.

The TE logic continues to dominate in this event. Even though scenes which exclusively feature the SWAT team and weapons training inherently illustrate the TE logic, these scenes are exceptional in the sample. In a drastic shift from the shot featuring an evidence technician or officer working in the lab, this event dramatically advances the action with a squad of officers wearing multiple firearms, head-to-toe camouflage, and rifles pointed straight ahead. In defensive posture, the officers crouch to keep a low profile and hold their weapons steady.

They fire their weapons the entire time that they advance forward in formation as a unit. The drastic increase in aggression between the two scenes is jarring, which sets the tone for the rest of the video; serving as more evidence that the COP was ignored, tensions were denied, and competing demands were managed through the either-or approaches of separation and selection.

**Event V**

In this scene, the camera sinks to a low angle looking up at two male officers from the department, one White and one Hispanic. Wearing sunglasses and unsmiling with their arms folded across their chest, the two men lean away from the camera. Behind them are two police SUVs with their emergency lights on, one with the department logo and the other unmarked with lights flashing. The U.S. flag and the Texas flag are both visible behind the officers in the background. The officer's positioning and the framing of the shot presents them as honorable and imposing. Maintaining the momentum of the video, the camera pans the car's red and blue emergency lights flashing in the background. A flash of fire streaks across the screen, revealing a black background with the words "APPLY TODAY" and "MIDLAND POLICE DEPARTMENT" in the center of the screen. As the techno music fades, the screen flashes again and the department's website address appears.

The two officers represent the department, with this scene fitting into the narrative as the capstone depiction of the Midland PD. The officers' proud stance and firmly set faces posing in the videos is most commonly found in TE videos. One essential component of the TE logic depicts police as heroic with honor-laden framing, as demonstrated in this scene. The officers are unapproachable, with their eyes concealed by the black glasses and frowns,

demonstrating that the strategy of ignoring or neutralizing the competing demands continues to be utilized.\

**Video Summary**

By setting up a clear-cut, well-defined boundary between the two logics by presenting disparate examples together, this video exemplifies dualism as an approach for favoring one logic. Although both logics are depicted, the disparity between the intensity of focus between them keeps the TE messaging prominent throughout. Dualism is represented in this video through the oppositional and binary depiction of the two logics. They are demonstrated to occupy distinct domains, with clear boundaries of what activities are TE versus COP without treating them as mutually incompatible. This video employs either-or strategies such as defensive mechanisms (projection, subverting tensions) and selection to respond to competing demands. Separate units within the department do different jobs as part of the larger TE-oriented mission of the agency. The job roles within policing which do not exemplify the ethos of the TE logic are given minimal attention while special effects, exciting musical transitions, and literal explosions abound in scenes featuring officers performing enforcement duties.

One instance of inconsistent messaging in this video is presented when the video features the phrase "Fulfill Your Purpose" in the shot of the door before the SWAT team bursts through. This is the only messaging in the video directed to the viewer. This text explodes along with the door using a shatter special effect. When the shards of letters blast away in all directions, it can be easily confused for actual glass, given the size of the blast and the nearby windows. The SWAT team explodes inwards towards the home's occupants and destroys the door. Especially given the

93

shatter effect merging the debris from the door and the text, the department visually destroys the inspirational statement, "Fulfill Your Purpose." This added element of violence demonstrates the either- or response of regression, amping up the TE messaging which is central to the department.

The department selected the scene with officers posing at the end of the video. The officers aren't talking to the audience, interacting with community members, or engaging in any other form of police work. They're simply standing in place, representing the department and demonstrating tacit approval of the department and its recruitment media. In terms of narrative, this video had the opportunity to close with any other sort of messaging or depiction of policing, which could bookend the video to complement the scene featuring the Community Relations unit. This would re-focus the video on the department's connection to the community instead of this scene which exhibits the department's separation from the community. Overall, the video creates tension between the police and those who are policed, but there is no tension between the logics since the department presents a subverted form of the COP logic.

TE#2: Newport, California

The Newport Beach PD's 2008 recruitment video has a runtime of 1:25. The video is strongly focused on the TE logic, highlighting hostile interactions with suspects, car chases, combat training, foot chases, threats to criminals, parading and ceremony, shouted commands, and SWAT raids. Coders identified no examples of COP in the video. Opening from a black screen, the background music launches into a high-hat drum intro and a pumped-up techno beat (130bpm). The video features extensive jump cuts which speed up the action on screen, complemented by freeze frames which add emphasis to key shots. All

featured officers are White and male throughout the video, making it the most extreme example of monoculturalism in the sample.

**Event I**

The video begins with the department's name on the screen logo and quickly transitions via spinning special effects to the challenging question of "Do you have What it Takes?" across the screen in black and white. In a fast-paced montage, an officer in the locker room straps on his bullet-proof vest, loads and clears the chamber of his gun, laces up his boots, and cinches up his belt. In juxtaposition to the banal nature of the task featured on the screen, the scene is edited to feature camera cuts eleven times in five seconds, with each shot punctuated by one loud Foley sound effect for each item of gear worn. The trivial nature of getting dressed for work does not match the extreme nature of the editing which increases the pace and immersion of the scene. This contradiction between the monotony of getting dressed and the drama of the editing immediately sets the tempo for the video.

The first message that the department shares in their recruitment video creates power distance between the viewer, who may or may not "Have What it Takes," and the department which determines eligibility. This immediate invocation of hierarchy is not inherently demonstrative of authoritarianism. In fact, this is a selection strategy that serves to create a power imbalance to neutralize or even ignore the competing demand of COP. This introductory question could come before scenes of officers throwing sandbags in the rain and helping a homeless man in the street making their ability to help their community, but the aggressive music and dramatic sound effects hint that this is not the case.

No police work is demonstrated on screen during this scene, and all video footage from the first ten seconds of the video was shot in a locker room. This scene builds excitement

without demonstrating its mission and what officers do in this department. This places an emphasis on the action of putting on the uniform, which, as noted in Jolicoeur et al. (2019), indicates power difference between those in uniform and those not in uniform The attention that is purposely attracted to this otherwise unremarkable daily task guides the viewer to (1) feel drawn into the action, (2) place significance on the visuals which are amplified via special effects, and (3) recognize that the department chooses to emphasize this task. The TE logic is demonstrated in the hierarchical frame created by the question "Do you have What It Takes?" as well as the focus on the material items which sets officers apart once they are wearing the uniform (e.g., handcuffs, gun, and badge).

## Event II

This scene features institutionalized combat training reminiscent of the military. Beginning with a frenzied drilling montage, officers wear full uniforms while marching in formation, salute their superiors, and stand at attention. While the color guard raises the flag behind them, the commanding officers wearing dress uniforms with white gloves stand at attention facing the recruits. One shouts: "You have six months to get it right!" The recruits undergo a series of bootcamp-style hazing punishments, such as standing with their arms fully extended in front of them, holding their batons while counting in unison; repeatedly slapping a wooden board on the wall in time to forced exercises; and being singled out and then undergoing a verbal dressing down standing in front of their commanding officer's desk surrounded by other officers. During the 10 second training sequence, the shot switches thirteen times, with the smacking noise of the officer's hand on the wall punctuating the aggressive beat of the music. As one commanding officer shouts "Do your job!" at a trainee, they respond by shouting "Yes sir!" in unison.

As described in Phase 1, coders identified these action sequences as fitting the TE logic, with the behaviors on screen illustrating organizational hierarchy through violence and stamina. Of all the scenes in the video, this is the only one which explicitly illustrates training new recruits, and all tasks that these recruits are being trained to do require military discipline and physical training. This narrative event fulfills the hinted promise of authoritarianism in the question: "Do you have what it takes?" Organizational leadership shouts at the new recruits during the training montage, "This is the Orange County Sheriff's Academy! You have six months to get it right!" In this training environment, those who are in authority use shouted commands, the threat of violence, and pain to convey their authority and to get recruits to follow their directions. This provides additional support for the TE logic and has implications for how officers implement their training. Recruits who are instructed in this environment are primed to reenact the same behaviors as they interact with members of the community. The department shows no footage of recruits engaged in studying, role playing, or learning to interact with community members in any way. Therefore, this example illustrates a defensive mechanism in which the organization cultivates the TE logic while withdrawing from the COP logic.

**Event III**

Leaving the training yard, during the next narrative event, officers engage in urban combat. Throughout these scenes, dispatch calls and police scanner noises provide background chatter. In a scene which begins with a police cruiser speeding in the dark with flashing lights and siren blaring, the next scene transitions to an officer crouched behind his patrol vehicle with his sidearm aimed at a compliant suspect whose hands are pressed against the trunk of a car. An officer rushes from his vehicle to jump over the wall surrounding an

97

apartment complex. Midway through scaling the wall, the action pauses after the officer leaps from the ground but before he actually leaps over. This freeze frame forces attention to the specific moment of action, emphasizing the officer's physical prowess. After the brief pause, the video speeds up to make up for the lost time, maintaining the hyper pace of action even though the screen has paused. As a new officer rolls open the back panel of a police cargo vehicle, the camera zooms in on racks of black rifles. Jumping to a closeup shot of an officer's hands, a magazine of ammunition gets slammed into the stock of the firearm.

The background audio of the police scanner and dispatch demonstrates a coordinated effort on behalf of the entire department. The situation continually escalates, beginning with rushing to a call, drawing a firearm on a suspect to get them to obey orders, scaling walls in pursuit of a suspect, and crescendos with officers distributing and arming rifles once the mobile command vehicle arrives. Each of these shots do not simply demonstrate physical fitness or toughness but are emphasized as feats of strength by carefully edited pauses and jump cuts.

These scenes cannot be understood as separate from the relative context of the video so far, which has demonstrated that officers are trained to engage with the community in this way through their academy training. The video demonstrates the academy inculcating strict obedience to authority at the expense of personal freedom, which continues to be exhibited beyond the academy setting. Up to this point of the video, there is neither tension depicted between the intense physical enactments of training and positive interaction with the community, nor an attempt to illustrate a secondary institutional logic. These actions and scenes repress and/or ignore the existence of the COP logic, thus ignoring the competing demands and falling into an either-or strategy.

**Event IV**

When the action moves indoors, the camera shifts to a first person POV which maintains the increasing pace of the video. Directly facing the camera, an officer circles around with fists raised before swinging at the camera five times over three seconds of film. Meanwhile, still indoors, a K9 officer directs his German Shepard who tackles a man dressed as a suspect. In a scene taking place outside, car chases escalate into foot chases and officers set up road flares with red and blue lights flashing in the distance. In a closeup shot, an officer grips his service weapon with two hands and fires four shots immediately to the right of the camera. Facing the camera, an officer draws his service weapon and flashlight while crouched behind the car door with his cruiser's spotlight pointed at his target. Switching back to the first person POV, a police dog leaps towards the camera, bites down, and pulls the cameraman to the ground.

Directly after the scenes where an officer leaps a wall and rifles are handed out, the camera angle shifts to a first-person perspective where the viewer is immediately under attack. After the previous scenes chased criminals into the apartment complex and over the wall, this narrative event pursues them indoors. Drastic changes in camera angle continually propel the action forward during this narrative event. In most shots, the first-person perspective is either attacking or being attacked, with weapons pointed towards the camera.

The Cowboy Shot, typically reserved for moments in film after the brave hero has achieved his goals (see for example Kryeziu, 2019), can be seen here as the camera angle shows the officer holding his flashlight and service weapon together near the bottom frame. Again, we see an either-or strategy that favors one logic (TE), ignoring the other (COP) via selection.

99

**Event V**

The camera shifts to an over the shoulder shot from behind two officers flying over the city in a helicopter, chasing suspects on the ground with the floodlight. The shot switches to a scene in a gym where one officer launches his opponent over his shoulder and onto the ground, while an officer in the background looks on. A freeze frame pauses the action when the opponent's legs are above his head in the air, his chest and head curling underneath the officer. After this brief moment for emphasis, the action jumps forward to the opponent being slammed onto the ground in sync with the shot ending. In a jarring transition, the video cuts to a sniper whose gun is pointed towards the camera, zooming in as he lines up his shot. In another sparring scenario, the camera POV jumps between the two combatants as they circle each other, switching sides as punches are thrown. Surrendering suspects kneel on the ground, backlit by police lights and SWAT members use a battering ram to take a door, rushing in with guns raised. In another training sequence, one officer pins his opponent to the ground with a chokehold, while a voice-over repeats the command to "Stop resisting! Stop resisting" until the already-compliant opponent taps twice on the ground to signal surrender. The music fades out during this scene, leaving a silence filled by the commands to stop resisting. A clip of a female dispatcher's voice plays while the shot transitions to the inside of an armored police vehicle with an officer rushing out with a rifle drawn.

This narrative event begins with officers searching for a fleeing suspect in a helicopter and then immediately shifts to the various ways in which police officers subdue their targets. Officers overcome their opponents from the extreme distance of a sniper's perch, crashing into their homes with the SWAT team, engage them in hand-to-hand combat, choke them out, and send in reinforcements. As in all previous scenes, the COP logic fails to present,

100

demonstrating that TE is being privileged by selection (an either-or strategy) The scene within the troop transport truck is made even more dramatic with lighting effects and an audio clip from a female dispatcher explaining that they "need a unit at 23rd and Balboa." The shot is edited to oversaturate the brightly lit area directly outside the dark interior of the armored vehicle, causing the officer to step out of the vehicle and disappear into a blank white void before the scene flashes and the white bursts across the screen before fading to the next scene.

## Event VI

For this shot, the camera is positioned looking out over an ocean pier during a sunset. Overlaid on this peaceful view is a voice track edited to sound like it is being shouted through a megaphone: "This is the Newport Beach Police Department! If you're inside, make yourself known." A police cruiser drives down the pier, with no other visuals which correlate to the voice clip, and the serene background of the pier stands in stark contrast to the vocal commands which have been edited in. As the music winds down, the text "careers with purpose" spins onto the screen beneath a large NBPD.

The disjointed nature of this last sequence arises from a clash between opposing logics in policing at the institutional level illustrate the complex and ambiguous demands under which the organization operates (Smith & Lewis, 2011). Multiple thematically disconnected elements combine to muddle the department's recruitment efforts in this scene. (1) The video closes with a police cruiser driving on a pier in front of a beautiful sunset, illustrating the desirability of the area as a place to live; (2) The last words spoken in the department's video are an implied threat to a suspect off-screen; (3) The text "careers with purpose" alludes to a meaningful employment in the department.

First, compared to every other scene in the video, the sunset background shot featuring the pier is unique, with the camera angle displaying the sunset with the waves rolling in. This is the first scene demonstrating any attractive features of Newport Beach, the city with the highest per capita income of all Orange County. This wide-angle shot establishes the exotic location and desirable weather. For a video featuring multiple scenes with officers engaging with suspects on public streets, the area is never the focus of the shot. With the music fading out, this shot features the most peaceful tone of the video.

Second, in all scenes previous, the audio and visual cues match up thematically. The violent blast of gunfire accompanies scenes where officers are shooting. When the officer chokes out his opponent earlier in the video, the voice-over makes contextually significant statements. This scene is different – it features a beautiful sunset over the ocean pier. However, the audio message does not sync with the video presentation. The audio of the scene features an artificially amplified voice in the styling of a police cruiser's megaphone. The audio comes from a SWAT raid, demanding that suspects make themselves known to the police. In this instance, separation and source splitting serve to keep the poles apart; TE for doing the job and COP for enjoying the community; yet another functional separation between competing demands.

Third, the single mention of career choice in the final frames of the video represents a lone effort to engage with recruits' career goals and mindfulness in the role that the Newport Police Department can play. The theme of purposeful career direction is not reflected in any other action on screen or in audio, nor is this message repeated in any capacity.

In a video which blitzes from physical training to combat to SWAT raids, careful decisions are repeatedly made to freeze frames for emphasis, jump cut forward for

excitement, and assign artificial sound effects to make the film more immersive. The decision to add one phrase of career-minded language reflects the commensurate level of attention to illustrate this message relative to the dramatic stylistic choices.

This final sequence functions as a grab bag at the end of the video, combining organizational messages with demonstrations of the area's natural beauty, overlaid with a threatening voice-over stylized as the loudspeaker on a police cruiser. The last shots in the video show the inherent desirability of the area. Although this shot demonstrates the beautiful landscape as a reason to live in the area and work for the department, there is an inherent irony in that reasoning. The scenes which demonstrate the presence of massive violent crime are presented in this video as not only not detracting from this peaceful situation, but as leading directly to it.

## Video Summary

This video features a dramatic inconsistency between the combat-style footage that made up most of the video and the landscape shot that closes out the video. Things which appear disharmonious are presented in the same context, allowing the narrative flow of the video to link them together. The department's decision to close out the flurry of violence throughout the video with the peaceful sunset suggests that the peaceful sunset emerges after all the brutal enforcement has been completed.

No matter what crime the department faces, Newport's sunny coastline as the location for the video is a material reality, creating a focused merger between the two seemingly opposed concepts (Gu et al., 2004). The department needs to recruit new members during a policing recruitment and retention crisis, spurred by the market forces making policing less desirable to recruits. In the context of these structural issues, the department produces recruitment

103

materials edited to garner excitement, favoring the TE logic to a militaristic extreme. The logics interact in this video as a dualism, being treated as incompatible. COP is not demonstrated to be a part of the job description for police officers in this video. Dualisms such as these often lead to conflicts by setting up the relationship between logics as bipolar and oppositional, even though they are not necessarily incompatible or mutually exclusive. The video closes with the self-referential text careers with purpose. Although the purpose of this career is not elaborated in any form within the video, the statement presumes that there is an important purpose to this violent and militarized approach to policing. By using a selection strategy that focuses entirely on TE and minimizes the COP, this video loses out on the opportunity to demonstrate that care for community members guides the career's purpose.

## TE#3: Enid, Oklahoma

The Enid PD's 2011 recruitment video has a runtime of 5:56. The video primarily features the TE institutional logic as it details the hiring and training procedure, the threats faced by officers in their work, and places more suspects in handcuffs than any other department in the sample. The video does illustrate some messaging which exhibits the COP logic, but most scenes depict officers engaged in aggressive acts with members of the community. Accompanied by an audio track of 90's metal guitar riffs, the video opens with the department's logo zooming towards the viewer with flashing police lights in the background.

The video features constant quick cuts of scenes clustered together to show multiple perspectives of the same scene or multiple instances of the same topic. The majority of the

officers featured in the video are White and male, although women and other minoritized groups within the organization are depicted.

**Event I**

After displaying the department's badge on the screen for 6 seconds at the beginning of the video, the point of view shifts to behind the wheel of a police vehicle during a car chase. Cutting to a shot of a woman's hands straightening her badge, and then to a police canine poised over a suspect, and then a while male officer driving a police SUV down the road, the video progresses between shots at the rate of less than one second per shot for the next twenty seconds. Many scenes feature mundane moments of policing, such as one White male officer leaning into the squad car of another White male officer or a White male officer pulling a bag out of the trunk of his vehicle. At the other extreme, the flurry of scenes shows an officer struggling to hold back a rottweiler lunging at a suspect, the SWAT team launching flashbangs into a home while advancing into the smoke, and a body on a stretcher being loaded into an ambulance behind a police car. The frantic pace created by the onslaught of scenes is complemented by the rock music and underscored when a voice-over states that "We go to work every day and have no idea what is going to go on." While a White female officer does paperwork at her desk, a new voice explains "It's exciting: not a dull moment." One scene in this sequence features children in a classroom with an officer giving a D.A.R.E. presentation. Another voice intones: "It's challenging. One thing I love about this job every day you come to work you don't know what's you're going to do." Individual voices of officers chime in with single word statements which one could assume represent the values of the department. "Dedication." "Rewarding!" "Interesting." As these words progress, the camera switches to a shot where four White male officers detain what

105

appears to be a citizen drunk in public. "It's an adrenaline rush, that's for sure." "Your heart beating out of your chest like it's going to explode!" A White female officer pushes a Black woman in handcuffs into the back seat of her car before the scene shifts to a view from the passenger side floor of a police cruiser, looking up at the officer driving, before a shot of an officer walking in the dark with a flashlight.

This event sets the tone for the rest of the video, elaborating the job of policing in the department as action-packed, unpredictable, and important. As the department combines disparate tasks which represent both COP and TE logics into one continuous stream of action, competing demands are compromised through a forced merger that aligns them but does not work through their differences. Different police tasks are represented together, ranging from time spent with children to SWAT raids. In some shots, the video features a closeup shot of a single piece of police equipment, including weapons such as tasers and handguns, technical equipment like the patrol car dashboard and CSI tools, and department paraphernalia such as a vest that says POLICE on it and a patch with the department's name. This seemingly random assortment of equipment interspersed between different policing actions presents the message that everything featured on the screen represents a possible experience that the recruit should expect in the department. In many shots, officers are engaged with members of the community – backlit by flashing police lights and engaged in tense discussion.

By illustrating both the TE and COP logics in this way, the department presents an image that combines in a forced merger; both of these logics in the everyday experiences of the officer in their department. Many of the scenes in this sequence demonstrate very little about the department, but the way that the brain processes rapid sequences allows the shots which

106

cause the greatest impact to remain salient for multiple seconds after they're off screen (Potter, 2009). TE actions tend to dominate scenes, with the one event that explicitly features COP as giving rise to airtime to patrol officers looking at a laptop, SWAT officers advancing in formation, and a zoomed in shot of a department logo. By combining the extreme depictions of the TE logic with content-neutral messaging like officers driving patrol cars, the department depicts TE as being core to policing. Likewise, by only demonstrating one scene featuring COP in this sequence, the relative unimportance of the COP logic is demonstrated and a forced merger of logics is observed, wherein TE is dominant and privileged though competing demands are neutralized.

**Event II**

After a quick succession of scenes, the length of time between scene cuts slows down as a White male officer wearing camouflage advances towards a target while shooting. Cutting back to the earlier shot of a police dog pinning a suspect to the ground, the suspect rolls around trying to get away, but remains pinned to the floor. The camera shifts to a first-person perspective of a White male SWAT team member taking down a door with a battering ram. The camera shifts to a shot from inside the same door, where a flashbang grenade explodes. After the camera's view fills with smoke, a riot shield equipped with fog lights slowly emerges through the smoke as the SWAT team advances in formation towards the camera with guns drawn. In a scene where a large white truck is pulled over by a patrol vehicle, the White male officer tracks the speeding vehicle, turns on his emergency lights, and walks towards the truck cautiously. The camera shot jumps back and forth between the flashing police lights and the officer closing in on the truck which amps up the excitement of the relatively mundane scene.

107

This event comes immediately after a whirlwind of rapid-fire shots and directly before a new officer talks to the camera for an extended conversation. These scenes are distinct from the ones before and after. In between the dizzying sequence of shots in the first event and the next event where officers talk to the camera in interview mode, the department showcases longer scenes of policing action including shooting while advancing on targets, dogs pinning suspects to the ground, SWAT raids, and a regular traffic stop. Again, by combining multiple scenes which represent the TE logic in a sequence with less exotic police duties, extreme actions of TE are presented as normative. The department's approach to policing requires officers to engage in a variety of tasks which may engage multiple logics – but the dualism inherent to the policing tasks depicted in the video so far requires officers to engage heavily in the TE logic without their enforcement focus inhibiting their COP efforts. Even though both logics are depicted in the video, the way that the different units within the department are separated out to do such radically different tasks reflects an either- or response to competing demands. By treating these different logics as independent and distinct, even though they are not pitted against each other, it results in an unstable effort to integrate that eventually results in selection of one pole.

**Event III**

With his name and rank printed across the bottom of the screen, a White male officer is interviewed. Standing in front of a greenscreen jail cell, Patrol Officer Justin Skaggs explains that "We had a situation here recently where another officer was shot at." During his statement, footage of a suspect firing a weapon at someone else who is out of the frame appears on the screen. He continues, "Some people may have decided this isn't a job for me. If that's the way you feel this is not the job for you." In the shot that comes onto the screen

while he's talking, multiple officers walk around a crime scene in the dark with emergency lights flashing. This sets up a narrative which could inform the next scene, where a White male suspect with a goatee is marched in handcuffs into a patrol vehicle by two White male officers on either side of him. Officer Justin Skaggs closes out his narrative with the explanation, "That only made me want to work harder to try to get those type of people off the streets."

Sitting in a room with the Enid, OK department logo on the wall, the department's chief of police explains more about the department's framework for policing. Directly responding to the statements by Officer Skaggs, Chief O'Rourke first affirms his statements by explaining: "It's not just getting the bad guys--that is that is a large part of our job--it is to right wrongs." However, as the Chief continues talking, he redirects the narrative away from the direction in which Officer Justin Skaggs was taking it. He continues: "But, a large part of our job is also to help people." The camera cuts to a shot of a White woman showing officers images on her phone while looking distressed, with the two officers standing back reservedly. Returning to the police station, Lieutenant Bryan Skaggs sits in the same chair that the Chief had been sitting in earlier. He says, "It's not uncommon to get a letter from one of those kids you affected back when they were 4th 5th or 6th grade or even in high school to come back and say you know we appreciate what you did." During his statement, the camera switches to show another D.A.R.E. training, with kids raising their hands eagerly. However, in the next shot, an officer is standing next to a patrol car, pushing a faceless individual into the back seat. As the voice-over continues, Lieutenant Bryan Skaggs explains that "We help them every day. We assist them on the road. We assist them with medical emergencies." When he starts talking about assisting on the road, the shot shifts from the suspect being

arrested to a shot of an officer getting into the back of an ambulance with an injured person. Switching back to Officer Justin Skaggs, he continues, "We are there to help, and that's what we do." The camera switches to show the first-person POV of a police cruiser driving in the dark with lights flashing and sirens blaring.

The inconsistencies between the different logics presented in this event is made evident in the Chief's language. While Officer Justin Skaggs is explaining how important it is to him to get the bad guys, the Chief elaborates that the job is about more than just getting bad guys. This video was edited so that these statements would be played in this order, even though they came from separate interviews, as is made evident from the identical background behind the men. As these interviews are cut into fragments so that individual statements can be interjected into the video to establish a narrative, the editing takes a prominent role in the meaning conveyed in these officers' statements. By positioning Chief O'Rourke's statement in the middle of what Officer Justin Skaggs is saying, the department doesn't just provide an alternative perspective to Officer Skaggs' framework for policing. It provides what feels like a *correction* to his framework, or at least an essential addition that needed to be said after Officer Skagg's statements. The incongruency between these two officer's orientations towards the department's mission (focus on catching bad guys versus a focus on helping people) is made evident, but they are not demonstrated to be inherently incompatible. The Chief's words demonstrate how he sees both the TE and COP logics working together when he positions these two things as both being "a large part of the job." Although the department expects officers to fulfill the competing demands inherent to both logics, the way that these two logics are intertwined in the video projects a duality – both logics are present,

interdependent, and conceptually distinct, but function in a both-and capacity, working to develop a unified whole.

When Officer Skaggs speaks up again at the end of the event, he echoes the Chief's words, saying "we're here to help, that's what we do." Officer Skaggs perceives his personal goal of getting the bad guys as being not just compatible with, but supportive of, the department's mission to help the members of their local community. This reflects an organizational response to competing demands from the both-and category, which demonstrates some integration of the logics. Officer Skaggs demonstrates what could be described as balance approach that embraces both poles and accepts contradiction. He achieves this through paradoxical thinking, substituting the task of getting the bad guys for helping the community.

**Event IV**

Back in his office, the Chief of Police looks directly into the camera and explains, "The requirements are that you have to be 21 years of age. You have to have a high school diploma or GED. You have to be a U.S. citizen, and you have to be able to pass a physical agility test." This is the longest continuous shot in the video so far. For over ten seconds, the camera doesn't jump to a visual or shift to a new speaker – the longest duration so far, in a video which has repeatedly featured 10 new shots in 10 second timespans. The chief outlines each requirement slowly, making certain that the viewer is aware of these requirements.

As the camera shifts to a scene of a White male recruit undergoing a polygraph, Chief O'Rourke outlines that "from there, you take your polygraph, and if you pass your polygraph, they start a rather extensive background check on you." A woman's hands type at a keyboard on the screen until the camera pivots to an officer reviewing paperwork at his

desk. In a new shot, the camera peers over the shoulders of two board members looking over to a White male candidate while the Chief continues, "They will do an oral interview in front of the board." When the shot shifts to demonstrate the same candidate taking a written test, the Chief explains that "You take a written test and if everything is good to go, then they will tell you that they are offering you a position."

Continuing to report the department's hiring and training procedures, the Chief explains that "once police officers are hired, they go in through about eight weeks of in-house training." The video depicts a diverse group of officers studying in a class, while a White male officer overviews police tactics at the front of the room. In an interview, Patrol Officer Shirley Blodgett describes the process, explaining that "We had to learn the policy and procedures. We had to attend CLEET school to get certified to be a law enforcement officer in Oklahoma."

In a new shot, the camera peers forward from the back seat of a patrol car, depicting an experienced officer driving with a recruit in the passenger seat. The officers drive down a residential street at a relaxed pace, allowing them to peer around the neighborhood while driving. Officer Blodget explains, "The FTO phase is where you ride with another officer, and that was 16 weeks long." During this voice-over, a new shot appears, featuring a closeup of two officers' hands loading their service revolvers. Chambering a round, the officer moves off screen.

As is common in videos with a strong TE logic, this scene outlines the process of applying and joining the organization in rigorous detail. This narrative depicts the hiring and training process as being one that requires work and study to undertake for a recruit, and which is completed when the officer receives their service weapon and prepares to fire it. The

depictions of the processes which are being described verbally in the interviews all depict very neutral images of police recruitment and the academy. There is no shooting practice, exercise drills, car chase training, or hand-to-hand combat. This presents a much less physicality-oriented academy experience than is common to recruitment videos. However, when the last scene shifts to not just loading the weapon but chambering a round for immediate use, the focus returns to the toughness and aggression inherent to the TE logic. Given that the next scene outlines officer benefits and promotional opportunities, this shot of the gun being loaded could portray a variety of different meanings depending on audience perception. Given the lack of direct link to the scenes preceding and following it, this shot could be intended to be thematically neutral, serving simply as filler footage of police-related video. However, many viewers could perceive this shot as being directly related to what the officers are discussing in the voice-over, as was true for the direct comparison to the previous statements made by Officer Blodget.

**Event V**

Patrol Officer Darin Morris starts off the event explaining that "The pay, I got good pay. Good benefits. I got insurance. Got a retirement." In between the statements from Officer Darin Morris and the next speaker, footage of a police car driving in a parking lot with emergency lights on fills the screen. Captain Jack Morris describes benefits available to organizational members as he explains, "There is room for promotion down here. They have a good health program that you're eligible for after 3 months. We have 11 holidays that are paid." During this period, the camera shifts to display three White male officers talking together in the middle of a public street with their cruisers' lights flashing.

Chief Rick West describes how the organization has reflexively self-structured to provide better conditions for the officers, stating that "One of the benefits that the department has provided was we moved from an eight-hour workday to a 10-hour workday, therefore you get three days off." As he describes this change, the camera's view follows behind a patrol car driving slowly in front of a supermarket, followed by a White male administrator looking over organizational charts with a highlighter. For a few seconds the video shows a White male officer driving with his K9 companion in the seat behind him and then shifts to Officer Blodget driving a patrol car.

As the department outlines the benefits enjoyed by members of the organization, the pacing lags compared to the rest of the video. When departments outline information which is not typically considered to be exciting, such as HR benefits, details of hiring processes, and minimum qualifications, they run the risk of dedicating too much time to this information and losing the attention or focus of some possible recruits. Likewise, the department may alienate some possible recruits if they do not provide enough support for those who need the basics of the hiring process explained to them in the video. The department addresses the lagging pace by flashing short videos onto the screen while the officers are describing the process. Again, we see an either-or forced merger wherein the process is explained albeit with brevity.

**Event VI**

In this event, the video takes the viewer on a tour of the various subunits of the department. Starting out with the SWAT Team, the camera follows three officers as they breach a room via the window. Smoke and glass go flying as the camera shifts to being inside the room right before the explosion. "There's a lot of incentives in doing different things in

114

becoming a part of different things once you come down here." The view shifts to a Latin/Hispanic dispatcher seated in front of her computer as she answers a call, "911, what is your emergency?" The view shifts twice, first to an officer driving in his car on the way to the scene of an emergency, and subsequently to another SWAT raid being commenced as six White males advance into a home while pointing weapons. The three officers talking in the middle of the street during the last event are now calling into the station on their walkie-talkies as they approach a different neighborhood home. During these last scenes, a voice-over explains, "At Enid Police Department you can excel in the same divisions that you could at a larger department." The camera shifts to a view taken from another car driving alongside a police cruiser driven by a White male officer. "All officers will start in the patrol division and eventually the opportunities present themselves to move to different areas, but all officers are trained in the patrol traffic operation." As he says these words, a different police cruiser turns on its lights and a Latin/Hispanic officer walks up to the window of a White woman.

As SWAT team members pour out of the back of an armored personnel carrier, their shields are raised and their weapons pointed at the camera. A voice-over explains, "We have a SWAT team: there are 12 men. They practice together twice a month, 20 hours a month." In the next few shots, the team positions themselves around the home that they're about to raid. They move in formation, covering each other's blind spots and huddle against the wall to keep a low profile. Despite the entire armory of militarized equipment displayed in SWAT sequence, no criminals are depicted and no weapons are fired. The voice-over continues, "Of course you got K9. We've got three K9 officers." The depiction of the K9 unit is likewise unaggressive, with a single officer letting a K9 on a leash jump down from the car.

Continuing down the list, the voice states, "You've got the DARE program. We've got a Community Police Officer." A scene with an officer pointing to a whiteboard behind him pops up on the screen, and then a closeup on the officer who is labeled as the one COP officer in the department. Cutting back to a view of the department, two White males wearing button-ups and ties engage in deep discussion. "You've got detectives, both juvenile and adult divisions." Another White male detective looks over an envelope starkly labeled EVIDENCE. With the camera angle returning to the back seat of a police cruiser while looking forward, the officer driving talks about how "Being a smaller department doesn't limit us. You have the opportunity. You don't have to stay in one division." A quick return to the SWAT team rounding a different corner of the same building while maintaining formation remains on the screen for two seconds before switching over to a forward-facing shot of a police cruiser racing down the left lane towards oncoming traffic. That cruiser parks outside a home and two of the White male officers conduct a search of the property while the woman is being interviewed by the other officer. Shifting to a wide view lens, the camera now displays the two officers walking a shirtless man in handcuffs to the police cruiser, the White male officers engage with the woman standing outside the home.

As a small department, Enid wants recruits to know that there are a variety of options available which are fulfilling on a personal level, can provide good pay, and will provide excitement. As the department highlights the individual units, they display information about the institutional logics which are most important to their work. The prominence and repeated appearance of the SWAT team throughout this event and the rest of the video establishes this unit as distinguished from the rest: In the montage showing a half dozen different career opportunities, the video flashes back to the SWAT team four times and the Community

116

Police Officer just once and the D.A.R.E. program one time. The detectives get comparatively few moments of airtime, as does the K9 unit. None of these examples demonstrate that these departments are less-well funded than the SWAT team or less important – simply that the SWAT team has an outsized imprint on the department's recruitment messaging relative to other units. Again, the TE logic dominates this event as it opens with a shot of the SWAT team breaching a room and closes with a shot of officers putting away the bad guys. Embracing an either-or strategy, the department engages in source splitting along functional lines, with the logics kept separate depending on officer encounters.

## Event VII

This event begins with a dispatcher's call over the radio with a White male officer wearing sunglasses following behind another patrol vehicle driving towards the location for their call. "When your dispatcher calls, you're running the situation through your mind before you get there and 90% of the time it's different when you arrive on the scene. These officers every day go from call to call and they have to expect the unexpected. My focus is strictly on that call, you know, and thinking what I need to know to get out of there." After he parks and meets up with three other officers, he is seen engaging with the suspect before they search his vehicle. Soon thereafter, the officers scatter back to their own vehicles and disperse.

Switching back to the interview with Captain Jack Morris, he justifies this perspective of focusing on "what I need to know to get out of there." He explains that, "Obviously you want to have a little fear in this job so you are safe. Because if you don't have any fear, you could become complacent--find yourself getting hurt. As he makes these statements, the camera peers through broken down fence slats to show three White male officers surrounding a

Latin/Hispanic suspect. The home area is rundown, and the suspect appears agitated. Looking in from outside, a White female officer pulls on her walkie and requests, "95-4 headquarters: send me another unit, code three. 95-4," as she turns her attention back to the tense situation taking place at the doorway.

A new voice-over describes working for the department, saying "I can't say enough in regard to the quality of the men and women of Enid Police Department." A White female officer typing at a computer in the department is shown. "It would be a fine opportunity for individuals looking to have a career in law enforcement." At this point, the video shows the Latin/Hispanic traffic cop who pulled over the woman earlier while he does paperwork alone in his car. The two detectives featured earlier are engaged in looking at an evidence folder. "What I'm looking for in an applicant for the Enid Police Department is an individual who's honest and self-motivated." A shot of the Community Police officer is displayed for two seconds before shifting to continuous TE tasks, such as giving orders to junior officers invoking hierarchy, violent tasks such as armed chases, engaging in shootouts, and restraining suspects. "Most importantly that person has to have a desire or a care for the community and people in general."

The camera switches back to the man who was being arrested for public drunkenness, now being escorted by three officers. The dialogue continues, "If you're looking for a good career with good retirement benefits, good health benefits, good pay… that is exciting, unpredictable, and very satisfying, this is a place to be!" As this voice-over comes to an end, the institutional logics become less central to the representations of policing depicted in the video. Over the span of 10 seconds, the camera switches between police tape designating a crime scene, an officer walking around the back area of his vehicle, and three previously

unfeatured officers talking on a sidewalk. After the music changes to a new rock 'n roll tempo, another shot of officers talking flashes onto the screen. During this new song, the beat features a 2 second drumroll every 10 seconds. Each time that drum roll takes place, shots of an officer shooting an automatic rifle are featured on the screen to be timed with the beat. The last shot of the video features a White male officer's hands closing a jail cell as the music fades out and the screen dims.

As the screen returns to regular brightness, the department's badge appears on the screen again with flashes of police lights popping up behind the badge. White text over the badge explains: "For more information, log on to www.enid.org/police, or call (580) 242 7009." "There is a time-honored tradition that comes with being an Enid police officer and who's worthy of wearing the badge. That time is now. For more information, log on to our website or call." During this time, there are no new visuals presented on the screen.

This video depicts clear markers of the department's organizational culture – displaying an attitude towards policing wherein officers are expected to internalize fear out of a sense of self-preservation. One officer explains that "my focus is strictly on that call, you know, and thinking what I need to know to get out of there." This depicts a logic in policing that fulfills specific duties but those duties are demonstrated to be informed by the needs of the officer instead of community members. The department does not simply display this as a theme, but describes and encourages it. This stands in contrast to the earlier framework elaborated by the department of police work as novel and exciting. Instead, this positions police work in the department as repetitively dangerous, where 90% of the officer's attention is spent on survival and escape from dangerous circumstances. The contrast between the TE logic's focus on the dangers faced by officers due to the direct reactions against criminality and the

COP logic's focus on reducing danger by creating alternative modes of interaction is manifest in this video. Whatever amount of COP is manifest in the video, the TE logic dominates because of the overarching nature of these statements and their universal applicability. This is supported in the theming of the video, with music constantly increasing the tension, pausing to add dramatic silence, or including a drum solo to move the action forward. Ultimately, this event illustrations separation and selection of one logic over another without demonstrating integration.

## Video Summary

As a video depicting the TE institutional logic, the exciting tone throughout the video keeps viewers alert. Multiple times throughout the video, the danger of the job is expressed as both inherent to the job and thrilling according to its own nature. This video provides multiple instances where many scenes are depicted in quick sequence, with just one or two instances of COP displayed alongside a handful of depictions of the TE logic and otherwise unremarkable activities. By continually framing COP work within this context, the instances of the COP logic are treated as forced mergers, with the TE logic often dominating.

Another notable issue which takes place in this video is the synchronization of the music with exciting action on the screen to make the video interesting, keep the pace, or to adjust the viewer's focus. This happens multiple times in the video with shots of officers firing heavy weaponry as a drum solo plays in the background, or the beat drops and silence pervades for a moment while the tension builds in a scene. This can be a great way to attract viewer attention, but increasing the number of scenes featuring officers engaged in automatic weapon fire impacts the lack of balance of TE and COP messaging in the video.

The interchange between the Police Chief and Officer Justin Skaggs is particularly interesting because first Officer Skaggs describes the organization's mission which centers around catching bad guys. Chief O'Rourke offers a competing narrative by declaring the higher focus of the job – centering around taking care of people and helping the community and moving beyond just getting bad guys. These two ideals explicitly are framed as competing identities which engage in a back-and-forth exchange, during which both elements are active and privileged players. However, after the Chief and Lieutenant Bryan establish their position on helpfulness, Officer Justin Skaggs returns to the screen and echoes their words about helpfulness without elaborating any different position than the one which he initially states. Even though O'Rourke elaborates his position as a reaction against the words of Officer Skaggs, Skaggs reappropriates the framework of helping the community and applies it to his actions of getting the bad guys. This demonstrates that Officer Justin Skaggs' position on policing is perceived as both necessary to be addressed by the Chief, but also understood as an acceptable framework. As this progresses, the meaning of "help" is renegotiated throughout the process, with the way that each officer uses it having an impact on all further discussions of help, reflecting the both/and strategy of integration to manage opposites. This reflects a compromise between the two poles and takes a middle-of-the-road approach which forcibly merges the two ideas together.

TE Summaries:

When an organization is prioritizing one logic ahead of others, it stands to reason that either-or tactics such as selection and separation would be common tactics to represent their organization. However, because the competing demands inherent to policing are inevitably

made manifest for most departments when depicting the job duties of officers, recruitment videos have the opportunity to embrace tensions and competing demands in order to share more sophisticated messaging about the organization's working culture.

Within the entire sample of video featuring the TE logic, many depictions of the TE logic were presented without the COP logic being featured in the video. However, even if the videos do not engage with both of these competing demands directly, multiple institutional logics remain at work within the institutional field. This makes the decision by some departments to only demonstrate institutional logic an indication of position within the field. As an example, the Newport Beach Police Department leans heavily into TE messaging and demonstrates *defensive reactions and mechanisms* which justify the violence presented in the video. When TE-focused media does present multiple logics, depictions of the COP logic are often used as part of a dualism to define what stands outside the TE logic. This is exemplified in the Midland, TX video which clearly delineates some job tasks as being standard police work while others are split apart as COP or other service-oriented units. In the videos which were TE-dominant but did create space for multiple logics, such as the Enid, OK video, the COP logic is invoked to reclassify the job of "getting the bad guys" as an explicit form of community service. While this can feel intuitive considering the role of police as a social protection, when police departments define their own work as protecting and serving, any distinction between the two tasks is rendered meaningless if TE is reclassified as a form of COP. This renegotiated meaning emerges through the merging of these two terms as the officers discuss what they see as helping the community, with each new comment reflecting on what was previously stated.

122

In sum, videos exemplifying the TE logic manage institutional complexity by either selecting for TE approaches; separating out COP logics into distinct tasks, or by reflexively using the COP logic to reflexively redefine the relationship between TE and COP logics, allowing the TE logic to gain space within the institutional field. In this next subsection on COP videos, I will explore how COP logic is represented in the TE-dominant field.

## COP#1: Decatur, Georgia

The Decatur, GA Police Department incorporates inclusive language with positive imagery for the department's interactions with the community in their recruitment video. The diversity in the video depicts an organization which values women and minorities at all levels of the organization. Clearly depicting the COP logic, this video illustrates personalized engagement with citizens, community-centric policies for the department, and the implementation of COP as an organizational structure.

### Event I

Opening with the department's badge on a bright blue background, the video for the city of Decatur, GA features instrumental guitar music and creates a comfortable and inviting vibe. After the camera shifts to the local city hall, shots of interesting and attractive architecture from around town are featured. In the downtown district, a directory map shows businesses and restaurants while White women with children walk around the outdoor shopping area. In an area with a similar visual background, a Black patrol officer points at a location off camera and gives directions to a Black citizen. Looking out towards a grassy area in the downtown district, an officer on a bicycle with a shiny silver helmet waves to two women sitting on a park bench, who wave back. In a scene featuring the previous patrol

officer, he chats with an older White male citizen in the park in what appears to be an extended conversation. Seated at a desk in his office, Chief Mike Booker talks through the importance of empathy as a cultural value for the PD. Demonstrating reflexivity, he states that "The Decatur Police Department is a very empathetic Police Department. We try our very hardest to put ourselves in other people's shoes and it tends to make you look at things from all sides if you do that. We manage our people that way and we treat the community that way as well."

This video centers community members in the work of police officers. Sequentially, the people of the town are introduced before the PD, depicting the police as ancillary to the day-to-day lives of Decatur's citizens. In this first event, the department depicts COP as endemic to their organization by outlining their community-centric approach and framing it around empathy and perspective-taking. Commonly in recruitment videos, character traits of officers and the department are listed, such as honor, dedication, or courage. This video is unique in the sample for its primary focus on empathy in the department's interactions both with members of the community as well as internally, demonstrating the selection of COP with no TE logic present.

## Event II

In the commercial district downtown, Officer Eric Jackson says that "Law enforcement in general has a high standard – but we are going to a higher standard!" As he elaborates the department's institutional positioning, scenes of White families playing with their children in the park are featured, with occasional close-ups on the statues, roads, and individual families. Demonstrating the purpose-driven focus of the department's efforts, Police Investigator Jennifer Ross explains that "You feel like you're doing more. You're not just responding to a

call and taking a report and then going to the next call and taking a report. You're actually getting to prevent crimes. You're getting to catch suspects." As she describes the work, the scene shifts to a close-up shot of a White male officer scratching a dog's chin. Officer Jackson resumes his patrol in the downtown district, smiling as he walks past members of the community and continues waving.

The higher standard in Decatur's PD is introduced during this event by Officer Jackson and remains a theme throughout the video. As Officer Ross elaborates on the day-to-day life in the department, she references the work of criminal enforcement involving preventing crimes and catching suspects. Although her attention on these enforcement behaviors does not illustrate the COP logic, the depictions of policing taking place on the screen feature officers assisting individual community members one-on-one. When she discusses the legitimate job of police enforcement, it does not distract from the emphasis on COP because of the visual depictions of the department which so clearly illustrate the COP institutional logic. She uses vocabulary which supports this orientation, describing the people that she catches as suspects instead of criminals or bad guys. She upholds the relational component of policing interactions instead of focusing on the task and procedures inherent to her duties, internalizing COP as a process.

Outlining for new recruits the department's organizational culture, Investigator Ross explains that the impactful nature of the career prevents the daily tasks done by officers from feeling repetitive or disconnected from the actual people they serve. This illustrates how personalized engagement connects officers with the community, one of the defining features of the COP logic. Highlighting this purposeful approach in how the department approaches their work, Ross reminds viewers that "you're not just responding to a call and taking a report

and then going to the next call and taking a report…you're getting to prevent crimes and catch suspects." This renegotiates the work of preventing crimes and catching suspects as being more meaningful than mindless report-taking. When departments are successful at internalizing COP in the processes that they enact, it is more impactful than simply making COP an amorphous goal of the department. It fundamentally alters the nature of police/community interactions, even when engaged in enforcement behaviors. This demonstrates the more-than approach of reframing and transcendence, which employs the dynamic interplay between opposing ideas to form a novel perspective. In many other scenes within this event, the video selects the COP logic at the expense of the TE logic, but this demonstration of transcendence allows these previous scenes to be reconsidered according to this new framework. The department perceives preventing crimes and catching suspects as a higher level of labor than simply responding to calls, and in the following event, the reframing continues as the officers describe how their enforcement behaviors affect the community.

**Event III**

Filming in the breakroom in the department, Officers Bellis and Beaupierre talk casually about how the department encourages respectful communication among members and with the community as well. Describing the relationship with the community, Lieutenant Bellis says that "Your work is actually noticed. You can see it in the community, and you can see the difference in the command staff: the sergeants, the lieutenants on up. Everyone actually acknowledges you." In a shot that depicts the same downtown area from previously, a bicycle cop rides on the sidewalk until he can be seen talking one-on-one with a White male member of the community. Speaking directly to the camera, Officer Fiksman explains that

126

"Being in a smaller agency, you're able to actually sit down with the citizen or the business owner and discuss ways to resolve the problems that's occurring in the area." As he speaks, the camera cuts to show Officer Jackson sitting down with a White woman holding a notepad, ready to discuss issues. Assistant Police Chief Keith Lee follows up by saying that "We can focus on not only the major crime issues, but also those smaller quality of life issues that are so important."

Focusing on the way that the organization structures the employee experience, officers talking during this event describe how they receive feedback within the organization. For these officers, it is the departmental standard of individualized attention and agency that distinguishes the Decatur PD from others and changes the fundamental nature of community engagement. Both Officer Fiksman and the Assistant Police Chief describe how the agency's size and structure affects community relationships. They elaborate the community policing principle of prioritizing policing decisions based on community feedback, focusing on both major and minor problems that are affecting the community. Assistant Police Chief Lee sees the twin goals of stamping out major crimes and attending to smaller quality of life issues as completely synchronous, existing in a comfortable duality with each other (Bisel, 2009). When one officer explains the principle and then a department leader supports those statements, the goals are made clear and their support is demonstrated by the organization. This represents the both-and approach of integration, which brings these two poles together but neutralizes tensions. This approach focuses on meeting competing demands, and while it can result in stability, it can be ineffective for complex systems. The Decatur PD represents the system in which they police as being capable of managing these possible organizational tensions.

**Event IV**

As the video closes, Officer Beaupierre begins to say that "It's not about just enforcing a law--" when Lieutenant Bellis interjects with "It's about enforcing a higher standard." As they speak, a Decatur police cruiser drives by slowly, clearly depicting the department's name and logo. The volume of the music picks up and the text "Enforcing a Higher Standard" appears across the center of the screen, with a link to the department's recruitment page. This event closes out the video with support for the department's theme of "enforcing a higher standard." This syncs up with the COP construct of self-differentiation from the institutional norms of TE policing, while possibly representing a type of transcendence strategy in which the "higher standard" subsumes both logics. However, there is too little TE present to be engaged as opposites, demonstrating the department's strategy of selection. While the two officers are being interviewed, the police cruiser which is featured on the screen attracts attention to the department's logo, helping to generalize these two officers' combined statement as indicative of broad department policies.

**Video Summary**

This video clearly and coherently illustrates a variety of COP components. Interactions between the officers and members of the community demonstrate personalized engagement and the department's community policing policies informed by the community. This clear message of the COP logic is given additional weight by the highly personalized nature of the video. Each officer on screen has their full first and last name listed on the screen as well as their rank and position. By individualizing each officer that is featured, every action depicted on the screen has a readily identifiable source and context instead of being enacted by an

anonymized 'cop' figure. The personalized nature fits thematically with the personalized engagement of COP.

There is no tension between the institutional logics depicted in this event or throughout the video. Many other videos clearly emphasize the risk to police officers and the honor merited by the position, while this video accentuates the connection between officers and the community, and the honor merited from these interactions. When these videos focus on the risk and the elevated position inherent to the job in these other videos, the need for cautious engagement with the community is established and justified. In these other videos, an empathetic approach would not be unwelcome, but would create a dilemma for the officers as they face the either-or choice between the mutually attractive alternatives of increased empathy and increased self-protection (Cameron & Quinn, 1988).

Likewise, compared to most recruitment videos, this video heavily features officers of color and women, with an emphasis on underrepresented groups in leadership positions. This video features three White male officers, one White female officer, and three Black male officers. Black men are the first police officers featured in the video, and the last scene closes out with a Black officer speaking to the camera. Decatur's Chief of Police is a Black man and the first specialized advanced career that is demonstrated in the video is that of Investigator Jennifer Ross. This proportion of minority representation is not just distinctive within the institution of policing – it is demonstrated that these minority officers are in leadership positions and involved in setting policing priorities. Diversity is not specifically mentioned once in the video, but when the first officer on the screen is a Black male who is talking with a Black citizen, the department's focus on race is made manifest. The roles that minoritized

officers play in the video and the positions that they hold indicate that diversity is seen as a strengthening feature of the department.

, The department's seamless integration of COP into their public representation allows them to depict a level of care for community members that would be unsustainable alongside many other demonstrations of policing. There is no sense of antagonism between the officers and community members and the way that they prevent crimes and catch suspects because their policing priorities are determined in concert with the community. This tension between the two competing demands would be present if the TE logic was more heavily represented. When enforcement activities are mentioned in the video, they're contextualized as "not just responding to a call and taking a report" and immediately reframed as being "noticed in the community." Although this demonstrates an attempt to integrate the logics, it does not clearly illustrate the TE logic in a way that allows it to be understood and have its meaning transformed. This video, more so than any other depiction of COP, is coherent in representing multiple aspects of COP without inconsistencies between COP behaviors and alternative competing themes. Despite some mentions of enforcement, no TE logics are demonstrated in the video. As such, the video leans heavily on the COP logic, showcasing an either-or strategy of privileging and selecting COP over TE. This video provides the framework in which more TE behaviors could be reframed as COP if they were featured more prominently.

## COP#2: Norman, Oklahoma

The Norman, OK PD's 2015 recruitment video has a runtime of 2:08 seconds. This video features an alternative approach to traditional recruitment videos with song, dance, and hand puppets which demonstrate the department's non-conformity with the dominant logic of TE.

Featuring no interactions between officers and citizens, the department's recruitment officer, Carl Pendleton, provides the entirety of the video's acting talent, scriptwriting, and video production. He prances around the department, eagerly demonstrating silliness and enjoyment. Tweeting out the video with the caption: "Our Recruiter may be a little too excited… watch at your own risk" (@normanOKPD, 2015), the department addresses the difficulty of creating a video which does not adhere to the dominant logic in the field. This allows for some insights into the department's institutional positioning, strategic messaging surrounding the video, and the video's target audience.

After the video went viral, local news networks reached out to Officer Pendleton, who explained that he wanted to make a video for a different audience than most videos. Describing himself as "a big fan of Disney and Pitch Perfect and all those kinds of things, which people don't think a police officer would be into," Pendleton made special note of the fact that he filmed the video when the department was empty and that he edited the video himself outside of usual working hours. After demonstrating this level of separation from the department, he moves on to discuss the success of the video, explaining that he's getting more recruitment calls than ever before. His supervisor, Lt. Lance Arnold described their target recruitment demographic for this video with the description "The segment of the population that we inherently always had trouble recruiting are the professionals out there who want to change their current career and they just don't know how. When they think of the police they think of the recruiting videos showing the SWAT team and bike team, and that may not be what they're really after." In my analysis of this video, I will illustrate various examples that demonstrate how the department chooses to separate themselves from the policing cultural norms which are guided by the TE logic.

**Event I**

Hearkening to the stylized typeface of movie theater trailers, words appear on the screen over a black background. As a minor key instrumental melody plays, the viewer reads a series of opening film credit introductions which say: "Norman Police Department Studios presents" … "in association with" … "now hiring productions" … "For the first time in forever." In a burst of animated notes, the minor key is overtaken by a cheerful strings rendition of the song "For the First Time in Forever" from the film *Frozen*. As the jovial music gains in momentum, the department's logo and badge zoom out to the center of the screen. In the next shot, the graphic of the department's logo has been replaced by an enlarged wooden display of a badge, mounted to the wall. Suddenly, a Black male officer in full uniform appears in the center of the screen, midway through his skipping leap. Over the next few seconds, cuts edited into the video teleport Officer Pendleton around the room, peering in from outside the doorway, doing acrobatic leaps down the hallway, and miming conversation with a pig hand puppet.

This event indicates that the video is intended to carry a lighthearted, somewhat humorous tone. Beginning with farcical introductory credits and closing with Officer Pendleton miming animatedly at a pig hand puppet, this event demonstrates a marked departure from the much more common exhibitions of valor, machismo, and toughness. For viewers, there is something inherently inconsistent in the officer gleefully frolicking from room to room in the department – this depiction does not match the heuristics which are informed by the TE logic. However, it should be noted that even in this situation where the officer is skipping down corridors and parodying Disney ballads, he does so with his service weapon, spare ammunition, handcuffs, and pepper spray strapped to his belt at all times.

Even though the dominant institutional logic is not manifest in the officer's behavior, the structures of his environment dictate the uniform he wears and the gear he equips. This video integrates the divergent elements of the deliberate harmlessness of an officer doing ballet moves to Disney music with the danger inherent to his uniform's fully equipped gun belt (Smith & Lewis, 2011). This juxtaposition of logics seems to fit the strategy of reaction forming, or reacting against the logic of another to cultivate the norm of COP. Instead of fully embracing both logics or demonstrating COP as a transcendent logic, the video shows selection and defensive mechanisms at play.

**Event II**

With the department's Police Officer Application Checklist on the screen, Officer Pendleton begins his modified rendition of the Frozen lyrics, singing "Applications are open, yes once more!" During his performance, minor special effects flash onto the screen to accent his words, with large question marks appearing when he says "I didn't know that we did that anymore? Who knew that we'd be hiring today?" Officer Pendleton mimics the hulking slow steps of a t-rex, with his mouth open in a wide roar. "For years I've roamed these empty halls, being a police officer and taking calls. Finally, we'll take your app today." Each time that the camera cuts from one shot to the next, Officer Pendleton is edited into surprising new positions such as getting bounced off an exercise ball, struggling through the steps of a waltz, or flapping his arms like fairy wings. He croons out "There will be actual real-life applicants. It will be totally strange. Wow am I so ready for this cha-a-a-a-a-ange." As he belts out the lyrics, his voice breaks into a quavering falsetto while he holds his arms up for emphasis. His facial expression alternates from excited to deadpan during one sequence, then from blissful to oblivious between shots. Continuing, he sings: "For the first

time in forever, we're hiring at NPD. For the first time in forever. If you have questions, come ask me."

Officer Pendleton is having a great time on video. He is fooling around with silly special effects and prances across the screen repeatedly before exaggeratedly sneaking away. When he sings, "Don't know if I'm elated or gassy, but I'm somewhere in that zone…" he appears to get distracted, meandering towards the camera and out of frame while sniffing the air. After a quick jump cut, officer Pendleton appears on the left side of the frame. He again tucks his arms against his chest for his t-rex performance and closes the song with the lyrics: "for the first time in forever, make Norman your home!"

Having ended his song, Officer Pendleton had spent over a minute performing behaviors which stand in direct contrast to the dominant logic (TE) in the policing field, which serves as a reaction forming strategy in which an either-or approach is used to manage competing demands Behaviors which reject the dominant institutional logic are face threatening and invite a reaction from the field. Recruits who are disinterested in joining the department because of the outsized influence of the COP logic in the video up to this point do not seem to be the department's main recruitment priority. Although this event does not demonstrate an approach to combine the logics in a way that productively illustrates both the TE and COP logics, after the first event, the video has gone beyond getting the viewer's attention with a gag. The video demonstrates that the department is engaging with the TE dominant institutional field in a way that does not follow the conventions of the TE logic - which is itself another cornerstone of COP.

**Event III**

After the completion of his last dinosaur steps, Officer Pendleton takes a seat at a desk in the department and turns to speak to the viewer directly. His voice sounds earnest when he says: "I'm master police officer Carl Pendleton, the recruiter for the Norman Police Department." He addresses his target demographic when he urges professionals in other careers: "Don't stay frozen in your current job. If you've ever had a desire to become a police officer, then visit our website." He continues the Frozen theme by directly pulling lyrics from the song: "We don't care if you're a bit of a fixer upper, or if you just like to have fun in the summer, you're in luck, because July 13th, our new academy starts." He lets recruits know that they don't need to be an ideal candidate, which both communicates confidence in the department's ability to train new recruits as well as bolstering the confidence in new recruits about their abilities and likelihood of success with the department. Smiling encouragingly at the camera, he invites: "Be a part of our team, join today. if you have any questions, give me a call." As the screen fades to black, the words "DOWNLOAD AN APPLICATION TODAY WWW.NEWNORMANCOPS.COM" appear across the screen in the same movie poster typeface.

In this event, Officer Pendleton speaks encouragingly and in very measured statements. He conveys his expertise by codeswitching to let his target audience know that despite the goofiness, he is inviting people to be part of a positive professional opportunity. The inconsistencies between his previous behaviors which are non-typical of police officers and his current demeanor comes together as he continues to reference *Frozen* with direct quotes from the movie. This idiosyncratic language continues to attract his target audience by

helping them connect the logics which were manifest in his performance to his career-oriented statements.

Even after Officer Pendleton changes his demeanor to sit and talk during this event, he continues to demonstrate the COP logic. He invites recruits to be a part of the team instead of challenging their ability to meet the department's standards. He displays confidence, both in his willingness to act silly, and in the department's ability to train recruits, serving as a way to privilege COP through reaction forming and continued selection as a tactic which does not align the two logics.

*Video Summary*

This video epitomizes the theme of self-differentiation from the norm. Because COP is not the dominant logic in the field, when a department declares itself to have COP as a central tenet of the organization, they risk being seen as being outgroup to other organizations in the same institutional space. Often departments make statements about how they are unique within the field of policing, but their statements do not significantly affect the video's primary logic unless they clearly demonstrate their distinction. The Norman Police Department demonstrates reaction-forming through their distinctiveness from the TE logic without ever referencing COP explicitly through the narrative function of each event in the video. Instead, the department made a video which squarely counters the toxic masculinity inherent to the TE logic by making a video which targets a subset of detail-oriented, mature adults who are not concerned about looking cool or demonstrating their authority.

In the introductory event of the video, the promotional trailer special effects prime the viewer for an exciting video-watching experience. After all of the buildup, the payoff in Event II is a recruitment officer singing along to a Disney song while playing around alone at

the police station after hours. Recruits watching the video are met with an incongruity that they would not find in most other videos. The absurd humor of Officer Pendleton's antics immediately captures viewers' attention but has nothing to do with policing. In this case, the use of humor does not align both logics. With little variation or escalation in the types of behaviors that he exhibits, the silly performance lacks a climax. His behavior is distinctive but lacks any explicit connection to his recruitment messaging. For these and other factors, Officer Pendleton's performance runs the risk of alienating possible recruits whose conceptualization of policing does not harmonize with the low levels of machismo, dignity, and toughness he exhibits. I suspect that this was his intent. However, Officer Pendleton outlines his target audience in the video when he addresses people who "feel frozen in their current job," "have ever been interested in a career as a police officer," and might consider themselves "a bit of a fixer-upper." This is a direct reference to two other less-popular songs from the movie, *Fixer-Upper* and *Fun in Summer*. If the department was looking for a way to make recruitment messaging that would catch the attention of parents, especially mothers, who had not considered policing, this could be seen as an effort to let them know that they could be comfortable working in this department. For a department looking to promote their image of COP, this messaging is incredibly effective because it explicitly lacks any of the hallmarks of the TE logic.

The film's amateur cinematography and editing highlight the one-man-band nature of the video, which reads as being the product of this single officer instead of his entire department. This dynamic allows Officer Pendleton greater freedom in the range of his representation of the department than would be afforded to the department had it been professionally produced. When Officer Pendleton selects a song which is going to be primarily known by

the demographic of parents, his decisions likely also influence who is not going to be attracted by this video. The most represented demographic in PDs in the U.S. is White males (67% nationally, datausa.io, 2022), with most recruits being between the ages of 18-25. Songs from the previous year's Disney Animated Classic film are not likely to be as influential at attracting or maintaining their attention. Only once a situation has been created in which it is no longer an appealing recruitment opportunity for officers who have a personal proclivity for the TE logic, Officer Pendleton starts talking to his target audience about the job opportunity with greater clarity and directs them where to apply.

Within this video, the COP and TE logics are treated as a dualism, wherein the bounds of what can be described as COP are clearly defined and separate from the TE logic which is eschewed. Icons of TE such as the uniform, introduction by rank, and service weapons are all presented as existing in the presence of silly song and dance, but they are never featured as part of the enactment of the TE logic. The prevailing strategy for negotiating competing demands used in this video is selection strategy, which is considered an either-or tactic. This allows the department to focus primarily on COP without addressing TE.

## COP #3: West Melbourne, Florida

The West Melbourne, FL PD's 2015 recruitment video has a runtime of 2:49. This video emphasizes  the COP logic. However, as the video features aspects of both logics, the depictions of TE are only slightly less impactful than the COP logic. Although this video does not demonstrate the clearest example of recruitment materials that depict the department as COP, the community-focused commentary in the introduction sets the tone for the video and the depictions of TE are consistently milquetoast. Although the video opens without any background music, when it begins after the Chief's introduction to the video, it helps to

138

sustain an upbeat and friendly tone for the video. The video features almost exclusively

single cuts of any one scene at a time, making it difficult for the viewer to link scenes

together into larger narratives. Although the video features a majority of White males in the

video, multiple female officers and officers of color are featured.

**Event I**

This video opens with the Chief of the department speaking directly to the camera at the

police station. He's standing in front of the city's flag and the U.S. flag, with the department

logo on the television behind him. He says, "Welcome to the West Melbourne Police

Department, I hope you consider a career with our agency" while a shot of a patrol vehicle

driving through a residential neighborhood appears on screen. "The best thing about the

Melbourne PD is that we are a progressive agency that's growing" he says during a shot of

two White male K9 officers. One is holding the leash while the other follows close behind

with his service weapon drawn. He continues, "We have state of the art equipment" when the

video switches to a line of White male officers being trained in hands-on firearm safety

during a meeting inside the department. The men are all holding service weapons in one hand

and ammunition in the other while they undergo inspection. The video switches to a shot of a

motorcycle officer driving down an empty country road with his flashing lights on. The

narration continues, "Outstanding training opportunities and excellent benefits," as two

White male officers walk towards a vehicle that they have just pulled over during the night

with their emergency lights flashing. One is holding a flashlight while the other draws his

weapon and follows behind. Returning back to the Chief's office, he looks straight into the

camera and says "We are building leaders of *this* community" before the screen fades to

black.

At only 15 seconds into the video at this point, the Chief has already shown a wide variety of different aspects of the department. Demonstrating the COP logic, his opening is cordial and inviting, and he chooses to highlight the department's progressiveness, neighborhood patrols, and the fact that they are "building leaders of this community. Footage of officers drawing weapons at a traffic stop and the K9 pursuit contribute to the TE logic. When his statements do not appear to be linked to the visuals, neither logic gains significant traction. Although this event leans towards the COP logic, at many times the combination of the scene selection and the narrative may leave viewers unable to link individual components of the video together. For example, when describing the department's progressive nature, K9 officers on the screen are following a trail, and while he mentions the training opportunities and benefits, a motorcycle officer drives alone on a country road. There is some tension between the elements, but never enough of a direct juxtaposition between unlike things for a direct opposition to emerge. Unlike many videos, there is no background music or overriding theme to the messaging, which makes identifying any one logic difficult. The last statement made by the Chief before the big shift to the next scene is allowed to have an enhanced impact, and as he states "we are building leaders in *this* community," the COP message takes prominence, if only barely. The lack of connection in between the scenes or between the audio and the visuals leaves the viewer without a strong sense of either logic, demonstrating an either-or strategy of separation. That is, the video keeps the logics separate and allocates each of them to a particular domain, not to overlap. This event demonstrates a forced merger that integrates the two logics without presenting the most extreme versions of them. This integration strategy compromises the possibility of transcending the logics, but allows for some level of coordination and coherence between them.

**Event II**

As this scene opens, a digital version of the West Melbourne police badge appears on the screen, broken into pieces around the edges of the screen. Over a few seconds, they coalesce and then snap back together, with upbeat music that remains in the background for the rest of the video. An excited voice-over begins, saying, "The West Melbourne PD is a growing innovative agency" as we see a close-up of a cop car with the West Melbourne police logo. The scene transitions to a pristine golf course surrounded by trees, where a nonstandard sports model police vehicle can be seen driving slowly. The voice-over explains "Located in Brevard County, Florida, we work with our residents, elected leadership, and businesses…" as the screen transitions to a shot of three White male police leadership figures wearing professional attire and gesticulating to one another. He continues, "…to provide protection and safety for our community" as the video shows two bicycle patrol officers smiling while standing next to their bikes, interacting with two young White children. One officer is a Latin/Hispanic male and the other is a White female.

This event showcases the advanced technology and equipment used by the department, the lovely vistas of the city, and officers engaged in COP behaviors with children. This event has a different tone than the previous, set apart by the music and graphical scene transition. The neutral shot featuring the logo on the side of the police car and the peaceful view from within the golf course set the stage for the following scene, allowing it to make a significant impact. The lack of other logics being demonstrated allows the COP logic to be primary in this scene, reflecting a selection strategy for this scene. This shot demonstrates a variety of different components which are easy to identify and label as COP, such as the diversity of officers in the scene, the public interaction with children, and the bicycle policing, all of

which contribute to the coherence and strength of the logic in this one shot. Therefore, it appears that the video uses an either-or approach, selecting one logic over the other.

**Event III**

When the camera switches again, the narrator is shown on the screen, wearing a shirt and tie, being interviewed in the same room as the Chief was earlier. He describes the way that the department stays up to date, saying: "I've been here 10 years, and since I've been here, we've always moved forward." The camera cuts to a close-up shot of an officer typing on his dashboard from the driver's seat. He continues, "From the computers inside the vehicles, to the technology that makes our job easier to the applications and programs that we use." The scene transitions to a different police vehicle with an officer running a license plate on a tablet while his emergency lights are flashing behind him.

The same White male officer who was supervising the earlier firearms training is now being interviewed. He describes the abundance of resources available: "If you look inside the car, everything you could want to do your job is provided to you." During this voice-over, the video shows a shot of a female officer talking on the police radio in her vehicle. He continues "What makes it so nice to work here is that West Melbourne provides you the tools to do your job." Demonstrating that tool, the camera switches to a shot of a police car parked at night with all the lights flashing. Cutting to a shot of a Black male officer being interviewed, he explains that "we have state of the art equipment here. A lot of agencies our size do not have what we have." Another new officer describes the comfortable working environment in the office as he says, "they really work with your schedule." The camera cuts to a shot inside the police station as two officers are interviewing a person wearing a suit inside an interrogation room. Switching to a new shot of two officers in a residential

142

neighborhood walking towards a house, he continues, "People are always willing to come in and fill in overtime if you miss a day of work."

Focusing on the collegial work environment and the access to technology, very little content in this event demonstrates either the COP or TE logic. The only technology that is demonstrated visually in this event is enforcement based, however, this does not strongly manifest the TE logic because of the mundane and universal nature of traffic enforcement. Likewise, although the officer's appreciation of the working environment of the department is an important consideration for potential applicants, the way in which these features are depicted does not clearly demonstrate either logic. The selection of the TE logic in choosing to feature only enforcement gear is moderated by the ambivalent and lukewarm presentation during the scene, reflecting the either-or approach of defense mechanisms, an either-or tactic.

## Event IV

Back in the interview room, a detective explains that "one of the biggest benefits that we have here at West Melbourne is the amount of training that we get." The video transitions to a shot of an officer in full camouflage ducking behind brightly-colored training obstacles in combat training. Explaining the supportive environment, he says, "As you move and progress up the ladder, you do get that training, so you'll never move into a new position and not get trained." The camera switches to show an officer in training practicing the proper technique for handcuffing a suspect who is wearing protective gear. Switching to a Steadicam shot of a SWAT team training together, the camera stays outside the door of the house being entered and no shots are fired. The next scene switches to an officer standing at a podium leading role call while his subordinates look up at attention. The voice-over continues explaining that "On the very first day I walked into the West Melbourne PD, everybody – between

143

administration, officers, everybody, they're caring. I could tell that they're family oriented." In a conference room scene, leaders from the department laugh together during a meeting. "It was just something that drew me closer" he continues as the view shifts to a new angle of the same scene from earlier in the video with the bicycle police, talking with the children's mother.

Combining this generalized workplace discussion with footage of officers training in violent enforcement tasks could indicate that the field's dominant logic of TE is so inescapable that these behaviors aren't perceived as distinct from everyday police work. Many of the visuals from this event evince the TE logic as they demonstrate shooting, evasive maneuvers, detaining suspects, and breaching a suspect's home through the front door. However, absent the visual footage, the audio could be associated with a number of different organizational behaviors which are not unique to policing. The audio discussion included the generalized topics of training and organizational climate, allowing the visuals to associate the TE logic with the statements. However, due to the lack of direct connection between the audio and visual, the visuals lose synergy while the audio actively distracts from the TE message features. Directly following the scenes featuring violent training, an intermediary scene with officers at the conference table between the violent training and the bike police scenes, the sustained impact of the multiple TE scenes reduces the impact of this single shot featuring COP. This reflects a both-and strategy of integration through a forced merger. The organization manages to maintain the salience of both disparate ideas, but the outcome loses effectiveness compared to more complete depictions of the logics. When logics are more fully expressed and can interact together, it is in their concurrent enactment that they implicate each other for greater clarity and outline the contours of each logic.

144

**Event V**

A Black male officer explains that "One of the benefits to living on the Space Coast is the access to the many attractions around here" as the film cuts to a shot of the Disney World sign on the freeway, and then a shot of Universal Studios during a fireworks display. "We're not that far from Orlando/Kissimmee area. You have beaches galore" as a view of beachgoers riding paddleboards can be seen. Shifting to a view from behind a boat, three men throw a fishing net into the water as he says, "A lot of fishing, boating, a lot of wildlife…20-30 minutes gets you to some of the nicest beaches on the Space Coast." Returning to the view of the beach, more people are paddle boarding and walking on the sand. When the officer explains that "We have the Kennedy Space Center...," the video switches to a shot of a spacecraft exhibit inside of a museum. "…Awesome schools, awesome health facilities." Over the next few spoken sentences, a montage of local Brevard County public schools plays. Confirming the last speaker's perspective, a new officer says that "We have some of the top-ranked school systems in Brevard County right, here in this city." When an officer states that "West Melbourne is a great place to raise your family," aerial drone footage over a sunny suburban neighborhood demonstrates his point. The footage continues, showing well-manicured baseball fields.

Demonstrating some of the features which would attract someone to move to this department as is commonly shown in recruitment videos, this department appears to be looking for experienced officers who are interested in transferring from another department. Because these officers are already familiar with elements of the policing career which are challenging, the organization-focused messaging of this department fits the demographic that would be attracted by the benefits of living in the area. As discussions of the area continue,

145

neither TE or COP take prominence, leaving viewers with the chance to reset their involvement with either logic. Competing demands are left secondary while recruits consider the logistics and benefits of living in the area.

**Event VI**

Showing a White female traffic officer approaching a stopped vehicle, a new voice-over begins: "If you are a motivated individual who possesses the qualities of honor, integrity, and service…" In an interrogation room, one White detective and one Latin/Hispanic detective speak animatedly to a person off screen before the screen switches to another local public school, this time with a school resource officer stepping out and heading in to work. The voice continues: "…and wish to have a rewarding career at a progressive agency, the West Melbourne PD is the place for you" The shot transitions to an officer training at the outdoor shooting range, firing a rifle at a target off screen. The video cuts back again to the K9 officers following their dog who is now offscreen, pulling the officer holding the leash around a hedge. In the final location of the video, the scene transitions back to the golf course, this time following the police vehicle as it drives off.

In blue text on a white background, the department's website address, phone number, and badge stretch across the screen. The voice-over concludes: "For more information, or to apply, please visit www.westmelbourne.org or call 321-723-9673." Using the same footage from the beginning of the video, the West Melbourne police badge again shatters into pieces, but is quickly attached back together. It fades to one final slide with blue text on a white background. It reads, "The West Melbourne Police Department is committed to a diverse work force and is an equal opportunity employer. The city of West Melbourne is a Florida drug free workplace."

This event, much like the opening event, features a hodgepodge of generic organizational messaging, mismatched audio/visuals, and scenes which clearly demonstrate the TE logic, though priority is given to COP. The video attempts an integration tactic through a forced merger, which is a more-than strategy. This event repeats the same situation as was demonstrated in the first – the generalizable organizational narrative about the supportive work environments decreases the overall salience of the competing institutional logics. Many of the "feelgood" messages brought up in the video help to keep the tone positive without demonstrating COP. If the examples and message features incorporating TE were rich enough, the TE logic would reflexively impact the messages about the positive work experience by showing how the supportive environment allows the department to do TE work more effectively. Again however, in this case, any of the narrative about the working conditions and location simply contribute a mild sense of pleasantness to the video.

**Video Summary**

This video depicts plentiful examples of both the TE and COP logics, but the lack of coherence in depicting most of them allows the video to present a blend of both that lacks overall impact. The COP logic is more prominent than the TE logic, but a variety of other factors decrease the salience of either logic, again demonstrating an attempt at a forced merger. The video attempts to utilize a both-and approach to balance the two logics, but fails to do so and returns to the selection of COP. This may be because the video lacks a narrative flow, which is especially impactful for videos where the audio and visuals are not directly linked thematically. One additional feature of this video which allows the COP logic to be most prominent is the way that the shots featuring TE behaviors are not framed to enhance the excitement or bravery inherent to these moments with dramatic music or special effects.

This video shows short single shot takes of each location that they film, usually without the camera moving from a fixed position. In many cases, this effectively neutralizes the aggression in scenes displaying the TE logic.

Because the video does not feature any music until directly after the Chief's introductory statement ends, his words lack the thematic support of supporting music. Music is a powerful message feature for presenting a theme, allowing more neutral statements to be imbued with the logics asserted by the tone and pacing of the music. Thus, in the scenes which could support either logic, tension is rarely manifest due to the low impact of any one depiction. Contributing to this problem, none of the police officers featured in the video have their names, ranks, or any other personal information discussed or demonstrated. This allows the officers to be deindividuated and decreases the viewers' ability to identify any one single coherent storyline.

This video does not effectively meet competing demands, not because it skews too heavily towards one logic, but because it does not effectively illustrate consistent messaging for either logic. Because the narrative does not develop into larger ideas, the depictions of either logic are not sensationalized, and the film is edited without a cohesive message structure, any possible productive tensions between the logics are indistinguishable and remain unexplored.

COP Strategies

Given the TE dominant landscape of the institutional field of policing, videos which primarily focus on the COP logic immediately differentiate themselves from other departments. This structurally affords departments the opportunity to reframe institutional norms when they depict a secondary logic as their main focus. For the videos in the larger

sample which focused primarily on COP logics, the most common strategies for addressing competing demands involved selecting for COP tasks, which occasionally would evolve into discourse which achieved an integration of the two logics. In rare instances, organizations were able to reframe and transcend the competing demands by demonstrating common ground between them. In the Decatur PD's video, the department's discusses "enforcing a higher standard," which implicates the possibility of a transcendent logic which is able to reframe the other two from a third-party perspective. However, the lack of a cohesive TE logic leaves viewers without a second institutional logic that they can understand or use to gain better understanding of the COP logic in this video. Creating recruitment material that meets competing demands is challenging because it requires clear depictions of multiple logics as well as a demonstration of how they can work together. This can yield unclear depictions for how the departments attend to competing demands, as was evident in the West Melbourne PD video. This video depicts some TE logics, however, the way in which these logics interact with COP are obscured because they are not actually juxtaposed in contrast. This leaves viewers aware of the presence of some TE influence with relevant context. For videos which embrace the COP logic without depicting any TE logic, as was demonstrated in the Norman, OK video, the prominence of the COP logic is clearly communicated. However, these videos do not provide viewers with organizational resources to understand their job relative more effectively to competing demands. Even though Norman's video effectively used humor to illustrate the COP logic, the humor does not attend to competing demands and demonstrate some level of harmony between the logics.

When focusing primarily on one single logic, both TE- and COP-centric videos can effectively convey information, but lack the relevant context to enable viewers to situate the

organization's orientation and position within the institutional field. The COP and TE videos which engaged in only one logic bore striking similarities in terms of their approach to competing demands. These videos primarily ignored them, demonstrating the wide range of situations in which an organization could choose a selection tactic as part of an either-or strategy for attending to competing demands. The videos in this next section engage both the COP and TE logics, mixing them and communicating more complex messages than can be expressed with one logic.

## Mixed (TE/COP): Omaha, Nebraska

The Omaha, NE PD's 2008 recruitment video has a runtime of 1:31. Throughout this video, a mixture of institutional logics occurs between TE and COP. The department presents images and audio which illustrate both mundane tasks undertaken by police officers as well as scenarios involving the bomb squad, car chases, and armed standoffs—extremely uncommon in real police work. Throughout this video, the department presents the logics of TE and COP as interconnected.

The TE logic is more prominent than COP in the video, but this is not entirely due to more time dedicated to one than the other. At some points, the audio content syncs up with the visuals thematically, while at other times, the images on the screen do not match the messaging of the voice-over. It is in the interaction between these two logics that audible messages enhance the impact with dramatic visuals. However, when audio and visual messaging represent disparate institutional logics, the impact of either logic can be diluted or diminished entirely. At times, it is difficult to reconcile the explicitly stated messaging in a voice-over with the scenarios depicted on the screen, such as when the audio talks about serving the community during scenes showing armed standoffs. During these moments of

150

incongruity, the TE messaging is tempered and made to feel less aggressive while the COP logic loses impact.

In this video, camera angle plays a significant role in the way that the officers on screen are framed. Camera angle, movement, distance, and frame all help "convey the subject matter in expressive ways and powerfully shapes the viewers' emotional responses and the meanings viewers detect in films" (Phillips, 2009, p. 61).

## Event I

The video opens with a closeup shot of a stylized department logo on the side of a police truck. An eager voice asks the viewer, "Would you like to be part of the best law enforcement agency the nation has to offer?" The video flashes through images of officers working at a computer and driving police vehicles. Focusing in on the motorcycles, the camera angle drops to the ground, peering up at the officers and motorcycles. The voice announces that "The Omaha Police Department is searching for qualified individuals who want to join our core of law enforcement professionals." As this line is read, scenes show a variety of department vehicles painted in matching colors. After showing the department helicopter, video shifts to aerial shots of the department and training facilities from that helicopter.

The narrative of the video establishes the department's middle ground between the two logics. The question above interacts with the viewer directly and politely, positioning the two logics on equitable footing with the department. This positioning reflects the department's stance in regards to hierarchical authority as they treat the new recruits as valued employees instead of military grunts, illustrating one of the structural components of COP. The video is edited to ramp up the excitement of the relatively mundane shots featured, such as views of

the department parking lot full of police cruisers and civilian vehicles, the department's empty driver's training course, and officers creating documents using Microsoft Word. When combined with the way that the camera angle peers up at the motorcycle officers from the street, the editing decisions throughout the opening scenes of the video influence the scenes' framing of policing as being both exciting and honorable. Although this fits in line with some of the core attributes of the TE logic, the messaging constituted by the combination of the two logics in this narrative event presents the department as navigating an integration or a middle ground that honors both ideals (a both-and approach).

**Event II**

On the ground at the training facilities that were featured from the air in the previous scene, an officer in a uniformed polo shirt jogs towards the camera. This helps to set the tone of the surrounding scenes by demonstrating the department's willingness to break with military uniform protocols and use the more approachable polo shirt, while using the action of the shot to maintain the brisk pace of the video, projecting the excitement of the career. The only sequences that demonstrate recruit training depict officers engaged in combat instruction and military exercises. New recruits stand at attention, undergoing inspection from a drill sergeant figure who inspects them as they work out and jog together in formation as a unit. As the camera shifts to the shooting range, this same drill sergeant shoots targets around the range while demonstrating combat maneuvering and ducking back behind cover. The life-size three-dimensional targets collapse to the ground after each bullet impact.

The department chooses to present the socialization process for new recruits in a way that emphasizes linear hierarchy as they undergo scrutiny for their appearance from the superior officer leading their drills. They communicate that recruits with the Omaha Police

152

Department are judged for their meticulous appearance, physical fitness, and weapons skills. By centering these features in their recruitment, the department projects an image of how recruits are socialized and the work that is done as part of the job. Juxtaposing different aspects of the job, the logics depicted in this event are inverted from the previous, wherein the tone was set by the department's welcoming approach and non-violent content. These scenes which emphasize physical fitness, heroics, and authority all represent a department which is recruiting officers who are trained to react according to their conditioning and enforce the law. If the department used these scenes to emphasize creative problem solving and proactive community building, then the department would appear to be recruiting officers who are well-suited to COP. As the video shifts from the neutral opening to military-style training, the narrative moves away from COP. By separating out these two segmented areas of the job and oscillating back and forth between them, this reflects the both-and tactic of vacillation.

**Event III**

A voice-over during this scene explains that "A career with the Omaha Police Department offers security, prestige, respect, and personal satisfaction." Outside a building surrounded by police vehicles, SWAT officers rappel to the ground in a training exercise. Extensively demonstrating this task, the video rotates through five different shots of the same scene – two officers repelling down the side of a building. The action is fast paced with scenes of officers racing each other towards the ground demonstrating their peak physical condition. Although the department chooses to highlight exhilarating demonstrations of the SWAT team's tactics (a clear example of TE), the task that these officers are engaging in (rappelling) does not inherently indicate the TE logic as strongly as most any other actions

which could be depicted being undertaken by a SWAT team. Rappelling down the side of a building is both thrilling and unlikely to ever be a part of an officer's workday, but it does not illustrate the same level of conflict between police and criminals as would a video of officers breaking down a door or shooting during a training simulation. Likewise, the voice-over provides a career-focused perspective on the action taking place on screen instead of a focus on the excitement of SWAT raids or noble fulfillment of getting the bad guys off the streets.

The alignment between these disparate logics during these scenes does not represent the department as operating from inconsistent perspectives. Instead, the scenes demonstrate how the COP logic can temper the influence of components of the TE logic, such as thrill-seeking and feats of strength. When the video shifts to a view of an armored vehicle driving towards the camera, the SWAT team dismounts in formation. Bold letters label the vehicle as an M.E.R.V. – Major Emergency Response Vehicle. As the squadron approaches a door with weapons drawn, the voice-over declares that "our officers are members of a progressive, professional, and nationally accredited department." These images position the organization as an enforcer of the law very seriously. For some viewers the voice-over that describes it as "progressive" and "professional" might appear as inconsistent with the TE stance—after all, the TE logic is a more traditional view of the role of policing. In this section, the Omaha PD appears to be saying that we can perform in traditional—almost military-like tactics—and be progressive by employing the latest technologies and updated methods of training—even if the tasks appear to enact traditional values and actions. The way in which the department has integrated the two logics in previous scenes, using a both-and approach of balance, establishes the context in which viewers evaluate new information in the video. When this

video illustrates narratives which could be considered conflictual, the existing interaction between these two logics suggests a moderate(d) position, attempting to balance the two in a way that does not entirely reject the other.

These scenes of police engaged in tactical situations are interspersed with shots of officers posing with their weapons drawn. When the voice-over describes the benefits of the job and discusses personal satisfaction gained in this career, the viewer can link the messaging that they hear to the visuals on screen. In this event, security, prestige, respect, and personal satisfaction are explicitly named and associated with weapon skills while professionalism and progressivism are associated with SWAT raids. Along with the glamorous presentation of SWAT, the video positions SWAT as the prestigious apex of the organization instead of a tool used sparingly, shifting the scene deeper into the TE logic, yet still demonstrating some sense of balance (a both-and strategy) between the two logics As the dominant logic shifts back and forth, the moderated interaction between the two sides builds the foundation in which a dialectic could continue to develop.

**Event IV**

Another brief helicopter scene transitions to a new event. The voice-over explains that "The Omaha Police Department offers you many opportunities for advancement including promotions and placement in specialized units." Demonstrating this point, officers on horseback are shown talking with a group of minority community members including children who are being assisted in petting the horses. In the following scenes, K9 units train by having the dogs run out of vehicles and leap towards other officers, but are never demonstrated attacking, biting, or growling. The longest scene in this event features one dog on the screen, running and jumping off a pier into a reservoir completely alone. Featuring a

zoomed-in jump cut which momentarily freezes the leaping dog while he is fully stretched out mid-air, the video was carefully crafted to emphasize the impressive athletic prowess of the K9 without demonstrating or glamorizing a dog attack. The department could use these scenes to demonstrate examples of K9 aquatic rescue and search capabilities instead of simply illustrating dog attacks. Exhibiting care for the level of violence demonstrated in the video, this scene stands in direct contrast to most videos featuring a K9 unit wherein a dog latches onto a target's arm and viciously drags them to the ground.

Like the mellowed way that the K9 unit is portrayed, the bomb squad is presented in a way that indirectly demonstrates the department's capabilities without glamorizing an explosive situation. By filming a bomb that is detonated in a remote area with a mechanical robot, the department takes a dramatic scenario and presents it in an unthreatening manner. This could be a means of showing how the department uses technology to protect citizens from harm. In a way, this communicates progressiveness—using the latest technology— while still enacting the TE roles. The scenes combine to create a moderated event that moves the predominance of the logics back in the direction of COP, allowing the upcoming scenes to illustrate the COP logic more affirmatively without a jarring switch. This indicates the both-and strategy of vacillation, as they move back and forth between logics.

### Event V

While the voice-over proclaims that "Our vision is to provide the highest level of police service to each person we contact…", the camera is angled low to influence the perceived relationship between the viewer and the target, looking up at the officers as they dominate the frame. Multiple shots and camera angles feature officers standing still while posing next to grand statues, demonstrating them as iconic figures deserving of respect. In the context of

this video, however, the honor-laden framing is tempered so that it does not overload the video with TE logic. Although these scenes strongly invoke a sense of exclusivity and honor, they are made less intimidating after a special effect slides across the screen and it cuts to the next scene. At this point the officers who had previously been posing are now talking with members of the community in friendly engaging ways, such as block party BBQs, assisting the homeless, and hands-on demonstrations for community members getting a tour of police equipment. This shows a viewpoint, that the two ideas—police officers as elevated individuals in society who must be respected—can be simultaneously presented with an image that shows they are also a part of the community who interacts in a neighborly way. By navigating back and forth between components of the TE and COP logics, the department uses the both-and strategy of vacillation and demonstrates the This advances the dialectic of the video by navigating back and forth between components of both the TE and COP logics and demonstrating this department's approach to balancing different aspects of policing.

These scenes feature members of the community from a wide variety of demographics, including members of minority groups and mixed-race families. Many officers are featured not wearing their full uniform during the montage. These different factors help to demonstrate how the department is engaging in a personalized version of COP where the individual needs of community members are being addressed. For example, the officers at the barbeque talk with individual community members one-on-one while holding their notepad during the conversation. In another scene, two minority officers engage with members of the homeless community with one officer kneeling on the ground next to a homeless man sitting against a concrete wall. In another shot, officers talk directly with teenagers who are standing near their parents in front of a school. The voice-over comments

that the department is "committed to community policing values and working with Omaha neighborhoods to provide a safe community." By using camera shots that appear to honor the officers and framing them as heroes for their interactions with the homeless—while also illustrating them to be community members who attend neighborhood cookouts--the voice-over directly links these service-centered behaviors to the process of earning honor. By reappropriating the honor frames of the TE logic, the department demonstrates a way to bridge the two logics despite incongruencies, with the shifting deeper into COP. This could be considered a *more-than* strategy as the bridging occurs simultaneously rather than at one time, showing that the logics need to be valued, interdependent, and intertwined with each other.

**Event VI**

During the spoken statement "Our foundation is based on strong leadership" the man who had previously fulfilled the role of drill sergeant is now wearing a suit and tie, typing away at his laptop while surrounded by stacks of papers and notepads in the office. This switch in roles indicates the interdependence between the different logics with which officers in this department must engage with during their work. This scene demonstrates that when officers advance into leadership roles they must fulfill key aspects of both the COP and TE logics as they supervise other officers, administer justice, and continue to enforce the law. As the department demonstrates the same individuals performing these disparate tasks, they indicate that they do not expect officers to subscribe entirely to the COP or TE logics. The message is that police officers do both over their day and over their career.

In a series of scenes demonstrating the variety of tasks that take place within the department, switchboard operators take emergency calls while technicians investigate

158

evidence using fingerprints and laboratory equipment. Recruitment videos often describe the requirements for working for the department -- physical accomplishments, courage, loyalty. In contrast to these common themes, the voice-over explains that "We expect sound decision-making and ethical behavior from our work force. We believe our employees are important contributors to the success of the Omaha Police Department." Throughout the police station, police officers can be seen doing paperwork, attending meetings, and taking statements from civilians. This is highly unusual, as most departments overemphasize the most viscerally exciting aspects of police work without showing or mentioning the very mundane aspects of the job such as completing paperwork. By highlighting the office work that is inherent to policing, the organization indicates the responsibility of documentation and behind-the-scenes cooperation as important components of sound decision-making and good ethics that they expect from recruits. These cooperative and un-flashy processes highlight the responsibility of the employee as a necessary and honorable trait for an Omaha Police Officer.

In an approach that puts pressure on the viewer, the voice-over asks, "Do you have what it takes to serve the community?" This is in stark contrast to many other recruitment videos which stop after asking "Do you have what it takes?" This elevates the traditional challenging narrative that questions if the viewer is tough enough to "have what it takes" to the importance of the service leadership motivation for policing. During this narrative event, bicycle officers travel through attractive areas of town and Segway officers patrol the downtown area. Aerial shots highlight the Omaha skyline while showing off idyllic bridges and community walking paths. By spending this much time illustrating the department's commitment to key components of COP, the dominant logic of the event leaves the TE

realm. However, because the department has repeatedly presented both logics in ways that have redefined and crafted new boundaries around each logic. This reflects the more-than strategy of reframing by situating these two logics in such a way that they are not pitted against each other. The scene demonstrating the powerful stopping ability of the K9 unit illustrates the department's capabilities for TE, but their demonstration of this capability was distinctly non-violent. The scenes with a drill sergeant supervising the new recruits feature an unspeaking figure inspecting people standing in formation, but not an angry drill sergeant yelling at the recruits and telling them to drop and do exercises. This department continues to present less-extreme applications of the TE logic which allow for more compatible aspects of community-oriented policing—they can be performed without significant inconsistencies. As the video showcases both logics in this way , a both-and strategy focused on meeting competing demands.

## Event VII

The view shifts to officers driving around the vehicle training course with their lights on. Responding to the question posed in the previous narrative event, the voice answers by saying: "If so, come join us and start making a difference. Visit www.joinOPD.com" After asking if viewers have what it takes to serve the community, officers are then demonstrated to make this difference through a series of high-speed vehicle maneuvers. This practice prepares them for the late-night car chase featured in the next scene. Multiple cruisers track a suspect's vehicle with the help of a spotting helicopter until they reach a dead end. The officers immediately leave their vehicles and take a defensive posture ducking behind their car doors. They draw their weapons on a driver who slowly backs out of her vehicle with her hands on her head. This scene appears to suggest that chasing down criminals is not

160

necessarily tough-handed, but done by the Omaha police officers in service to the community. After returning to a view of the custom modified police truck from the first narrative event, the shot focuses on the department's logo. The scene fades to a shot of two police cruisers facing towards the viewer with all doors open and officers pointing guns at the camera. As the police helicopter goes overhead, the department's recruiting website flashes across the screen.

When the video was filming cars driving around the track, the task of 'emergency driving' (which is one of the TE codes) is demonstrated to be exciting, but when the driving shifts to actual streets, it is demonstrated to be useful for catching criminals. After the subject has been caught and subdued, officers park the cars and set up a scene complete with spotlights illuminating the cars and a department helicopter overhead before the department logo appears on the screen. This event illustrated TE so perfectly that it jerks the logic past the midpoint and firmly into the TE logic, demonstrating the either-or strategy of separation. The narrative for this event features skill training, skill usage, and demonstrations of pride in your skills for the purpose of catching bad guys.

## Summary

This video provides important insights into how blending can occur during efforts to attend to competing demands. When the actual examples of a logic incorporate some elements of the other logic, the way in which both logics are presented simultaneously within one scene allows them to both develop in combination with each other (as connection, a more-than strategy of dynamic interplay of opposites simultaneously). Examples from this video include the department's highly honor-laden framing and mild aggression which are both applied in scenes demonstrating COP. Likewise, the militarized and aggressive scenes

161

featuring combat training are presented mostly nonviolently, with the only shooting that takes place happening when one single officer shoots down three shooting targets. The combination of these logics failed to create an environment in which both logics could be co-present, but allowed for the dialectical nature of these interdependent ideals to modify the presentation of each as they emerged in sequence. The department positions the TE and COP logics as interdependent opposites which co-implicate each other, building into a cohesive message about how the department orients towards the logics. By co-presenting the logics and allowing the depictions of each to have significant implications on each other, the department presents a model for how recruits can navigate the competing demands they face in their work.

## Mixed: Danbury, Connecticut

Danbury, CT created three videos over the span of 6 years – 2014, 2016, and 2017. To avoid reaching saturation, though, I randomly selected two of the three videos to analyze (2014 and 2016). Collectively, these videos illustrate ways to moderate (soften/cushion/conceal) extreme elements of either institutional logic. Although this effect occurs throughout the videos, in the Danbury videos, three factors very effectively show how institutional logics are represented: humor, the depiction of alternative institutional logics, and low media richness.

First, in these videos, humor affects the impact of extreme depictions of the institutional logic. Humor simultaneously challenges and maintains the incongruities of the social environment by both releasing and internalizing the inherent tension (Speck, 1999). In the 2014 video featuring Officer Daniello, his continued buffoonery as he interacts with other police presents two inconsistent messages about the department's organizational culture.

162

First, the fun characterization and unique storytelling demonstrate that this organization uses nontraditional approaches and "doesn't take itself too seriously." However, the continued demonstration that the main character of the video's behavior is viewed as transgressive by other members of the department reinforces a rigid organizational hierarchy dynamic.

Second, by depicting both the COP logic and the TE logic in the same video, the department attempts to establish their own balance between the two frameworks. . Balance, though, often has a way of breaking down and can result in temporary or unstable ways of managing competing demands and it is not always effective for complex systems (like police recruitment) (see for review Putnam et al., 2016). We see this breakdown occur as the COP logic is most strongly represented alongside even more extreme depictions of TE. The COP logic functionally "breaks up" the presentation of the TE logic, resulting in a false camouflage of balance between the two logics. The way in which race and gender are depicted also carries significant weight in this regard, as this depiction provides a demonstration of the department's structural commitment to diversity, one of the key components of COP.

Finally, a comparison of the two videos demonstrates the importance of media richness for organizations engaged in institutionally complex environments. Rich media enables organizations to create messaging which is suited to address the disparate frameworks of various stakeholders. Vast disparities in media and narrative richness between the videos helps to illustrate the critical nature of richness when engaged in institutionally complex environments. The lack of media richness in the first video does not enable a nuanced depiction of a logic, while the narrative richness of the second video shows complex interactions between the two.

163

**Danbury, Connecticut video #1: 2014**

This Danbury police recruitment video is a 4:25 minute long PowerPoint presentation of the overarching duties and entry requirements for new recruits. This was the department's first recruitment video in the sample and the least elaborate video of the three (again, I chose to analyze only two of the three videos to avoid repetition). Throughout the video, blocks of text and photos appear on screen every few seconds to move forward the action of the video. Opening with stirring instrumental music that was originally composed for the 2004 Hollywood blockbuster, *Alexander the Great*. Throughout the video, the tempo of the music slowly rises and falls without distracting from the visual content, but likewise, it never accentuates the message. Throughout the entire video, the name of the department is featured across the top of the screen with a blue themed background and the department logo in the top left. Due to the video's lack of basic cinematography, the film's still-frame pictures carry the vast majority of the video's narrative. This video illustrates how unimpactful any one message component is when presented without any other messaging to support it.

**Event I**

On the first slide, stock image photography of a badge and patrol car are superimposed next to the Danbury Police Department sign. Within the first few seconds of the video, the capital D, P, and D from Danbury Police Department float down to the center of the screen to form a new acrostic with the words Dependable, Professional, and Dedicated. Because the special effects used to animate the letters are so basic and foundational to PowerPoint, seeing them used in this format makes the video feel dated, probably even when it was first published. This low level of dynamic content limits the department's ability to convey rich or nuanced messaging about institutional logics. The scene slowly fades away to black while the

164

word "WELCOME !!!" floats out from the center of the screen and new text appears, encouraging viewers to "Please take a few minutes to familiarize yourself with all the Danbury Police Department has to offer you." As a photograph of an officer wearing a 19th century uniform appears, text is revealed stating: "The Danbury Police Department has a proud history… Established in 1889, it has served the citizens of Danbury, CT proudly for over 120 years. Today the department has 155 sworn officers and 9 civilians supporting its mission of preserving the peace, protecting life and property, and enforcing all laws and ordinances." A series of historical Danbury pictures appear on the screen in slow motion featuring officers engaged in various acts of service or posing together for the photos. These vintage photos depict the department's shared history and demonstrate who historically was welcome among the ranks. There are no women or minorities featured in any of the classic photographs, which shows the stark homogeneity and honor framing that are so core to the TE logic. This stands in tension with some of the depictions which come next in the video, setting up the opening positions for early dialectical interaction within the video.

Despite the century-long gap between the historic and the more recent photos, the actions taking place on screen fit perfectly into the video, portraying the department as consistent and unchanging. Just as in the modern recruitment materials, the historical photographs feature officers engaged in both COP and TE tasks, such as guiding traffic at a busy intersection, posing while standing in formation for a photo as a department, posing while seated on their motorcycles, assisting someone at the scene of a crash, and doing paperwork back at the station on a typewriter. As the department demonstrates its consistency in projecting its image over the years, the overwhelming similarity between the historical photos and modern footage could indicate a lack of development over the past century in

their policing practices. The text appears: "If you are looking for a rewarding, challenging profession, you should consider The Danbury Police Department."

These historical recruitment materials also demonstrate that the department has a long history of navigating competing institutional logics, engaging in behaviors representing both the COP and TE logics. In a balance, the department aims to project an equal and steady state representation of the two logics. In historical photos officers posing on antique motorcycles surrounded by classic cars embodies the honor-laden framing which is typical of the TE logic, while the officer helping at the scene of the 1950s car crash fits neatly within COP. The way that these different aspects of the job are presented together without clashing with each other which sheds light on the department's approach to balancing the logics. When images representing the two logics are presented together, the impact of either logic is interrelated to the other instead of functioning independently or in sequence. This fits well as a both-and strategy for representing competing demands as opposed to the either-or approach we often see. Even though the department may have gone through drastic reconfigurations and upheavals over the years, the historical materials presented in this event flatten that history. As the department picks and chooses historical figures and events to display, the presentation portrays a smooth image that informs the department's current position In effect, Danbury's PD employs this event in a way that balances the COP and TE logics.

**Event II**

Demonstrating the breadth of the opportunities available for recruits, the video shifts to a series of photos featuring officers from different units of the department. Text that appears on the screen reads, "Here are just some of the opportunities available to you as a member of our department." Representing the Patrol Unit, two White officers look questioningly at the

166

camera while a Black officer makes a phone call. Both officers who can be seen in full profile are armed with their service weapon. Representing the Honor Guard, a photo features 12 officers in formation wearing dress uniforms in a park. All officers are White and male. The next slide depicts the SWAT Team, with an armored personnel transport vehicle driving down an empty road. The K9 Unit is represented with an image of another White male officer posing in front of his car, holding the leash of a black Doberman. Four White male officers on motorcycles pose with their bikes in front of the department to represent the Traffic Unit. As that image fades, the Accident Investigation Unit is depicted with a totaled white sedan on a neighborhood street in the center of the photograph. While writing, a White male officer peers over his notepad with a couple looking on in the background. The department's Dive Team is pictured with one officer in dive gear floating next to an inflatable raft and holding a rope, while another officer in a dive shirt looks on, sitting next to the raft's engine. The department's Evidence Technician Unit features the first woman in the video at 1:49, wearing bright purple gloves while peering at a firearm. She is seated at a desk in front of a computer back at the station. The department's Bike Patrol is depicted by a photo with dozens of bicycles stamped with the department logo lined up in a row, without ever actually demonstrating any officers riding them on community streets or using them. The final shot in the montage illustrating different units in the department features a Black officer standing next to a woman. The words Community Services appear on the bottom of the screen while the woman who appears to be a community leader stands in front of a crowd sitting inside what appears to be a community center, with a whiteboard and foosball table behind them.

These shots do not focus on the most exciting aspects of an officer's possible work duties, and they likewise do not attempt to illustrate the duties done by officers in a dramatic fashion. By choosing to represent all of these different subunits within the department, the wide variety of tasks shows that policing in Danbury attends to a variety of different community needs. Likewise, the restrained tone of the PowerPoint presentation is reinforced in this tepid display of the different units. Although aspects of both the COP and TE logics are demonstrated, the lack of media richness constrains the impact of any one depiction representing either logic. No COP behaviors are pictured on the screen in this montage until the slide explicitly labeled as Community Services, featuring a photograph of a Black officer appearing in front of a classroom alongside a Latin/Hispanic teacher. Throughout the video, there are 48 times wherein an officer appears on the screen (two Black male officers, one White female officer, and 45 White male officers). Given the one exception of the officer assisting at the scene of an accident in the historical photograph, COP interactions are not demonstrated in the video, indicating the either-or strategy of selection and dominance of the TE logic.

**Event III**

The next section of the video takes the viewer on the tour of the department, piece by piece. An exterior shot is captioned with--Police Headquarters--immediately followed by an interior shot of the headquarters lobby. Touring the Communication Center, four desks in cubicles are featured on the screen, each workstation dominated by multiple monitors. Three officers sit at the desks, with the only officer facing the camera being a White male. Shots of the Physical Fitness Facility demonstrate modern workout equipment, while the Indoor Range photo depicts three officers practicing their shooting as an instructor wearing a

branded Glock shirt assists with their grip. To show where officers meet every morning, the Roll Call Room is featured, demonstrated in a photograph of two rows of empty tables and chairs. The Locker Room and Prisoner Cell Block are empty merely demonstrating the existence of these two areas.

This depiction of the physical locations central to the department conveys information to the viewer about the way that work is done within the organization. This event demonstrates that working at the department includes mundane tasks such as paperwork, and that police officers keep their body in shape, their shot precise, and their job duties straight. Further, the department doesn't just set these clear expectations. They demonstrate that supporting the officers as they maintain and progress their skills in these areas is built into the department's structure. Notably absent are processes which incorporate the community or disrupt the rigid hierarchical structure of the department that support the TE logic. In other words, this scene showcases selection, privileging the TE logic over the COP logic.

## Event IV

To show candidates details about salary and benefits, this section of the video lists out key points about officer compensation. Salary, insurance, pension, holiday pay, vacation benefits, and other details about the job are all listed. Speaking to the requirements for hire, the video lists the criteria that a candidate must reach, including citizenship, a minimum age of 21 years old, a high school diploma or its equivalent, and a clean criminal record. The department lists each test that candidates must pass, including a written exam, oral boards, physical ability tests, multiple polygraph tests, psychological evaluations, physical examinations, and an extensive background investigation.

After this extensive list of requirements, the department encourages possible candidates with the text "The men and women of The Danbury Police are very proud of their department and look forward to talking with you about a rewarding career in law enforcement." The words then transition off the screen using PowerPoint's Scatter effect, making the medium in which the video was made exceptionally salient. The department's vital information appears on the screen, encouraging applicants to contact the recruiter via phone, email, or in person. The view shifts, as though the camera is positioned in front of a laptop that is slowly scrolling down an infographic advertising the next recruitment event. As the camera slowly scrolls down, the infographic features prototypical imagery for the department--handcuffs, officers standing at attention, and the department logo. In a final shot, a new rendering of the department's logo dominates the center of the screen, with the words Dependable, Professional, and Dedicated making a return across the bottom of the screen. This is yet another type of selection, an either-or strategy, that slightly favors TE given the images of handcuffs, standing at attention, honor, and other markers of hierarchy.

**Video Summary**

Typical of many TE videos, this one: (1) featured depictions which emphasized ceremony and valorized officers; (2) offered very incomplete depictions of COP; and (3) gave an exceptional amount of airtime to minimum application standards. Because there is a paucity of COP in this video, even the weak instantiations of the TE logic have a greater impact than they would in a more balanced presentation. This video demonstrates the importance of media richness when attempting to convey messaging to disparate audiences in an institutionally complex environment. The limited technological affordances of the medium used to create this video impose a limit on the nuanced information about the

organization's institutional positioning. Straightforward information can be conveyed in this type of presentation format, but integrating and responding to the perspectives of multiple stakeholders is not a straightforward task. The still-frame photographs in this video represent single moments in time as a way to convey meaning about an entire squadron within the department – and thereby the department itself. This only allows for flat comparisons between single snapshots as opposed to the more complex juxtaposition of narratives that occurs in the department's subsequent recruitment offerings. Here we see a form of selection that favors TE and neutralizes the tension with COP. Even though Event I presents a nice balance of the two, subsequent events embody selection of TE as a means to handle the competing events.

**Danbury, Connecticut video #2: 2016**

The second video in this series produced by Danbury in 2016 is 4:08 long. This video references the department's previous recruitment video and also communicates the setting, the characters' personas, and information about the organization's culture. Especially when compared to the previous offering from the department, humor is a central component of this second production, likely functioning to increase the audience's level of immersion, decrease reactance, and illustrate the department's unique approach to navigating the COP and TE logics. As the second video over the course of five years that the department created to attract recruits, this video demonstrates how their representations of the organization have evolved over the time frame relative to these two logics.

### Event I

The video begins with a shot looking into the open door of the office of Danbury's Police Chief. Chief Patrick Ridenhour is engaged in a conversation with the town's Mayor, Mark

Boughton, while looking out the window. Cutting to a closeup shot, the mayor says to Chief

Ridenhour, "You know what Chief? I'm so proud that we're the safest city in Connecticut.

But I heard we need more officers?" The Chief responds with, "Yes we do Mayor. We're

running a little short, but I got one of my best guys on it right now." Switching to the POV of

the Chief, the camera points out towards the street where an officer in a neon green safety

vest is energetically waving a hand-painted 'Help Wanted' on the smalltown street corner

right outside the department. Looking bemused, the Chief says to Mayor Boughton, "Wow,

maybe I need to give him a little more direction." In response, the mayor says, "Good luck

with that one Chief, let me know if I can tweet something for you." Outside, just in front of

the officer waving the sign, the camera angle switches to show the Chief interrupting the

recruitment officer who is dancing excitedly and yelling "We're hiring!" at passing cars. The

Chief shushes him, telling him "Vin, Vin, man, Vinny, come on." In a comedic back-and-

forth, the recruitment officer says: "Chief, what's going on? We're making progress man!"

Ripping the sign from the officer's hands, the Chief pats the Lieutenant's back and walks

away saying "Maybe we should do a video." In response, the recruitment officer shrugs his

agreement, saying "Alright, we'll do the video."

This narrative event introduces key figures in the video while clearly demonstrating

organizational norms and sharing critical information for recruitment. Because this

informality between these key leadership figures exists despite gaps between their positions

in the hierarchy, these relationships demonstrate more than individual social connections.

This informality represents components of the organizational culture, including the

department's lack of pretense and interpersonal relationship focus that allows them to engage

with other members of the department on an individual basis instead of being primarily

172

filtered through their relative rank. The overt message conveyed by the video is that the department's recruitment efforts are adapting to meet contemporary challenges.

Although the three men featured in this scene represent a significant portion of the departmental leadership in their prestigious careers, they are presented in a caricature which exaggerates key features of their dynamic. The mayor offers the Chief help through his distinctly specific and non-sequitur offer: "Let me know if I can tweet something for you." The Chief is demonstrated to have relegated his staffing issues to an eccentric and apparently clueless recruitment officer, and Lieutenant Vin Daniello himself affects a childish and unprofessional demeanor as part of his character. This ironic depiction of humorously dramatized characters and their ineptitude *characterizes* the nature of social interactions within the department. The mayor explicitly offers his support in a public display of solidarity with the department despite an inauspicious launch. The Chief redirects and refocuses Officer Daniello instead of sanctioning him, and Officer Daniello eagerly follows orders and reorients to the improved plan. The silly sitcom-esque feel of these interactions creates an approachable situation for viewers to see organizational members respond to issues without dramatizing the higher-stakes and organizationally face-threatening problems faced by the department. Throughout the video, and in future efforts, the department uses this subversive tactic of facetiously depicting their initial organizational failure so that they can subsequently illustrate the department's savvy competence as they resolve the problem.

The humor in this opening event sets the stage for the rest of the video, demonstrating that this department has a playful culture and that organizational members feel comfortable engaging creatively with their relationship to authority figures. The video juxtaposes Lieutenant Vin Daniello's two inconsistent roles as both the department's capable director of

recruitment and his assumed role in the video as a hapless fool. Humor has two key areas of

effect which have been studied in communication literature: the role that humor plays in a

given situation, and the reasons communicators use humor in their messaging (Lynch, 2006).

By juxtaposing some of the disparate elements at play in a humorous interaction, humor

invites communicators to engage in perspective taking and challenge established norms. This

creates an opportunity for other members of the department to demonstrate how they

maintain an inviting departmental culture. In the interaction between the department's

orientation towards the COP logic and the TE logic, the absurdist humor of the video

simultaneously resists and reproduces dominant discourses (Zoller, 2014). Because the

humor does so much to remove the perception of threat from the policing happening on

screen, dominant discourses supporting legalistic enforcement tactics can be more readily

accepted. Conversely, because the humor defuses suspicions, orientations towards policing

which would be face threatening to those who strongly embrace the organizational identity of

most traditional departments can be welcomed with less apprehension. In either case, when

the department uses humor to poke fun at outdated institutional norms when they play with

these traditional boundary lines, the distinction between power and resistance is blurred

(Glyth, Frank, & Vaara, 2019; Zoller, 2014). Humor is a valuable strategy for challenging the

established traditional boundaries between oppositional forces, and irony can be used as a

more-than strategy as part of serious playfulness. This tactic capitalizes on purposeful

juxtaposition of incongruent ideas to provide organizational members with useful

positionality and resources for addressing competing demands.

**Event II**

The video cuts into a faux PowerPoint slide presentation, with visual cues indicating a lack of professionalism, such as multicolored text in Comic Sans font and the slide background's violent gradient from lime green to electric yellow. Officer Vinny is obviously standing in front of a greenscreen and looks visibly uncomfortable while he struggles through his line: "The city of Danbury Police Department is now hiring". Affecting a stutter, he looks down from the camera and says "you know what, t-t-this isn't working" while taking off his hat. He continues by saying, "this can't be the script" as the camera pulls back to show the production on the live set, where he is seen wearing his dress uniform, shirt, tie, and jacket alongside bright green boardshorts. Leaving the film set, he explains that "I know what I'm talking…I'm not crazy. We actually have to show people!" Walking past a visibly confused production team, Officer Vin Daniello exits the studio as the music's tone shifts into an upbeat tempo. This demonstrates a type of reflexive practice, as Officer Daniello appears to reflect back on the organizational direction of the department and its recruitment videos by exclaiming they have to show people and then exiting the studio.

The self-effacing humor of this scene demonstrates an organizational desire to break with outdated norms. Because the department's previous recruitment offering was entirely created as a PowerPoint, Officer Daniello's statement could reference Danbury PD's evolution as a department over the past five years. Having established the department's new approach and rejecting the old, the contrast between these two different positions is demonstrated as progress (Cooper, 1986). Responding to the inconsistency between the organization's previous methods and the department's updated approach, the department visibly depicts their rejection of past methods of recruitment. Recognizing that the department needs to

progress forward from outdated methods. By adding this scene to the video and referencing the modality, the department is showcasing their decision to reject previous recruitment methods, participating in reflexive practice and humor (both-and strategies). The department holds an opportunity to progressively transform historical organizational norms and establish a new organization and direction. This is an inherently comparative process, but to align the competing logics much like in the first event, they employ these more-than approaches of reflexive practice and humor as an early step in the process of navigating between the COP and TE institutional logics.

## Event III

Opening this next narrative event, a quick series of shots covering the exterior of the Danbury Police headquarters appear on the screen. After the view shifts to inside the lobby, Officer Vin Daniello walks in through the sliding glass doors and smiles invitingly. Looking straight into the camera, he says, "Hey everybody, I'm Lieutenant Vin Daniello from the Danbury PD. We're hiring and I'm here to show you what it's like to be a police officer in the city of Danbury." He walks towards the camera and then into the room marked as the Training Classroom. Faster than the eye can process each shot, nine different short video scenes flash across the screen depicting exciting moments an officer could have in their career as the music syncs up to the pace of the video, increasing in speed and tempo. The clips of car chases, arms training, parading in uniform, and other traditional TE tasks are all depicted within a few seconds. While each of these clips can be absorbed, viewers are likely unable to immediately process what they saw, due to the extremely short duration in which they were on the screen (Potter et al., 2014). That is, when scenes are presented in such quick succession, viewers may be able to recall some of what they saw from that time, but these

rapid-fire bursts are best understood as a stylistic unit which increases the pace of the video and grab the viewers' attention. Following these clips, the video turns to Officer Vin Daniello standing in front of a series of banners declaring "Danbury Police Department: Dependable, Professional, Dedicated," as he outlines the first steps necessary to apply to the department. He smiles towards the camera and explains "Ok, so first you have to complete the application, testing, and selection process. Then you're off to the Police Academy, where you'll learn the framework of policing, the principles of law enforcement, and get in pretty good shape."

The video shifts to the department's gym to demonstrate the space where recruits will work out. In a close up shot of his face and hands, Officer Vin Daniello lies back on a weight bench while exerting himself trying to complete a bench press while the camera slowly pans out. Another officer in a uniform polo and a full arm sleeve tattoo encourages Officer Daniello while spotting him during the workout. Once the camera pans out to the full weight room, Officer Daniello is shown to be lifting only the bar while the assisting officer looks down incredulously. In a new scene where Officer Daniello is having his patrol badge pinned to his uniform by a young woman, he continues, "Once you graduate the academy, you'll be sworn in and get your badge." The camera pans out to show Officer Daniello flanked by three women on each side, including the smiling young woman who pinned his badge on him earlier. To emphasize this moment, a special effect mimicking a camera flash takes place, creating a black and white still-frame of Officer Daniello and the six women. As the camera continues to pan out, it ducks through the 4th wall towards the viewer in a surreal special effect, showing the picture in a frame on the wall, commemorating these nameless women praising the recruitment officer. This narrative event commemorates graduation from the

177

police academy and Officer Daniello having his badge pinned on him during a swearing-in ceremony. In the U.S., a common practice found in PDs involves family members of officers pinning their badges on them when they graduate. The women in this scene are commodified as they are literally and figuratively positioned around Officer Daniello without any further explanation as their unexamined presence demonstrates his prestige. This again contributes to the TE logic, wherein normatively White and male officers are the ones being honored by women, thereby demonstrating their elevated status. Unnamed women's support of PDs is common in many videos illustrating the TE logic. However, this scene comes directly after the weightlifting sequence which specifically emasculates the officer and lowering the machismo - which is specifically a COP tactic to differentiate from the norm. By placing the scenes in which Daniello is being mocked directly before a scene in which he is fawned over by adoring women, the department tempers the toxically masculine messaging, allowing the two disparate logics to connect with humor and storytelling. This challenges the normal boundaries of the TE logic, which is useful for the organization as a way to open meanings and develop options. What begins as a both-and vacillation tactic develops the possibility of enacting a dialectic between the two that creates new productive meaning.

**Event IV**

As the setting shifts to a shooting range in this next scene, Officer Vin Daniello continues to demonstrate his charisma with self-deprecating humor. In the next clip, all of the booths in the range are occupied with officers who are supervised by the range master during target practice. All of the officers are wearing full uniforms and neon orange Honeywell ear protection, and each time we see an officer fire their service revolver, we hear the gunshot crack and watch bullet casings fly out of the handgun. The voice-over continues throughout

178

the scene; "Now that you're a police officer, come to Danbury to learn about becoming part of our great community…" Then, in a close-up of the target, gunshots punctuate the scene as pieces of the target ricochet after being hit. He continues "You'll also get additional hands-on experience for cutting edge training division." As the camera angle moves to mimic the motion of the target papers zooming in towards the shooters after the session, the Lieutenant dances while blowing out smoke from his finger guns. Holding his entirely untouched target up in front of him, it is revealed that all of the scenes featuring bullets striking their mark were, in fact, not fired by Lt. Daniello. The shooting instructor shakes his head in shame.

During this narrative event, Officer Daniello's braggadocio provides a humorous storyline to follow while demonstrating the quality of the department's shooting range and shooting instruction. Even though it is demonstrated that Officer Daniello failed to ever hit his own target, the viewer is given close-up footage as shot after shot explode through the center bullseye of the paper targets for the officers who are actually practicing. The department's skillful shooting and high standards are demonstrated while any messaging that could be considered disconcerting is effectively neutralized by Daniello's caricature of goofy incompetence. This camouflaging effect of humor that results from inconsistent depictions. In sum, this event handles the competing demands between logics by juxtaposing them, engaging in humor, and employing a more-than strategy of serious playfulness. This approach serves to challenge the boundaries between logics and opens up new meanings for how departments can handle recruitment and represent the work to stakeholders.

**Event V**

The next scene takes place in the Danbury parking lot with Lieutenant Vin Daniello standing in front of a police car. A female training officer stands on the other side of the car,

179

behind him. Looking into the camera, he continues, "Now you're in field training, and you might make mistakes--but that's ok! That's why you're assigned to experienced officers, like Christina, Ralph, and Joe, who will show you how it's done." As he says each of the other officers' names, the camera cuts to a close-up shot where Christina nods and smiles while keeping her hand on her service weapon, Ralph gives an unassuming two-finger wave, and Joe barely looks up from this month's edition of *American Police Beat* magazine. Joe's goatee is neatly trimmed and his camouflage gear suggests a military background. On the magazine cover facing the camera features the headline, *We Enforce Laws; It's NOT About our Feelings*. In a close-up shot of Training Officer Christina, she turns towards the police car passenger door and says "alright, let's go!" Lieutenant Daniello calls out "Let's rock'n'roll!" and heads to the driver's door. When the door won't open and he realizes he left his keys inside, he tugs on the handle repeatedly and exclaims "Are you kidding me?" When Christina walks over, she eyes Lt. Daniello judgmentally and asks him "Really, again?"

The next clip shows Lieutenant Vin Daniello leaning against the doorframe of a white cinderblock room with fluorescent lighting. He explains "After your field training is complete, you'll be assigned a patrol unit. Here you'll be out on your own, protecting your community, and when you really need to…you can make arrests!" As he pauses during this line, he smirks and shrugs his shoulders. It is not explicitly evident what part of his statement is being hedged by his paralanguage, but the inconsistency between the serious topic of conversation and his lighthearted demeanor serves to nullify the power distance otherwise invoked in his statement. As he says this line, the camera pans back, again demonstrating Officer Daniello's goofy behavior as he's locked in the cell by Christina and an unnamed officer who walk away, discussing their immediate lunch plans. Lieutenant Vin Daniello

looks out into the hallway from inside the cell and shouts out, "Are you kidding me? That's not funny!" while they continue to walk away.

As the department continues to use slapstick humor and buffoonery to deflect from the TE messaging that is represented in their actions, the viewer's visceral reaction against violence and authoritarianism is tempered. During this time, the overall impact of the TE messaging on the video's narrative continues to build as the department presents examples of enforcement in their messaging. As they demonstrate their impressive weapon skills and display how new recruits are locking up the criminals, they subsequently make a gag which distracts from the TE-logic messaging. In this manner, humor allows these TE logic-informed structural characteristics of the department to be depicted without impacting the welcoming tone of the video. Instead, the humorous approach cloaks the immediate potentially alarming impact of watching enforcement behaviors for viewers while enabling the video's structural narrative. As various members of the department continue to illustrate this lack of respect for Lt. Daniello, the cumulative effect of the gag being played out in each scene allows them to illustrate different features of the department while defusing the sense of elitism and bravado. Because Lt. Daniello is in actuality a high-ranking and decorated member of the department, his continued willingness to be the brunt of the joke demonstrates the organization's comfortable organizational culture. This is one of the core constitutive components of the COP logic in recruitment videos: the delineation of this department as unique within the field and breaking from the traditional institutional norm.

In this event, humor provides affordances for both the COP and TE logic. In many instances, humor softens the impact of (and decreases reactance against) legalistic messaging and thereby reinforces the traditional enforcement logic. However, the humor in this event

also supports the COP logic by demonstrating Danbury PD's willingness to look foolish in an institutional field dominated by depictions of toughness, capability, and superior force.

Because humor inherently exists as a function of juxtaposition and incongruity (Douglas, 1975) when a joke is made in the film, it simultaneously highlights both the structural validity of the concept being mocked and the significance of the alternative message being conveyed. Joe, the muscular and highly masculine-presenting training officer, is pictured reading a magazine featuring headlines reinforcing the traditional enforcement logic. As the interaction between the two different logics plays out throughout the video, scenes like this become less easy to classify as strengthening the impact of either the TE or COP logics. Lynch (2002) explains that as a core component of humor, whenever humor is mobilized, it dualistically creates opposite narratives in a social setting.

During this scene the video engages with the actual enactment of enforcement behaviors, with a variety of other factors coming into play which continue to soften the blow of the TE logic. As Lt. Daniello's voice-over explains, the fresh recruits who just graduated work in the patrol division, and like Officer Christina and her colleague here, they are responsible for arresting criminals and locking them in these cells. However, because Officer Christina is instead locking up her supervisor instead of an actual prisoner, the scene feels like a gag. This allows the department to provide an example of the work which is expected of recruits while simultaneously defusing the tension of arrest and incarceration. In addition to the way that these storytelling elements affect the department's positioning, Officer Vinny's incongruous mannerisms and behavior in the video do not adhere to the traditional standards of decorum which are integral to the TE logic. This incongruity leads to these paradoxical situations where the video's starring representation of what it means to be an officer is

himself getting locked up. This muddies the water around how any one of these scenes sustain either the TE or COP logic because the representation of policing in the video is understood to contradict the actual occurrence of events in the real world. These scenes are filmed in a chosen order with a continually developing narrative that unfolds throughout the video. In this context, the link between these scenes and either institutional logic must be understood as being part of a complex interrelationship that continues to develop after the scene ends.

Known as the *paradox of humor*, the act of jokingly referencing a topic instantiates one new message while simultaneously demonstrating the validity of the status quo (Meyer, 2000). Arguments could be made as to the net effect of Joe the Training Officer's characterization of the TE/COP relationship that is being enacted in the video, but it undoubtedly does present messaging which is significant for both logics. Officer Joe is just one of the three different training officers, standing in strong contrast to the easygoing disposition of Officer Ralph or the exacting discipline of Officer Christina. This militarized, cold, and hypermasculine representation of training inheres the TE logic, but this orientation towards policing is likewise illustrated as being outnumbered by other approaches like the relaxed feel of Officer Ralph or the intensity of Officer Christina. As the video continues to establish a reflective relationship between TE and COP, the department's depictions of police work contribute to both logics, continually creating/re-creating the department's institutional positioning. At times this takes place as part of the both-and strategy of vacillation, featuring different aspects of the job in sequence, but at others, the way that these scenes build a larger narrative allows them to reframe each other (a more-than strategy that relies on opposing forces mutually implicating each other to add new understanding).

**Event VI**

Ironically, this next scene uses sophisticated special effects and elaborate storytelling to demonstrate the department's lack of pretension. Shifting to what appears to be another scene which is framed to obviously take place in front of a greenscreen, Lieutenant Vin Daniello is decked out in Jedi attire, complete with robe and lightsaber. Adopting the mannerisms of a Star Wars character, Officer Daniello continues in a low voice, "…and after a short time on the force, young Jedi…" He suddenly looks up and peers around himself, drawing his lightsaber. He takes the hood off his head and looks at the lightsaber in disbelief, apparently recognizing how artificial the scene feels. He code switches back to his normal tone, asking, "are you kidding me with this thing?" Returning fully to his recruitment officer persona, Lt. Daniello looks at the camera assuredly and says "Listen, you can join one of our specialized units!" He twirls the lightsaber around his head in a casual gesture and then throws it off-camera, followed by a zapping noise and a pained grunt. Officer Daniello displays his best imitation of shock.

This scene gives the department another opportunity to demonstrate their distinctiveness within the institutional field, which they use to again show the department's approachability. As the video is about to transition into a long stream of short videos demonstrating different subunits within the department, this scene provides a surprising and humorous event to maintain an excited tempo and upbeat mood. Additionally, humorous scenes like this one have been demonstrated to decrease the viewer's counter-argumentation in two different ways: As a distractor--by placing additional demands on the viewer's limited cognitive resources (Sternthal & Craig, 1973); and as a discounting cue – by demonstrating the issue to

184

be "just a joke" (Nabi et al.,2007). Engaging in this sort of serious playfulness as a more-than approach, the department invites viewers to see connections between the different logics as they're enacted. This reflexive practice aids in handling competing demands.

## Event VII

In this narrative event, we see that the scenes do little to assert any new positions on TE or COP. Additionally, the scenes which more strongly support a TE logic are not treated with internal consistency. Officer Daniello transitions to listing all of the different subunits in which officers can serve, starting with a two-second blast of 10 different shots featuring varied career options within the department. At this point, the music syncs up to the images with a drum solo that increases the speed and tempo of the clip. The short clips feature scenes of two police officers riding bikes; two officers looking at a crime scene from the point of view of the evidence; three men with badges walking through a hallway; an officer in scuba gear, submerged neck-deep in water; an officer petting a police dog; The Honor Guards presenting the colors in front of the Danbury police officer building; 7 SWAT officers in tight team formation; guns pointed straight at the viewer; and three police officers in motorcycles speeding towards the camera, followed by a patrol car. None of the scenes are on screen for longer than 200 milliseconds. At the end of the brief montage, Lieutenant Vin Daniello starts to name the positions available to new recruits in Danbury. For most specialized subunits, Officer Daniello finds some way to interact with members of the unit.

"You have the Honor Guard," he intones as the camera zooms in to a close up of one member swinging his shotgun in precise movements. Demonstrating the perfectly synchronized squadron as they shift positions and march in formation, their meticulous movements are dramatized as the camera peers down the line of officers performing a Three

Volley Salute. This is part of the department's ceremonial funeral ritual, commonly performed after an officer is killed in action. This ceremonial behavior honoring past officers is heavily steeped in traditional enforcement logics, invariably bolstering each recruit's awareness of the risks that they will face as they do their job.

Demonstrating the SWAT Team, the camera shot features an armored transport vehicle driving straight towards the camera, siren blaring and lights flashing. The music picks up pace, embodying the excitement of the scene. As SWAT Team members dismount the armored vehicle in formation, they form a defensive position where they each take on a unique role, with some holding shields and others following as a rear guard. As the last member of the team exits the frame, Lt. Vin Daniello is revealed behind the SWAT team wearing sunglasses to match the team's tactical gear. As he continues marching towards the camera, he spreads his arms wide and then enthusiastically shouts out "SWAT Team!" Notable in the context of this video, humor is not attempted in this scene.

Demonstrating the Traffic Unit, three police officers on motorcycles drive towards the camera, followed by a police car. Cutting to a Cowboy Shot, Officer Daniello wears a motorcycle helmet complete with microphone and earpiece. He stands in front of a patrol car and raises his foot and rests it on the vehicle's bumper, with the squad car's lights flashing behind him. Abandoning what would otherwise be a dignified posture, a wide grin breaks out across the recruitment officer's face as he gestures around himself excitedly.

Demonstrating the officers who use SCUBA equipment, three police officers float in a pool, neck deep. Officer Daniello wears a Hawaiian shirt and snorkel, bobbing up and down in an American Flag-adorned *We the People* pool floatie. To maintain the humorous tenor of

the video, when Officer Daniello shakes his hands in the "Hang Loose" motion to the camera, the other officers knock him off his floatie and into the water.

In the next clip, Lieutenant Vin Daniello beams out a smile while he pets and scratches a Black Labrador Retriever. He asks "You like dogs? We got dogs!" while mimicking the dog and sticking his own tongue out while panting. Avoiding the cliché of the attack dog chasing down a subject wearing the training suit, this dog wags his tail wildly, arching his back to encourage further petting.

In the scene featuring the bicycle unit, the camera shifts to a squad of officers riding bikes in a brick alleyway and down a set of stairs without slowing down. Capturing the action from three different angles and highlighting the moment when his bike leaves the ground as it goes over the stairs, Officer Daniello calls out "Bike Patrol."

Shifting to a shot where the camera is seated on the back seat of the patrol car facing an officer dusting for prints and using a black light, Lt. Daniello's voice-over dictates "Become an evidence technician in the crime scene unit." Switching to an extreme close-up shot of the revealed prints, two female evidence technicians reveal a previously obscured set of prints as they search for evidence.

The Criminal Investigations unit is represented in a scene where three officers in uniform are juxtaposed on the screen with three other officers in undercover disguises comprised of baggy hoodies, construction uniforms, and baseball caps, with their faces blurred out. Officer Vin Daniello can be seen wearing a wig and causing a disturbance in the interview room, exasperating the other officers in the room while the Chief looks on, shaking his head in disappointment. Reinforcing the theme of serious play, this depiction makes the rules of

engagement within this situation clear by experimenting with challenges to the traditional boundaries for behavior, a more-than strategy for responding to competing demands.

As the pace of the music picks up, Officer Daniello is again framed in the Cowboy Shot, flanked by a crowd of youth Police Explorers all wearing their dress uniforms. In this shot, Officer Daniello is the only person immediately recognizable as Caucasian. With only a couple exceptions, all of the youth in the Explorer program are non-White. When the music calms down for a moment, Officer Daniello asks, "How about helping the community with our Explorer Unit?" In a rapid pan backwards, the camera zooms out to show even more youth Explorers all jumping in excitement. and cheering. Continuing the theme of community service, the next clip shows police officers playing kickball with elementary school kids as Lt. Daniello's voice-over continues: "or get involved with kids as a school resource officer." Showing officers high-fiving kids after the game, each officer is surrounded by a cluster of jumping and cheering children, drawing the focus back onto the officers who are surrounded by their adoring fans.

In a new scene, Officer Daniello appears alongside two Latin/Hispanic officers. The first says "Si usted habla Espanol…" and the second continues "o voce fala Portugues," until Lieutenant Daniello jumps in to say "like my good friends here, Edgar and Rudy, who will be compensated with additional paid time off." Depicting the department's administrators, Lieutenant Daniello leans back in an office with his feet up on the desk. He gestures towards two Sergeants and engages them in casual conversation, providing another illustration of the department's relaxed stance on the trappings of authority within the organizational hierarchy. He tells the viewer, "You know after a few years, you too can get promoted, like my good friends Drew and Amy". As Drew and Amy enter the room and wave towards the camera,

they are followed by the Chief of Police. Looking sternly at his recruiting officer, the Chief

asks "Someone wanna tell me what's going on here?" Vin Daniello looks shocked and gets

up quickly from the seat. He glances up sheepishly at the camera and says "not my office"

before making an abrupt exit.

Like many recruitment videos, the Danbury Police decided to highlight a number of

different units in their materials. This demonstrates the breadth of opportunities within the

department and presents messaging about goals that have been explicitly approved by the

department. These scenes assert very little, if any, new positions on TE or COP and the

scenes that more strongly represent TE contain a lack of internal consistency. For example, in

the scene depicting the SWAT subunit, Officer Daniello engages in no mischief, but during

the scene featuring the Criminal Investigations unit, Officer Daniello dons a bad wig and

performatively aggravates an entire squadron of police. In some of the scenes which showed

the different career paths available, very little excitement happens, such as the scenes

featuring officers searching for evidence, where no jokes are made and no high-tempo

actions take place. However, in other mundane situations, such as the aquatic unit floating on

the surface of the pool, a series of visual gags take place before the slapstick "push Officer

Daniello into the pool" moment.

The COP logic is reinforced when the department shows the officers speaking Spanish

and Portuguese and describes how they are compensated for their valuable skill set. This not

only demonstrates diversity as a valued trait within the department –it likewise demonstrates

the creation of internal programs to support diversity. This rich demonstration of the COP

logic helps support how COP messaging inherent to the department's depiction of the

Explorer program and other interactions with the youth. These scenes of White officers

surrounded by adoring children of color who are cheering them on do not demonstrate a very coherent depiction of the COP logic on their own. Thus, when presented without other messaging supporting the COP logic, scenes with officers having praise heaped on to them can feel self-congratulatory instead of indicating a service mindset. When bookended by scenes with complementary COP messaging, these less vivid depictions of the logic are given more weight.

When considering how humor is used in this narrative event, these scenes demonstrate two different effects of humor on this video. First, the humor consistently keeps the video interesting, keeping the viewer engaged in what is happening next and also distracting from what just happened previously. Second, the department consistently uses humor to make potentially heavy scenes like intense interrogations and car chases more lighthearted in feel. Considering the editing of this event, the sequence of these scenes often involves interspersed moments of COP and levity between more TE dominant imagery. By interspersing scenes featuring the hypermasculine units such as the motorcycle cops, K9, and detectives with scenes featuring COP units (the aquatics unit, the bike cops, and the traffic), the vacillation tactic is employed and allows the scenes to develop a collaborative dialogue.

**Event VIII**

The music starts playing again as Officer Daniello's voice outlines the requirements to apply. He explains, "If you're interested in making a difference in the community and have a can-do attitude, you'll also need to meet a few of these minimum requirements". Ending with the TE logic's standard listing of minimum requirements, this event outlines for new recruits all of the qualifications that they must have to be eligible to apply with a detailed focus on the body's physical capabilities and a lack of socially deviant violations such as drugs,

felonies, or mental disorders. These are common standards that any organization may adopt in screening applicants, but they only outline bare minimums for an officer's mental fitness for the job and do not attempt to outline any social skills or community outreach experience which would most benefit an officer engaged in COP work. The voice-over encourages viewers, "To begin your journey, go to either of these websites to apply between these dates and be sure to follow us on Facebook, Twitter, and Instagram!" with lists of links to social media pages.

## Video Summary

This video represents the job of TE policing as enjoyable and honorable. Through the use of humor to deflect focus from the uncomfortable aspects of traditional enforcement, the video maintains an upbeat tempo and presents a friendly department without actually effectively illustrating the COP logic in either the subject matter or the treatment of the scenes depicting it. Considering the affordances and constraints inherent to the medium of recruitment materials, humor enables the department to communicate multiple effects on the overall representation of institutional logics. More to the point, the humorous material presented in the video effectively allows the department to present components of the TE logic in an unthreatening manner while simultaneously making the video more comfortable and interesting for viewers to watch (Smith & Powell, 1988). The humor in this video demonstrates the department's positioning relative to institutional norms by breaking away from the traditionally accepted frameworks for organizational self-representation (Meyer & Rowan, 1977; Oldani, 1988) by resisting the impulse to "take themselves too seriously" instead of "being able to take a joke." Likewise, by reducing tensions, humor can reduce the inhibitory effect of traditional enforcement depictions on the organization's ability to

191

cohesively illustrate commitment to the COP logic (Rubin, 1983). Finally, humor also induces viewers to process the video's messaging less critically in a variety of ways (Petty & Cacioppo, 1986; Young, 2004). Humor creates a positive mood for viewers which decreases their skepticism when viewing the video (Baumgartner & Morris, 2008). By consistently re-introducing humor throughout the video, viewers are induced to process the video's messaging peripherally, especially when their own position on any given topic is similar to that of the organization. (Lyttle, 2001).

## General Summary of the Danbury Videos

From the first to the second video, the Danbury PD advances in a variety of ways. Technologically, the organization has progressed from amateur slideshows to captivating video productions. In Danbury's first video (2014), a still-frame image of an officer in the same photograph as a citizen represents the entirety of the department's focus on COP, but as the department's recruitment develops, the Explorers program and other youth-focused programs took a more central role in the video. Additionally, if the department's depiction of COP has increased in both clarity and scope, as well see from 2014 to 2016, the way in which the department represents the TE logic have expanded as well. As the instances in which the TE logic are depicted increasingly vividly, they become more well-defined and have greater impact. However, as these messages become more powerful, these TE depictions are often counterbalanced with accompanying messaging which prevents the COP logic from being completely overshadowed. We see points of integration which build a compromise between the logics, allowing for fairly seamless vacillation back and forth between them. As some of the depictions increase in excitement, the interplay between both logics allows for a more reflexive approach and allows emotion to bridge the two logics. The

creative and enjoyable-to-watch space created in this video allows the narrative tactics, plot devices, and special effects to change how the TE messaging is processed in the moment while still depicting the same behaviors. This is a unique affordance of the combination of these two disparate logics through the use of humor, allowing the department's serious playfulness to bridge connections between the two logics in their depiction. This builds resources for organizational members to perceive connections between the two logics in implementation for officers.

The 2014 video features historical footage from the department which shows off the toughness and consistency of the department in a way that also intones respect by featuring pictures of officers over the last century. In the 2016 video, Officer Daniello's affected bumbling provides a foil for the department to play off, illustrating their intimidating prowess in traditional enforcement in the context of a comedy sketch, S which presents a vivid contrast to TE messaging; there is an immediate juxtaposition against the extreme examples of TE behavior. There is a powerful effect in reorienting the video's overall messaging, however, scenes featuring officers having cheerful interactions with community members can only do so much to recover from the shock of the previous event.

Throughout the video, the department's representation of policing became more extreme, which illustrates one possible feature/characteristic of vacillation as a more-than approach to competing demands. The way that the video is sequenced, many scenes which incorporate extreme examples of the TE logic are positioned so that they are immediately followed by scenes depicting the COP logic. This constant back-and-forth dynamic allows the narrative to build momentum with each joke, which in turn implicates a similarly escalating response. As this pattern of oscillation between the opposites continues, it alternatively connects the logics

by linking similar ideas and disconnects them by providing stark contrast. It creates a self-sustaining cycle where repeatedly invoking humor promotes a reciprocal intensification of the logic that is being depicted because of the way that humor grows stale without new developments.

### *Summary of Phase I Analysis*

RQ1 asked about which institutional logics are demonstrated in PD recruitment videos. To respond to this research question, in Phase one, a team of coders (including myself) analyzed 12 hours and 38 minutes of videos and conducted a thematic analysis. A codebook was developed that incorporated audio, visual, thematic, and narrative elements, yielding six primary themes for COP logic (i.e., personalized engagement, self-differentiation from field, demonstrations of community-centric policies, internalization of COP as a process, and diversity as strength) and four primary themes for TE logic (i.e., exciting storytelling, officer heroics, incomplete COP, and hierarchical orientation).

Videos that represented either of the two logics (TE or COP) were randomly selected while videos that represented a mix of both logics were intentionally selected for analysis in Phase II.

### *Summary of Phase II Analysis*

RQ2 asked about patterns in how PDs present multiple institutional logics. In order to respond to this research question, in Phase II, I analyzed a sample of videos from each type to extend knowledge about how organizations communicate to manage their relative position on the logics. When departments create institutional messaging, they rely upon the dominant logic of the field to guide their self-representation. Thus, when organizations interact in

194

institutionally complex environments, their strategy must enable them to adhere to multiple logics, while carefully navigating issues which have differing rules and expectations for outcomes across logics.

Within the videos analyzed for Phase II, videos most commonly approached competing demands with the TE and COP logic framed as a dualism - usually centered around the contradictions stemming from structuring the two logics as categorically-opposite. This positions the two logics as bipolar and oppositional, even though the practical enactment of either logic reflexively attends to the other. This approach commonly led to videos which depict one singular institutional logic, or present an unbalanced depiction of the logic which doesn't allow organizations to focus on competing demands. Some of these videos could be described as demonstrating defensive mechanisms such as ambivalence, projection, and reaction forming to establish the validity of their monological perspective. Separation and selection strategies in the videos treat contradictory poles as distinct phenomena that function independent of each other, despite their inherent connection. These videos functionally deny the existence of tension, contradiction, and the development of dialectics.

As the Danbury and Omaha videos allow the logics to respond to each other and create meaning in their juxtaposition, dialectics can develop which inform the experiences of organizational members. Within these dialectics, opportunities for both-and approaches which avoid segmenting opposites or privileging one pole over the other. Vacillation is the most common both-and approach employed in the videos, as departments demonstrate the different units on the force and enact warrior-guardian narratives. These videos highlight the different aspects of policing and present them in ways where there is space for multiple narratives to exist simultaneously. Although they may not have the complexity to represent

195

opposing logics with great depth, the integration tactic employs both clumsy forced mergers and attempts at balance when the existing system is stable.

At times, depictions in the videos rise to the challenge of approaching competing demands with more-than responses which connect oppositional pairs, usually by negotiating a connection through otherwise disconnected spaces. When the logics are presented in tandem and then demonstrated to mutually implicate each other, the competing demands can be reframed to attend to different audiences with the messaging. This was demonstrated to occur when tasks were reframed from a traditional TE context and imbued an added measure of public service through the lens of the COP logic. The tool which was used with some of the most range was humor, which was demonstrated in videos addressing competing demands from the perspective of reflexive practice and serious playfulness. Some attempts at humor were more successful than others at juxtaposing the logics to afford organizational members resources to guide behavior. When humor was used to distract from other possible negative messaging or as a one-off gag, the videos did not demonstrate reflexive practice. When humor was used to humanize the officers and push back against dominant logics in the institutional field, the approaches often used irony and comic relief to alleviate tension between the logics.

Because institutional messaging attends to different audiences and discusses separate topics, the ways in which organizations integrate the two logics differ. However, across instances some patterns emerged for both the sequencing and richness of the presentation of the oppositional institutional logics, complete with unique affordances for the information that could be presented. Sequencing refers to the chronological pattern of narration which clearly manifests the logics. Antagonism describes extreme depictions in which the logics

196

meet in jarring ways, either sequentially or at the same time on the screen. This affects how easily it can be integrated with another logic. In my analysis of the sampled videos, I identified ways in which representing multiple logics in a single artifact allows for an added layer of meaning: vacillation (both-and), ambiguity (more-than), separation (either-or), and selection (either-or)I describe each below.

In vacillation the pattern of sequencing for the logics tend to alternate, one after another, at such a pace that the logic is never predominantly illustrated for more than a few scenes. In this back-and-forth pattern, the logics have the opportunity to interact when they are not highly antagonistic, which can lead to a synthesis in some instances as they segment and connect in a both-and way. For example, in the Enid, OK video, vacillation emerges as the video plays clips from interviews with different officers in the department. The first officer to be interviewed opens with a story about his fellow officer who was recently shot by a criminal, eliciting the TE logic. Immediately after he explains how this has inspired his passion for catching the bad guys, the video cuts to an interview with his supervising captain in the department. He responds to his subordinate's statement with "it's not just getting the bad guys…a large part of our job is also to help people." This is echoed when the third officer being interviewed talks about "helping them every day" while using examples of policing tasks, some of which are easily identified as COP, such as assisting citizens with medical emergencies. Others that he and other officers mention are somewhat more ambiguous, such as helping people on the road, during which the video shows an officer detaining someone in the back of his patrol vehicle without any further context. When the first officer comes back onto the screen again, his words echo the words of his Captain and everyone else interviewed, saying "We are there to help. That's what we do." However, due

to his previous statement about his drive to get criminals off the street after an officer was shot, his words take on a different tone than those of his Captain. After the third officer's statements about "helping" were visualized on screen in a way that illustrated the TE logic, the significance of the word "help" has shifted. This first officer's statement about helping now must be considered in the context through which the definition and underlying logic of help is developed.

In this interaction, though, we also see more-than strategies come into play. Over the course of the interaction which continues throughout the video, the department's focus on help remains consistent, but the ambiguous way that this word is used to support both logics is a valuable affordance in this institutionally complex environment. Ambiguity is a more-than strategy that fosters more-than approaches such as third space and dialogue that develops through a zone of ambiguity (Putnam et al., 2016, p. 127). This has implications for the way that the definition of words can shift based on the context. When organizational media elaborates an unclear meaning for a concept in their materials, their subsequent references to the same concept draw on this ambiguity, allowing for oppositional logics to exist in the same conceptual space. When this continues to happen, the nature of the relationship between the logics shifts, and future messaging must be understood from the emergent paradigm which is unique to the organization.

Another type of more-than strategy seen in the videos is the use of humor. Like previous studies, I found that it is often used to attract attention or to keep audiences interested (Lynch 2006; Collinson, 1998), but it also accomplished other tasks in the videos such as defining in- and out-groups. Often this was done by disparaging the out-group calling on various stereotypes (Ford & Ferguson, 2004). Disparaging humor was most commonly noted in

videos that illustrated the TE logic, such as when the Avondale, AZ recruitment officer makes jokes about lazy people who eat potato chips on their couch and couldn't hack it in the department. With this in mind, studying disparaging jokes is a fruitful context for theory building and understanding the intricacies of intergroup relations.

Humor also was frequently used as a means to deflect potentially negative judgements about some elements of police work because when the audience is laughing or even simply amused by the unfolding actions, they are less inclined to feel negatively about the representations (Lynch, 2002); the positivity diminishes the negativity (Yoon & Tinkham, 2013). Humor elicits positive emotions of happiness and mirth, helping to neutralize the negative emotions (Chan, 2011; Martin and Ford, 2018). In addition, humor also worked to disparage outgroups and strengthen ingroup relations. This may cause some viewers to positively view the department as a desirable in-group causing them to be more attracted to join.

In other situations, vacillation can lead to a spiraling inversion or a competition between the opposing logics which degenerates into selection or an either-or process (Putnam et al., 2016, p. 124-126). The second Danbury video uses a vacillation pattern, but because it does not contain aggressively antagonistic depictions of the logic, the lack of hyperextreme shots makes the lack of cohesion between the presentations of the two logics less salient. This vacillation pattern forces viewers to repeatedly mentally reorient, or choose, between the two logics in shared spaces, making connections between the two. This pattern positions the organization as engaging in acts which harmonize well with each other. For vacillation, the video's orientation to policing is created by the way that they tell a story through narratives which make the intersection of the logics sensical. This allows the department to highlight

some behaviors as valorous and quickly skip over others based on the narrative, even if similarly oppositional depictions of the logics are compared.

Videos with *separation* primarily present the department's COP work and TE responsibilities as separate, segmented, and sequenced into only a few different scenes. Separation is an either-or strategy in which the opposite logics are segmented functionally into duties, topics, or job activities (Putnam et al., 2016, p. 123)In the Kansas, OK video, the logics are presented with most of the COP logics presented in two segments of the video. After demonstrating some well-crafted non-extreme depictions of K9s and the bomb squad, keeping the TE logic from being too extreme, the video features lengthy and extensive shots of a community event and barbeque. At the end of the video, the voice-over asks: "Do you have what it takes to serve the community?" in a challenging, yet inviting tone. The vast majority of the rest of the video features the TE logic, in long sequences of scenes which build on the richness of the previous depiction. By keeping the logics separate in this manner, even though there is significantly less COP depicted in this video compared to TE, the COP logic is not completely overrun because it is depicted in multiple scenes that coherently demonstrate multiple aspects of the COP logic. Even if COP was overwhelmed by the dominant TE logic, COP was able to make much more impact than it would have if it were split into smaller chunks across the duration of the video. Police departments that perceive policing as dualistic, or are engaged in a duality, are able to present their orientation toward enforcement and the community as they adopt either-or strategies. When organizations divide up responsibilities to separate them according to their underlying constitutive logic, then they can construct the relationship between the two logics as being incompatible within the same space.

Depending on the narrative which is elaborating meaning in the media, this could include organizations that understand the logics to interrelate as binaries and expect members to seek excellence in competing job roles. As in this example, however, when the department simply demonstrated that they have a COP unit, a resource officer at the local high school, and a PAL program – contrasted to their SWAT team, exciting car chases, sniper training, hand to hand combat, athletic training, detective work, traffic patrol, etc. – the COP logic is inherently deflated and can be seen as something to be embodied by those few who are assigned to those specific duties.

When recruitment videos use a selection pattern (an either-or strategy), they tend to open up with an extreme depiction of one logic that fails to match the overall tenor for the remainder of the video. One logic is privileged and accented in an attention getting way which marginalizes the other tension, again, an either-or strategy. The most common way that this is depicted is through some of the most sensational yet least-likely to occur moments of an officer's career. In the Midland, TX video, the first scene opens with officers in full camouflage, hunkered down together in combat formation, pointing guns at the camera. For context, less than 2% of officers ever participate in a SWAT team (LEMAS, 2017), and the role of sniper isn't universal for SWAT teams in the U.S. Thus, even though this scene does not reflect a job responsibility that potential recruits should expect to be a part of their career as a police officer, it kick-starts the video with adrenaline and toughness. This has drastic implications for the department's institutional positioning relative to the two logics when one logic is oriented to excitement and stimulation. Although it is a principle of marketing that promotional materials will gain more attention if they are more exciting (Campbell, 1995), highlighting job tasks which are unlikely to ever even be seen by organizational members

dampens the impact of messaging supporting any other logics. Although the Midland, TX video shows a variety of non-exhilarating and important policing tasks, such as crime scene investigation and interviewing citizens, these scenes are inherently affected by the position of the selection/attention-grabbing opener in the sequence (i.e. primacy effect/serial positioning, see Cowan et al., 2002).

Overall, as Phase II of this narrative analysis shows, departments strategically use tactics of cinematography, music, sequencing as well as the actors chosen to represent their department in various ways to attract the attention of potential recruits. In doing so, they illustrate the logic that operates in their department that affects the structure and relationships within the department, their relationships with citizens, and their daily behaviors. They implement these strategies knowing that this identity positioning has the potential to attract some, while repealing others, thus in the largest category of videos—those that attempt to include both COP and TE logics. They choose various ways to present oppositional activities as dualisms, dualities, or dialectics or in aligning COP and TE activities, inserting narrative features of COP and TE or using humor to moderate effects of potentially harsh TE depictions. These strategies intend to enable departments to communicate with potentially wider audiences.

## CHAPTER FIVE

### DISCUSSION

Messaging to prospective members and other stakeholders is a foundational element of positioning organizations for various audiences. These messages are used for a variety of purposes including communicating organizational missions, how the organization views

itself and its work, and how it views itself relative to the community it serves. This organizational communication attends to the competing demands that permeate its operations, relationships with members and target audiences and its identity. In this study, I examined one medium for that communication for PDs—recruitment videos—to learn more about how they potentially align themselves with logics that underlie the assumptions of their functions. This investigation probed more deeply the strategies associated with representation of and alignment of the logics for certain target audiences. This chapter discusses those findings and related implications and limitations. I conclude with suggestions for future research.

## Institutional Logics and Organizational Tensions

Institutional logics are frameworks for rationality that guide organizational members in thinking and action (Friedland & Alford, 1991; Thornton & Ocasio, 1999). This study investigated how institutional logics were represented within one particular type of organizationally-produced media: PD recruitment videos. As described in the literature review, through the years PDs have operated under different logics that affect how they perceive themselves relative to their communities, the structure of the organization, including their jobs and daily tasks. Recruitment videos are designed to attract applicants, typically those who are in alignment with the logics demonstrated in the videos. Individuals who do not share similar views and do not identify with practices about how police officers should perform their duties, would likely be discouraged from applying to that particular department. For these reasons, departments who draw on both COP and TE frameworks may try various approaches to reduce obvious differences between the logics.

The first phase of this dissertation, responded to two research questions: **RQ1** which asked about what institutional logics are depicted in police recruitment videos, and how each logic is represented, and **RQ2** which was analyzed in Phase II and asked about what strategies surface in the literature to deal with competing institutional logics and what types of oppositions surface in presenting particular logics or combinations of them.

To respond to these questions, I analyzed several hundred recruitment videos to identify the logics that were present in the videos and whether the individual videos could be classified based on one logic that was predominantly featured. Thematic analysis revealed that the traditional enforcement (TE) logic which showed officers enforcing the law to curtail the activities of "law-breakers" was most dominant and was depicted practically universally across the sample. This is an expected finding given that PDs must be relied upon to protect their communities by tracking and apprehending suspects. This also is not surprising given that TE activities are far more dramatic and exciting and likely more easily engage the viewer. In all but a few cases, police officers were seen in police chases or handcuffing law-breaking individuals. However, community-oriented policing (COP) was a secondary logic that was co-present with the TE logic in the vast majority of videos. However, the large number of videos that simultaneously represent both TE and COP is worth noting. While most U.S. PDs are attempting to forge stronger relationships with members of their communities (for a variety of reasons), the fact that they would choose to also represent COP activities, even though they can appear less exciting in a recruitment video, is a valuable insight.

This research builds on the work of Aiello and Gumbhir (2016) who found two oppositional logics at play in how PDs represented themselves on their websites: community

204

service and crime control. Their research found that even though departmental online media emphasize community engagement, the crime control narrative is ubiquitous throughout police websites. This was echoed by Koslicki (2018) who identified the presence of the two themes of militarism and community policing and Smith (2022) who found community-oriented behaviors to be less salient than more traditional tactics in a review of 567 U.S. police recruitment videos In the current study, crime control and militarism are both components of the TE logic, which was demonstrated with: (1) exciting and dramatic storytelling, (2) threatened officers as brave heroes, (3) incomplete examples of COP, and (4) intensive descriptions of the application process, and (5) demonstrations of hierarchy. Conversely, the COP logic was most prominently depicted through (1) modeling personalized engagement, (2) self-differentiation from the norm, (3) demonstrating community-centric policies, (4) organizational structures which make COP a process instead of a goal, (5) long-term orientation to community relationships, and (6) diversity as a strengthening feature.

While the exact motivations of the departments represented in the current study for their presentations of the logics are not known, we can speculate about some objectives. First, since the videos are intended to offer a preview, they enable potential recruits to view significant elements of the job in their department. Since COP activities are becoming more predominant, departments draw on both logics in the tasks and events they present. Much in line with SIT which holds that individuals seek to strengthen their associations with groups that they value and believe prestigious (Tajfel & Turner, 1986), individuals whose values and expectations align with this representation of the logics should feel encouraged to apply to the department. Given that organizations are aware of the multiple viewpoints which they

must attend, most choose to depict a wide variety of different behaviors displaying and intersecting with both logics, which gives them the widest possible audience for their recruitment.

Second, PDs must persistently attend to multiple stakeholders. Videos such as these also communicate to position the department to other audiences such as to current members, government officials and the larger community. For PDs, the relationship between these logics is an important aspect of their institutional positioning. For example, the video from the Decatur, GA Police strongly emphasized their community engagement. Scenes featured officers customizing their interaction with different groups of community members, always demonstrating the cheerful disposition and helpfulness of the officers. This may reflect the police leadership's desire to maintain or develop a friendly, cooperative relationship with community members. Alternatively, this depiction of the logics may be an indication about perceived expectations from the larger community. For example, in communities in which racial relations have been a significant focus, the department may wish to more closely align itself to either the COP logic if it's trying to build racial relations or it may reflect a stronger TE logic if the intent is to demonstrate dominance over racial issues. The video produced by the Newport Beach, CA Police Department with its demonstration of urban combat may be one such example. The overall effect in how the department presents its relationship to the logics positions it relative to other PDs on this important dimension.

**Demonstrating Strategies for Managing Competing Logics**

This study also provides a better understanding about how the organization presents their narrative and strategically organizes the interplay of the logics. In the second phase of this study, I responded to **RQ2** which asked about the competing orientations in the logics and

whether they were represented as oppositional, and if so, what types of opposites surfaced in the video. I sampled videos from three categories—predominantly TE, predominantly COP, and the largest category, TE and COP--to more deeply analyze the narrative process by which the video shares their story. Much like other types of films, recruitment videos use cinematic techniques such slow-motion, camera angles, and others. I applied a tension-centered approach and observed that the messaging found in some of the recruitment videos in the sample illustrated clear parallels with some of the different categories of responses to organizational tensions, as outlined by Putnam et al. (2016).

Accordingly, I found that multiple institutional logics can vary in three key ways: (1) the ontological relationship between the logics (for example, being seen as compatible versus mutually exclusive), (2) the types of strategies for situating the logics (e.g., selection one logic, separating them functionally, vacillating between them, connecting them, or putting them in humorous, ironic relationships), (3) the types of opposition that surfaced in the videos (e.g., dualisms, duality, dialectic), and (4) affordances or the varying impact of different depictions of the logics (for example, an officer presented in slow-motion strapping on their gun while getting dressed versus pointing and shooting that gun at the camera). These affordances vary for different strategies of organizational representation and shape the identity of the organization. Potential organizational members who view recruitment media are unlikely to ever notice the underlying strategies because the videos' narratives and action sequences compel the viewer's attention (Moyer-Gusé, & Nabi, 2010).

I identified several ways the PDs dealt with the underlying tensions of COP and TE. First, within the videos that focused primarily on the TE logic, the most common organizational responses to tension observed in the sample included *either-or approaches,*

207

*selecting out one pole or defense mechanisms.* Either-or approaches were seen when departments would show only the TE logic, such as was demonstrated by the New Newport Beach Police Department's video which didn't ever feature a community member. The video was about the department's job as enforcers of the law. Defense mechanisms, in which the organization denies the existence of the tension in the first place were evident when they would feature statements from citizens about how wonderful the department is, such as in the Salt Lake City, UT video featuring an officer describing the encouraging notes and plates of cookies that she gets left on her car during her workday.

Some departments chose to integrate the logics, allowing them to engage in *both-and* approaches, for example, integration through either a forced merger, a middle ground, or balance and vacillation between the opposites. In the 2012 Enid, Ok., video directly after Officer Justin Skaggs explains his passion for enforcing the law due to threats against officer safety, his Chief of Police explains directly after that "a large part of our job…is to right wrongs." He supports the officer and integrates that perspective as he continues "But, a large part of our job is just to help people." In the 2016 West Valley City, UT. video, the department demonstrated both COP and TE logics consistently (both-and). Speaking about his inability to resolve all of the concerns that he gets faced with every day, Officer Josue Llil says, "My job is just to find the best way to help someone and sometimes you can only do so much." He explains that he can find fulfillment in this situation, however, by asserting, "But then there's time that you can just do everything for that person, and it's just the best feeling ever.".

At times, some departments exhibited signs of *more-than* approaches which productively engaged with the tension between logics. This usually took the form of *reflective practice*

*and serious playfulness* (as coined by Putnam et al., (2016) drawing from Huxham & Beech (2003) and Barge et al., (2003). This framework refers to the use of tensions to open meanings and develop options, engage in purposeful action driven by emotions rather than rational arguments, and challenges to normal boundaries, typically enacted through trial-and-error exploration, reflective positioning, and humor, irony, and play (Putnam et al., 2016, p. 127).

The videos from Danbury Police offer an example of this with their paradoxical anti-hero protagonist. By using tensions to engage in playful humor and irony in recruitment materials, the organization's meaning is vague. This strategy relies on ambiguity and encourages recruits to read into the ambiguity to negotiate their own understanding of the logics.

When the department communicated a distinction between the two institutional logics, but not a mismatch, this caused *tension* to emerge in their juxtaposition. For example, tensions emerged in the recruitment video for the Enid, OK PD which potentially allowed them to meet competing demands (Seo et al, 2004; D'Enbeau, 2017). When two officers spoke about their experience on the job, the first explained how getting shot at by criminals increases an officer's dedication to catching bad guys. This was immediately followed by another officer who elaborated on a different characterization of the job--helping people and positively impacting children. Both officers explained how previous interactions between an officer and a member of the community affected how they do their job now. There is an incommensurate tension between the way in which an officer adjusts their occupational identity to respond to either (a) being shot at, or (b) getting letters from school children that they helped in the past. This is because the first officer's adjustment to his occupational

209

identity after being shot drew from the TE logic as opposed to the COP logic linked to community engagement.

When institutional logics are presented as clearly defined and inherently opposed, a *dualism* exists. In many recruitment videos, departments "navigate" the dualism of COP and TE through source splitting, where the types of work by officers in different unit assignments are divided neatly according to the logic. This strategy for representation manages competing demands between the two logics by keeping these contrasting policing behaviors completely distinct in purpose and implementation. Putnam et al. (2016) describe this organizational response as an attempt at *separation* which can keep the poles separate and independent, and often fosters power imbalances, closes off opportunities for growth, and divides resources (Poole & Van de Ven, 1989). When the West Melbourne Police, FL department describes the various units that officers can join within the department, they include the patrol unit, the SWAT team, the bomb squad, the investigations unit, the honor guard, the bicycle unit, and the community policing unit. Officers in the patrol unit are depicted writing tickets while the SWAT team marches towards a suburban home in tactical formation. The bomb squad, investigations unit, and honor guard all feature tasks reinforcing the TE logic, but the subsequent event depicts the bicycle unit and an officer smiling with a citizen while riding through the city and the community policing unit features officers in a park with kids. These representations make it clear that tasks associated with the two logics are separate, conducted in different locations, with different community members and by different police officers. Although that depiction may not reflect reality—officers that arrest people are also involved in community events—by separating them in their video that represents the department they communicate that they view the logics as both important but distinctive.

When the inconsistencies are understood as being inherently core to the occupation of policing, officers are tasked with the challenge of navigating through the contested space of this *duality*. In recruitment videos in which the department depicts the logics as dualistic, each logic is exhibited fully in the organization and expected to exist concurrently with its oppositional logic (Farjoun, 2010; Kristensen, 2020). In studying the juxtaposition of opposing forces in duality, both the antagonistic and complementary mechanisms at play in the interaction impact the ongoing relationship between the two logics. When opposing logics are understood as existing in a duality, departments must display both logics without establishing an environment which would exclude either of them. For officers in the field, faithfully internalizing both logics in their day-to-day work is an overwhelming task that requires significant organizational support to facilitate their easy moving from engaging as a community member to enforcing the law. Rather than explicit claims about performing both as an enforcer and community member, departments can respond to this pressure by sharing information about the equipment, facilities, training opportunities, and other organizational benefits. Showing the availability of these resources show support to members of the department in fulfilling both sides. For example, in the West Melbourne, FL recruitment videos, the enforcement actions of canine chases, handcuffing suspects, and drawing weapons in a standoff are juxtaposed alongside clips of officers near and alongside happy residents gathering in the park and the statement "we are building leaders of this community." In the midst of these depictions of oppositional institutional logics, we see close-ups of the department's patrol vehicles and sophisticated dashboards, high quality tactical gear, and classes with officers being trained alongside community members. These

features of the department provide officers with the resources necessary to navigate both sides of their tremendous job demands.

When organizations continually (re)position themselves within the interplay between two competing institutional logics, the *dialectical* interactions of the two competing logics implicates the constitutive features of each other. This is a continually evolving process in which the relationship between the logics evolves over time. This is a useful perspective to take on oppositional institutional logics because dominant logics are never completely fixed targets (Thornton & Ocasio, 1999; Toubiana, 2020). Dialectics describe the progression of systems in either a duality or dualism (Farjoun & Fiss, 2022).

For example, the depictions of policing from the Danbury, CT, PD illustrate the department's dedicated efforts to navigate the intense duality of community service and law enforcement. By referencing their own previous recruitment videos and the changes in the department since then, the department demonstrates their attention to changing dominant discourses about policing. Recognizing that social narratives about the role of minoritized groups in PDs have changed, this department chose to highlight more women and minorities in significant positions as the videos progress, indicative of COP. The department similarly indicates COP through the sustained growth of the Law Enforcement Exploration program, the national police outreach and recruitment program targeted to youth ages 14 to 21. In the videos, they cite the growth of the organization Prora, using examples of its success to represent the organization's focus on COP. The meaning of each subsequent depiction is inherently linked to the previous demonstrating an evolving relationship with the COP logic, thus a dialectic plays out on the screen. This development allows the instantiations of the institutional logics to reflexively redefine each other as they progress. However, when the

majority of the substance that is being presented on screen inheres one institutional logic but is being displayed in constant intermittent dialogue with unconvincing representations of an oppositional institutional logic, the depictions which make up the core of the logic shift towards the dominant logic over time.

When interdependent pieces of different institutional logics exist both simultaneously and synergistically over time, and under some circumstances they behave in such inconsistent and unexpected ways that it seems ironic, irrational, or absurd – a *paradox* is manifest (Lewis & Smith, 2014; Smith & Lewis, 2011). Instances demonstrating paradox are quite rare in the videos, but never entirely paradoxical because that would require the organization to fully implicate the role of TE and COP relative to each other. Similar to the way that an organization will seldom understand a dominant institutional logic to be completely inconsistent with another institutional logic present in the field, truly paradoxical relationships are rare. In fact, I found none in the recruitment videos. What I did find was examples of *paradoxical behavior* in recruitment videos, such as suspects sitting in the back of a police cruiser talking about how great the department is, or intimidating recruitment officers prancing around on screen while singing Disney songs. I found that in an environment in which the competing demands between many aspects of COP and TE were constantly made manifest, situations which seem irrational or absurd were not uncommon.

For example, paradoxical behavior is implicated when the detective from the West Melbourne Police Department wears her service weapon on her hip alongside her miniskirt and high heels to investigate an inactive crime scene. If that officer is working in situations where she needs to be ready for combat, ready to run and fire her service weapon at all times, then the high heels she wears while stepping around the evidence markers at the crime scene

213

make for an illogical choice. This highlights another important aspect of the recruitment videos as a medium – as purposely constructed depictions of the organization--they are inherently inaccurate. Instead of filming police officers engaged in their work, the department paradoxically pays members of the organization to performatively execute policing tasks on video while doing no actual police work in order to demonstrate how they do police work. These depictions are performative acts of communication, a dynamic which is accepted by the viewer to be representative of the department's positioning and organizational identity.

## Juxtaposing Logics through Narrative

This study also examined how the videos respond to multiple institutional logics that can be oppositional through narrative meaning, which can be created by establishing that an event is just one part of a larger story. Information is embedded in relevant context and imbues the information with purpose, direction, and momentum. Thus, the meaning of each event is produced by the part it plays in the whole episode. Sequencing within a video can dramatically alter the narrative, the vehicle by which institutional logics are elaborated. The importance of the sequence of events within a video is made evident when considering the difference between the storyline of a video and the narrative which would emerge if the same scenes were shown in reverse order. Even the sequence of events within a smaller subsection of a video can be critical for messaging. To illustrate this point, videos would often feature a scene such as an officer driving at night during a storm. If the scene which directly follows the late-night drive featured officers handing out emergency supplies during a natural disaster, the COP logic was inherited in both scenes. If instead, the next scene featured officers chasing after a suspect with flashlights in the rain, the traditional enforcement logic

214

permeated both scenes. Through this unfolding process, the department is positioned both cumulatively as well as retroactively, with each new message feature interacting with both the COP and traditional enforcement logics. Each unique sequence in which a given set of scenes could be arranged allows for a different balance of the institutional logics. As competing logics develop throughout the video, the pattern of their interaction creates a narrative about the department's orientation towards the community. As the department illustrates varying distinctive, sometimes competing components of the job, tensions develop, and contradictions can arise in the juxtaposition of contrasting logics.

These results indicate there were three main ways in which scenes interacted: the scenes either (a) complemented each other by reinforcing an institutional logic together; (b) detracted from the impact of either scene in representing the other institutional logic; or (c) interacted without any significant impact on either institutional logic. For example, scenes showing officers at a shooting range hitting targets, followed by a scene of tactical units breaking down a door and a suspect running away but stopped by a police dog demonstrate how scenes combine to strengthen the representation of the TE logic. However, scenes of officers training at a shooting range followed by scenes showing officers talking to classrooms of children tell a story of highly trained professionals who encourage youth to enter careers in law enforcement where they can become similarly trained. Alternatively, scenes in which police officers and dogs run through backwoods can generate significant excitement. The meaning of those scenes isn't fully understood by the viewer until they see the scene that ends the event--either the officers tracking down a dangerous suspect who is attempting to escape into the woods, or a young child who was lost and whom might have spent a long night in the woods without the officers' rescue. This is important because the

department may wish to represent a wide array of their activities (all of the above), however, the arrangement of the scenes changes the unfolding narrative about the department's logic. Further, because these videos included dozens of scenes unfolding, each of these interaction patterns took place multiple times at different points, resulting in a wide variation of emergent patterns across the length of video.

This has important implications for organizations engaged in self-representation in recruitment media. Because of this continually-redefined relationship between scenes, depending on the pattern of arrangement of logics, single shots can have significant impact on the messaging of the entire video, even negating the impact of scenes presenting an alternate institutional logic.

**Role of Humor**

An important finding was that humor is commonly used in recruitment videos. Like previous studies, I found that it is often used to attract attention or to keep audiences interested (Lynch 2002; Collinson 1998), but it also accomplished other tasks in the videos such as defining in- and out-groups. Often this was done by disparaging the out-group calling on various stereotypes (Ford & Ferguson, 2004). Disparaging humor was most commonly noted in videos that illustrated the TE logic, such as when the Avondale, AZ recruitment officer makes jokes about lazy people who eat potato chips on their couch and couldn't hack it in the department. With this in mind, studying disparaging jokes is a fruitful context for theory building and understanding the intricacies of intergroup relations.

As a tactic for representing multiple institutional logics, humor affords organizations a tool to engage in self-reflection as members explore unfamiliar territory. In a few examples in the sample, humor productively interrogates the linkages and disconnection between

216

competing demands while reducing face threat inherent to conflicting tensions. However, in other instances, humor simply falls flat. Humor also was frequently used to deflect potentially negative judgements about some elements of police work because when the audience is laughing or even simply amused by the unfolding actions, they are less inclined to feel negatively about the representations (Lynch, 2002); the positivity diminishes the negativity (Yoon & Tinkham 2013). Humor elicits positive emotions of happiness and mirth, helping to neutralize the negative emotions (Chan 2011; Martin and Ford 2018). In addition, humor also worked to disparage outgroups and strengthen ingroup relations. This may cause some viewers to positively view the department as a desirable in-group causing them to be more attracted to join.

## Organizations Operating in Society

A final finding from this study with theoretical and practical implications is the likely influence of changing societal values and expectations. Organizations operate within larger systems, and, therefore, they must be responsive to their environment (Weick, 2001). Societies continuously evolve, adopting new rules about what is considered acceptable behavior, integrating or dissolving in-group/out-group biases, and accepting changing rules that govern policies and organizational operations. To survive and thrive, organizations must adapt to these changes (Turner et al., 2013). Here, my focus is on the role of police and the inclusion of minorized individuals.

Since the 1950s and 1960s, American culture has mostly progressed to an explicit desire to eliminate (or at least lessen) discrimination of minoritized groups including individuals of color and women. Along with those strides, the American public expects governmental agencies to respond by treating minoritized individuals humanely and the

217

majority expect fair treatment for all individuals by police agencies. Police departments have responded, and most have changed the way they perform and interact with their community. Whereas the longtime logic of PDs had been and may still is to enforce the law, in recent decades PDs have trended toward more COP logics including viewing their role as members-partners in the communities in which they work. Although PDs have long retained a mission to protect and serve their communities, organizational leadership must respond to changes (Uhl-Bien & Arenas, 2018), including to how it communicates about these issues with potential recruits as a means of attracting new members.

At the same time, the image of PDs across the country have been affected by hostile racial relationships and damaging press coverage in recent years. Media stories such as the murder of George Floyd have shocked and dismayed the American public. This has caused some to disparage police work and call for investigation into how police officers respond to calls—emergency and otherwise—and interact with potential law-breakers. In this fall out, many police agencies are challenged to recruit top candidates in the quantities required. Simply said, PDs must look for ways to improve relationships with their communities and the public's perceptions of what police work entails as they continue to enforce the law.

In this environment, police recruitment videos communicate their identity to the public and position themselves relative to other departments that are competing for qualified applicants. On the one hand, recruitment videos must attract viewers' attention by showing exciting elements of police work--high-speed police chases, K-9 attacks, and wrestling "bad guys" to the ground—to capture and retain viewers' interests. However, departments must ask themselves whether these depictions reflect the logics by with the department operates and how these images affect who does and does not apply.

What was revealing was identifiable progress when departments posted newer videos. A total of 41 departments hosted older and newer videos on their websites simultaneously. From viewing those videos, it was clear that newer videos offered more scenes demonstrating COP, often with humor and frequently interspersed with TE scenes for added excitement. The newer versions usually featured more minoritized individuals. Early videos often used only white males, but more recent videos often had women, sometimes in leadership positions, even in roles that demonstrated their authority over male officers. More officers and community members of color were also evident in the scenes. As described by institutional theory, PDs, like other organizations, are subject to the effects of institutionalism—they tend to adopt similar rules and behaviors over time (Meyer & Rowan, 1977). These demonstrations of inclusion are generally argued by Greene (1987) to demonstrate COP logics because the officers on the screen better represent the publics they serve. However, from a practical standpoint, PDs must also be mindful that any choices they make about who is represented and the behaviors they demonstrate may not appeal to all audiences. Videos that draw on both TE and COP may be one way that PDs attempt to make their videos appealing to broad audiences.

## Limitations

Like most studies, this investigation was limited in ways that may affect its generalizability and interpretation. First, I necessarily relied on the subset of PD recruitment videos that were available online from August 2017 to December 2017, the time in which all of the videos were downloaded. Many departments keep their websites and social media accounts current, removing old content when new videos are produced, and as such, this is an inherently incomplete sample of all videos created during the 2000-2017 timespan.

Additionally, much has happened since this particular timespan, including the killing of civilian George Floyd by police and several mass shootings, each sparkling dialogue about defunding or reorganizing PDs (e.g., Bleiberg, 2022) and the COVID-19 global pandemic. It is likely that police training, in addition to police work, has changed as a result of these events (see for review White et al., 2023).

Although I make the argument that recruitment videos are artifacts reflecting the underlying values and assumptions of the organization, I recognize that it is possible to make incorrect inferences from these artifacts and not completely understand what aspects of the organization they reflect (Wilkins, 1983). In this dissertation, I cite well-established findings from recruitment literature which argues that potential recruits will choose which organizations to apply to based on the level of agreement between their own ideology and the logics of the department. It must be noted however, that recruits have a wide variety of other constraints which guide their decision making, such as salary and benefits, proximity to their residence, or willingness to relocate. Further, once hired by an organization, members are able to make their own decisions about what aspects of the organizational culture they choose to internalize (Fielding, 1988). However, for the purposes of this study, I depend on the transferability of the insights from Barber (1998), Tom (1971), Schneider (1987), and Sycz (2014) to assert that potential applicants are most attracted to organizations whose positioning is in sync with their own personal values.

## Directions for Future Research

There remains a need for research in this area, particularly when it pertains to race and gender. For instance, over the development which emerges over the span of the two videos I analyzed from Danbury Ct, the depictions of race transform in interesting ways.

Overall, the proportion of screen time dedicated to officers who are members of a minority ethnic group did not increase. When counting the total number of seconds in which officers of color were depicted on the screen relative to White officers, the 2014 video featured 6.3% officers of color and 10.4% in 2016. The 2016 videos heavily feature the Black Chief of Police, which increases the proportional representation of minorities in the video. Given the Chief's presence in the video as a central character, this only highlights the low levels of minority representation among the rank-and-file officers in these videos.

Around 35% of the citizens of Danbury are Latin/Hispanic, and as of 2014, 9% of the department was Latin/Hispanic. No Latin/Hispanic officers are featured in the 2014 video, but speaking Spanish or Portuguese is mentioned in the video as qualifying recruits for extra benefits. In the subsequent video, the majority of the representation of Latin/Hispanic officers came from the scene where one Spanish-speaking and one Portuguese-speaking officer talk about qualifying for more time off. The most recent video from the department features two scenes which prominently feature Latin/Hispanic officers – another scene where Spanish- and Portuguese-speaking officers are featured while the department talks about bonus benefits because of their language skills, and during the color guard sequence. The camera angles, the full-dress uniforms, the crowd standing and watching, and the music during the color guard scenes make it obvious that these officers deserve respect for demonstrating the highest standards for the department.

Ironically, it is the contrast between this scene and the rest of the video which makes it stand out so prominently. So many other officers featured in the video are White that the few times in which a Black or Latin/Hispanic officer is prominently on the screen, their skin color is a salient feature. Although not analyzed in its entirety, the most recent recruitment video

from Danbury (2017), their bicycle unit is 100% White, the detectives at the crime scene are all White, the SWAT team features no officers of color, the officers at the shooting range are all White, and the honor guard is all White with the exception of two highly prominent Latin/Hispanic officers. The camera repeatedly sweeps around these two officers' faces before setting up long angled views of all the White officers standing in a row behind them. This literally centers them on the screen, as opposed to the scene about Spanish and Portuguese language skills. In this shot, a dripping wet Daniello is foregrounded while these two officers behind him give him reminders about seeing the Chief.

This dynamic in which White officers are foregrounded while Black and Brown bodies play supporting roles feels striking in the second video during scenes featuring the Explorers – teenagers in a police-run community program for kids interested in careers in law enforcement. The first shot of the Explorers scene lasts for four seconds, depicting Officer Daniello surrounded by dozens of kids. Of the 26 kids' faces in this shot, only two are not immediately recognizable as Latin/Hispanic. This comparison is striking already, but when the camera pans out, the entire group of 60+ youth can be seen on screen, but with a far greater proportion of White kids. When the Explorer program is depicted in the next recruitment video, all of the Explorers on screen are Latin/Hispanic, but in small groups. The racial makeup of the Explorers is much less visually-striking of a comparison when featured in groups of 3-4 people in non-sequential scenes. When race is made salient as it is in the scene with Daniello and the Explorers, the disparity between the department's own demographics and those of the Explorers is brought into sharp relief. This is an objective feature of the department, but it is given meaning through the way that race is presented in the rest of the video. This subjective understanding is the difference between representation

222

that illustrates the value of minority group members and tokenism that illustrates the disparity in minority representation.

Representation for female officers experienced a similar trend across these videos. Over the span of the three videos, the officers on the screen were women less than 3% (2011) of the time and then 8% (2016). Viewing limited and stereotypical characterizations of race in media influences the attitudes, beliefs, and behaviors of audience members (for a review, see Mastro, 2009). Much like the way that the embodied presence of dozens of Latin/Hispanic children materially and visually demonstrates the value of the Explorer program, the women in the scene with Officer Daniello as he "graduates" the academy are likewise commodified. This cannot be understood as depicting the department's complete framework towards women, as this video (2016) also depicts a woman secure in her authority as a field training officer. Officer Christina doesn't just fit in as one of the three FTOs, she also demonstrates annoyance at Daniello by chastising him when he loses the keys and even locks him in a cell. When Officer Daniello directs himself towards the camera and tells the viewer that they could rise in the ranks and be promoted, he indicates towards "his good friends, Drew and Amy." This equalizing visualization matched with Daniello's assertion that "you" individually can be promoted in this department has been established as foundational for countering internalized gender biases (Coltrane & Adams, 1997).

In a study on gendered wording in job advertisements and how it sustains gender inequality (2011), Gaucher et al. found that job advertisements which featured men more prominently than women induce viewers to perceive the jobs as unsuited to their gender, socially discouraged, and unappealing. The poor quality of representations of women in these videos structurally matters for both the men and women who are potential recruits. Women

are less likely to apply for the job in the first place (Cheryan et al., 2009) and men who embrace male-dominant values are less likely to apply and subsequently engage in behaviors which thwart the progress of gender diversity in the workplace (Mao et al., 2021). One feature of the last two videos which helps to exacerbate this issue is the fact that the main characters' of the video were all men. The detailed narrative of a recruitment officer double-dipping on the success of his last recruitment video while hiding his procrastination from his boss requires significant screen time. For departments who choose to represent themselves with captivating narratives that transport the viewer, the race and gender of these main characters must be considered in light of their outsized impact on racial representation and more research is needed to best understand how to accomplish this.

In addition to furthering our understanding of how race and gender depictions can propel police training, there are several other areas that warrant future research. For instance, departments must determine at what point they revamp their training videos, how often they revisit their videos, whether their videos and websites are complementary, and how important these videos are to the recruitment process to various stakeholders. There is also a need-to-know basis for which logic is most attractive to various leader types (authoritarian versus authoritative), female and minority candidates.

<div align="center">**Conclusion**</div>

Organizational messaging in recruitment videos and the logics that they convey is an area ripe for investigation (Thorton & Ocasio, 2008). Research on organizational narratives as part of their messaging to the public provides a linkage for organizational logics and the social identities with whom they wish to appeal. Organizational positioning has received little attention in the field of communication. The ever-evolving views of society necessarily

must have effects on how the organization views itself including its mission and practices. An opportunity for more focused investigation is the interplay of logics as organizations adapt and attempt to satisfy numerous stakeholders including—member, customers, owners, governmental agencies and the communities in which they may be located. This invites examination of the narratives they use to communicate who they are, what they do and why others may wish to join them.

In this study, I identified the logics and how the logics are presented in opposition in PD recruitment videos. In addition, I was able to characterize how PDs drew on both logics—TE and COP—that are often in competition to provide a narrative about their department and practices in an attempt to attract prospects

This dissertation contributes to research demonstrating the utility of examining organizational logics and responds to the noted lack of work that articulates the constitutive mechanisms in these types of narratives (Thornton et al., 2012). The analysis offers further insights into the meanings underlying recruitment messaging by organizations and their ability to attract audiences that might identify with either TE, COP or both orientations. Overall, this study calls for additional research in how organizations position themselves in ways that respond to broad audiences, and changing societal values and expectations.

# REFERENCES

1.      Abbott, A. (2005). Linked ecologies: States and universities as environments for professions. *Sociological Theory*, *23*(3), 245–274. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0735-2751.2005.00253.x

2.      Abrams, J. R., & Bippus, A. (2011). An intergroup investigation of disparaging humor. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, *30*(2), 193–201. https://doi.org/10.1177/0261927X10397162

3.      Aiello, M. F., Gumbhir, V. K. (2016). Police web presence: Engaging with the digital frontier. In S. W. Phillps, & D. K. Das (Eds.), *Change and reform in law enforcement* (pp. 244-260). Taylor & Francis. https://doi.org/10.1201/9781315369181-14

4.      Aiman-Smith, L., Baur, T. N., & Cable, D. N. (2001). Are you attracted? Do you intend to pursue? A recruiting policy-capturing study. *Journal of Business and Psychology* 16, 219-237. https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1011157116322

5.      Alexander, M. (2010). *The New Jim Crow: Mass incarceration in the age of colorblindness*. The New Press.

6.      Ashforth, B. E., & Mael, F. (1989). Social identity theory and the organization. *The Academy of Management Review*, *14*(1), 20–39. https://doi.org/10.2307/258189

7.      Andrews, R., & Miller, J. K. (2013). Representative bureaucracy, gender, and policing: the case of domestic violence arrests in England. *Public Administration, 91*(4). 998– https://doi.org/10.1111/padm.12002

8.      Banton, M. (1964). *The policeman and the community*. Tavistock.

9.     Bakhtin, M. (1981). Discourse in the novel (M. Holquist, & C. Emerson, Trans.). In M. Holquist (Ed.), *The dialogic imagination* (pp. 259-422). University of Texas Press.

10.    Barber, A. E. (1998). *Recruiting employees: Individual and organizational perspectives*. Sage.

11.    Barbour, J. B., & Lammers, J.C. (2015). Measuring professional identity: A review of the literature and a multilevel confirmatory factor analysis of professional identity constructs, *Journal of Professions and Organization, 2*(1), 38–60. https://doi.org/10.1093/jpo/jou009

12.    Barker, V., Giles, H., Hajek, C., Ota, H., Noels, K., Lim, T-S., & Somera, L. (2008). Police-civilian interaction, compliance, accommodation, and trust in an intergroup context: International data. *Journal of International and Intercultural Communication*, *1*(2), 93-112. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/17513050801891986

13.    Barthes, R. (1972). *Mythologies* (A. Lavers, Trans.). Hill & Wang. (Original work published 1957).

14.    Baumgartner, J .C. & Morris, J. S. (2008). One "Nation," Under Stephen? The effects of The Colbert Report on American youth. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media, 52*(4), 622-643. https://doi.org/10.1080/08838150802437487

15.    Benton, M. (2020). Representation is not enough: Symbolic representation and perceptions of the police. *Administration & Society, 52*(5), 794–822. https://doi.org/10.1177/0095399720905368

16.    Berman, P. S. (2006). Global legal pluralism. *California Legal Review, 80*. 1155–1238.

17. Besharov, M. L., & Smith, W. K. (2014). Multiple institutional logics in organizations: Explaining their varied nature and implications. *Academy of Management Review, 39*(3), 364-381. https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2011.0431

18. Bisel, R. S. (2009). On a growing dualism in organizational discourse research. *Management Communication Quarterly*, *22*(4), 614–638. https://doi.org/10.1177/0893318908331100

19. Bleiberg, J. (2022, July 20). Uvalde school officials look to fire police chief after shooting. *Los Angeles Times*. https://www.latimes.com/world-nation/story/2022-07-20/uvalde-schools-look-to-fire-chief-arredondo-after-shooting

20. Bordwell, D., Thompson, K., & Smith, J. (2020). *Film art: An introduction*. McGraw-Hill Education.

21. Born, M., & Taris, T. W. (2010). The impact of the wording of employment advertisements on students' inclination to apply for a job. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, *150*(5), 485-502. https://doi.org/10.1080/00224540903365422

22. Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, *3*(2), 77-101. https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa

23. Brockner, J., Ackerman, G., Greenberg, J., Gelfand, M. J., Francesco, A. M., Chen, Z. X., & Shapiro, D. (2001). Culture and procedural justice: The influence of power distance on reactions to voice. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, *37*(4), 300-315. https://doi.org/10.1006/jesp.2000.1451

24. Brooker, G., & Wheatley, J. J. (1994). Music and radio advertising: Effects of tempo and placement. *Advances in Consumer Research, 21*, 286-290.

25.  Bryant-Davis, T., Adams, T., Alejandre, A., & Gray, A. A. (2017). The trauma lens of police violence against racial and ethnic minorities. *Journal of Social Issues*, *73*(4), 852-871. https://doi.org/10.1111/josi.12251

26.  Bucher, R., & Strauss, A. (1961). Professions in process. *American Journal of Sociology, 66*(4), 325-334. https://doi.org/10.1086/222898

27.  Cable, D. M., & Turban, D. B. (2003). The value of organizational reputation in the recruitment context: A brand-equity perspective. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 33*(11), 2244–2266. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1559-1816.2003.tb01883.x

28.  Cameron, K. S., & Quinn, R. E. (1988). Organizational paradox and transformation. In R. E. Quinn & K. S. Cameron (Eds.), *Paradox and transformation: Toward a theory of change in organizations and management* (pp. 1-18). Ballinger.

29.  Campbell, M. C. (1995). When attention-getting advertising tactics elicit consumer inferences of manipulative intent: The importance of balancing benefits and investments. *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, *4*(3), 225-254. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327663jcp0403_02

30.  Canales, R. (2014). Weaving straw into gold: Managing organizational tensions between standardization and flexibility in microfinance. *Organization Science, 25*(1), 1-28. http://www.jstor.org/stable/43660865

31.  Cardarelli, A. P., McDevitt, J., & Baum, K. (1998). The rhetoric and reality of community policing in small and medium-sized cities and towns. *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies & Management*, *21*(3), 397-415. https://doi.org/10.1108/13639519810228723

32. Carlson, E. J., Poole, M. S., Lambert, N. J., & Lammers, J. C. (2016). A study of organizational responses to dilemmas in interorganizational emergency management. *Communication Research, 44*(2), 287–315. https://doi.org/10.1177/0093650215621775

33. Champion, D. J., & Rush, G. E. (1997). *Policing in the community*. Prentice Hall.

34. Chang, F. F. Y. (2011). The use of humor in television advertising in Hong Kong. *Humor: International Journal of Humor Research, 24*(1), 43-61. https://doi.org/10.1515/humr.2011.003

35. Chang, C., & Poston, B. (2019, February 6). Garcetti orders LAPS to scale back vehicle stops amid concerns over black drivers being targeted. *Los Angeles Times.* https://www.latimes.com/local/lanow/la-me-ln-garcetti-lapd-metro-20190206-story.html

36. Chandy, R. K., Tellis, G. J., MacInnis, D. J., & Thaivanich, P. (2001). What to say when: Advertising appeals in evolving markets. *Journal of Marketing Research, 38*(4), 399-414. https://doi.org/10.1509/jmkr.38.4.399.18908.

37. Chappell, A. T., & Gibson, S. A. (2009). Community policing and homeland security policing: Friend or foe? *Criminal Justice Policy Review, 20*(3), 326-343. https://doi.org/10.1177/0887403409333038

38. Cheney, G., Christensen, L. T., & Dailey, S. (2014). Communicating identity and identification in and around organizations. In L. L. Putnam & D. K. Mumby (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of organizational communication: Advances in theory, research, and methods* (3 ed., pp. 695-716). Sage.

39.    Cheryan, S., Plaut, V. C., Davis, P. G., & Steele, C. M. (2009). Ambient belonging:

How stereotypical cues impact gender participation in computer science. *Journal of*

*Personality and Social Psychology, 97*(6), 1045–1060.

https://doi.org/10.1037/a0016239

40.    Choi, C. W., Giles, H. (2012). Intergroup messages in policing the community. In H.

Giles (Ed.), *The handbook of intergroup communication* (pp. 264-277). Routledge.

41.    Cohan, S., & Shires, L. M. (1988). *Telling stories: A theoretical analysis of narrative*

*fiction.* Routledge.

42.    Collins, C. J., & Stevens, C. K. (2002). The relationship between early recruitment-

related activities and the application decisions of new labor-market entrants: A brand

equity approach to recruitment. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 87*(6), 1121–1133.

https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.87.6.1121

43.    Collinson, D. (2014). Dichotomies, dialectics and dilemmas: New directions for

critical leadership studies? *Leadership, 10*(1), 36–55.

https://doi.org/10.1177/1742715013510807

44.    Collinson, D. (2020) 'Only connect!' Exploring the critical dialectical turn in

leadership studies. *Organization Theory, 1*(2), 1–22.

https://doi.org/10.1177/2631787720913878

45.    Coltrane, S., & Adams, M. (1997). Work-family imagery and gender stereotypes:

Television and the reproduction of difference. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 50*(2),

323–347. https://doi.org/10.1006/jvbe.1996.1575

46.     Cook, P. J. (2015). Will the current crisis in police legitimacy increase crime?

Research offers a way forward. *Psychological Science in the Public Interest, 16*(3),

71–74. https://doi.org/10.1177/1529100615610575

47.     Cooren, F., & Martine, T. (2016). Communicative constitution of organizations. In K.

B. Jensen & R. T. Craig (Eds.), *The international encyclopedia of communication*

*theory and philosophy* (pp. 1-9). Wiley. Retrieved from:

https://www.researchgate.net/publication/309394678

48.     Cordner, G. W. (1997). Community policing: Elements and effects. In R. G. Dunham

& G. P. Alpert (Eds.), *Critical issues in policing: Contemporary issues* (pp. 451–

468)*. Waveland.

49.     Cordner, G. W. (1999). Community. In L. Gaines & G. Cordner (Eds.), *Elements of*

*community policing in policing perspectives: An anthology* (pp. 137-149). Roxbury.

50.     Cortazzi, M. (1994). Narrative analysis. *Language Teaching, 27*(3), 157-170.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444800007801

51.     Cowan, N., Saults, J. S., Elliott, E. M., & Moreno, M. V. (2002). Deconfounding

serial recall. *Journal of Memory and Language, 46*(1), 153-177.

https://doi.org/10.1006/jmla.2001.2805

52.     Crank, J. P. (1989). Civilianization in small and medium police departments in

Illinois, 1973–1986. *Journal of Criminal Justice, 17*(3), 167-177.

https://doi.org/10.1177/109861119900200305

53.     Crank, J. P. (2003). Institutional theory of police: A review of the state of the art.

*Policing: An International Journal*, *26*(2), 186–207.

https://doi.org/10.1108/13639510310475723

54.     Crump, J. (2012). What are the police doing on Twitter? Social media, the police, and the public. *Policy & Internet, 3*(4), 1-27. https://doi.org/10.2202/1944-2866.1130

55.     Cunha, M. P. E., & Bednarek, R. (2020). A source of novelty and/or absurdity: The paradoxes of management. *International Journal of Business Environment*, *11*(1), 69-79. http://hdl.handle.net/10362/93309

56.     D'Aunno, T., Sutton, R. I., & Price, R. H. (1991). Isomorphism and external support in conflicting institutional environments: A study of drug abuse treatment units. *Academy of Management Journal, 34*(3), 636-661. https://doi.org/10.2307/256409

57.     D'Enbeau, S. (2017) Unpacking the dimensions of organizational tension: The case of sexual violence response and prevention among college students, *Journal of Applied Communication Research, 45*(3), 237-255. https://doi.org/10.1080/00909882.2017.1320568

58.     Dailey, R., Reid, S. A., Anderson, M. C., & Giles, H. (2006). Community review of police conduct: An intergroup perspective. *Social Psychological Review, 8*(1), 20-34. https://doi.org/10.53841/bpsspr.2006.8.1.20

59.     Davies, B., & Harré, R. (1990). Positioning: The discursive production of selves. *Journal for the Theory of Social Behavior, 20*(1), 43–63. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-5914.1990.tb00174.x

60.     Demirden, A. (2021). The critical examination of social identity theory. *The Journal of Political Psychology*, *1*(2), 39-56. https://www.politikpsikolojidergisi.com/wp-content/uploads/2022/03/PPD2-2-Ahmet-Demirden.pdf

61.     den Heyer, G. (2016). *Delivering police services effectively*. Routledge.

62.     Derby, W. J. (2008). Impact of drug decriminalization on the future of police recruiting standards. *The Police Chief, 75*(8), 92-95. Retrieved from: https://www.policechiefmagazine.org/the-impact-of-drug-decriminalization-on-the-future-of-police-recruiting-standards/

63.     Deuchar, R., Crichlow, V. J., & Fallik, S. W. (2020). Cops in crisis? Ethnographic insights on a new era of politicization, activism, accountability, and change in transatlantic policing. *Policing and Society*, *30*(1), 47-64. https://doi.org/10.1080/10439463.2019.1584197

64.     DiMaggio, P. J., & Powell, W.W. (1983). The iron cage revisited: Institutional isomorphism and collective rationality in organizational fields. *American Sociological Review, 48*(2), 147-160. https://doi.org/10.2307/2095101

65.     Dixon, T. L., Schell, T. L., Giles, H., & Drogos, K. L. (2008). The influence of race in police-civilian interactions: A content analysis of videotaped interactions taken during Cincinnati police traffic stops. *Journal of Communication, 58*(3), 530-549. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1460-2466.2008.00398.x

66.     Dixon, T., Smith, M. A., & Weeks, K. R. (2021). Race, policing and communication: Old problems, 21st century struggles. In H. Giles, E. R. Maguire, & S. L. Hill (Eds.), *The Rowman & Littlefield handbook of policing, communication, and society* (pp. 17-34). Rowman & Littlefield.

67.     Dunn, M. B., & Jones, C. (2010). Institutional logics and institutional pluralism: The contestation of care and science logics in medical education, 1967-2005. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 55*(1), 114–149. https://doi.org/10.2189/asqu.2010.55.1.11

68. Ericsson, K. A., Krampe, R. T., & Tesch-Römer, C. (1993). The role of deliberate practice in the acquisition of expert performance. *Psychological Review, 100*(3), 363-406. https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-295X.100.3.363

69. Fagan, J., Braga, A. A., Brunson, R. K., & Pattavina, A. (2016). Stops and stares: Street stops, surveillance, and race in the new policing. *Fordham Urban Law Journal, 43*(3), 539-544. https://ir.lawnet.fordham.edu/ulj/vol43/iss3/3

70. Fairhurst, G. T., Cooren, F., & Cahill, D. J. (2002). Discursiveness, contradiction, and unintended consequences in successive downsizings. *Management Communication Quarterly, 15*(4), 501-540. https://doi.org/10.1177/0893318902154001

71. Fairhurst G. T., &. K Putnam L. L. (2014). Organizational discourse analysis. In L. L. Putnam & D. K. Mumby (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of organizational communication: Advances in theory, research, and methods* (3rd ed., pp. 271–296). Sage.

72. Farjoun, M. (2010). Beyond dualism: Stability and change as in duality. *The Academy of Management Review, 35*(2), 202–225. https://doi.org/10.5465/AMR.2010.48463331

73. Farjoun, M., & Fiss, P. C. (2022). Thriving on contradiction: Toward a dialectical alternative to fit-based models in strategy (and beyond). *Strategic Management Journal, 43*(2), 340-369. https://doi.org/10.1002/smj.3342

74. Feldman, M. S., & Pentland, B. T. (2003). Reconceptualizing organizational routines as a source of flexibility and change. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 48*(1), 94-118. https://doi.org/10.2307/3556620

75.    Ferguson, M. W., & Dougherty, D. S. (2021). The paradox of the Black professional: Whitewashing Blackness through professionalism. *Management Communication Quarterly, 36*(1), 3–29. https://doi.org/10.1177/08933189211019751

76.    Fielding, N. (1988). Competence and culture in the police. *Sociology, 22(*1), 45-64. https://doi.org/10.1177/0038038588022001004

77.    Ford, T. E., & Ferguson, M. A. (2004). Social consequences of disparagement humor: A prejudiced norm theory. *Personality and Social Psychology Review, 8*(1), 79-94. https://doi.org/10.1207/S15327957PSPR0801_4

78.    Franzosi, R. (1998). Narrative analysis—Or why (and how) sociologists should be interested in narrative. *Annual Review of Sociology, 24*, 517–554. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.soc.24.1.517

79.    Freud, S. (1927). *The ego and the id*. (J. Riviere, Trans.). Hogarth Press (Original work published 1923).

80.    Fridell, L. (2004). The defining characteristics of community policing. In L. Fridell (Ed.), *Community policing: The past, present and future* (pp. 3–12). Police Executive Research Forum. https://www.policeforum.org/assets/docs/Free_Online_Documents/Community_Polic ing/community%20policing%20-%20the%20past%20present%20and%20future%202004.pdf

*81.*    Ford, T. E., Breeden, C. J., O'Connor, E. C., & Banos, N. C. (2018). Jokes and humor in intergroup relations. In H. Giles & J. Harwood (Eds.), *The Oxford encyclopedia of intergroup communication* (Vol., 2, pp. 1-17). Oxford University Press.

82. Franke, R. H., Hofstede, G., & Bond, M. H. (1991). Cultural roots of economic performance: A research note. *Strategic Management Journal*, *12*(1), 165-173. https://doi.org/10.1002/smj.4250120912

83. Friedland, R., & Alford, R. R. (1991). Bringing society back in: Symbols, practices, and institutional contradictions. In W. W. Powell and P. J. DiMaggio (Eds.), *The new institutionalism in organizational analysis* (pp. 232–267), University of Chicago Press.

84. Gant. L., & Schaible, L. (2022). The impact of policing styles on officers' willingness to make referrals into pre-arrest diversion initiatives. *Police Practice and Research,* *23*(1), 20-33. https://doi.org/10.1080/15614263.2021.1914041

85. Gau, J. M., Corsaro, N., Stewart, E. A., & Brunson, R. K. (2012). Examining macro-level impacts on procedural justice and police legitimacy. *Journal of Criminal Justice, 40*(4), 333–343. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcrimjus.2012.05.002

86. Gaucher, D., Friesen, J., & Kay, A. C. (2011). Evidence that gendered wording in job advertisements exists and sustains gender inequality. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *101*(1), 109-128. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0022530

87. Giblin, M. J., & Galli, P. M. (2017). Compensation as a police candidate attraction tool: An organizational-level analysis. *Police Quarterly, 20*(4), 397–419. https://doi.org/10.1177/1098611117713679

88. Giddens, A. (1984). *The constitution of society: Outline of the theory of structuration*. University of California Press.

89.    Giles, H., Bourhis, R. Y., Gadfield, N. J., Davies, G. J., & Davies, A. P. (1976). Cognitive aspects of humor in social interaction. In T. Chapman & H. Foot (Eds.), *Humor and laughter: Theory, research, and applications* (pp. 129-154). Wiley.

90.    Giles, H., Hajda, J. M., & Hamilton, D. L. (Eds.). (2009). Harmony and discord: The music of intergroup relations. *Group Processes and Intergroup Relations, 12*(3), 291-412. https://doi.org/ 10.1177/1368430209102207

91.    Giles, H., Hill, S. L., & Maguire, E. R., & Argus, D. (2021). New directions in policing and intergroup communication. In H. Giles, E. R. Maguire, and S. L. Hill (Eds.) *The Rowman & Littlefield handbook of policing, communication, and society* (pp. 371-390). Rowman & Littlefield.

92.    Giles, H., Linz, D., Bonilla, D., & Gomez, M. L. (2012). Police stops of and interactions with Latino and White (non-Latino) drivers: Extensive policing and communication accommodation. *Communication Monographs, 79*(4), 407-427. https://doi.org/10.1080/03637751.2012.723815

93.    Giles, H., Maguire, E. R., & Hill, S. L. (Eds.). (2021a). *The Rowman & Littlefield handbook of policing, communication, and society*. Rowman & Littlefield.

94.    Giles, H., Maguire, E., & Hill, S. L. (2021b). Policing through the lens of intergroup communication. In H. Giles, E. R. Maguire, and S. L. Hill (Eds.) *The Rowman & Littlefield Handbook of policing, communication, and society* (pp. 1-16). Rowman & Littlefield.

95.    Glassman, A. (1992). *Visions of light: The art of cinematography*. Kino International.

96.   Gnisci, A., Giles, H., & Soliz, J. (2016). CAT on Trial. In H. Giles (Ed.)
      *Communication accommodation theory: Negotiating personal relationships and
      social identities across contexts* (pp. 169-181). Cambridge University Press.

97.   Goldstein, H. (1979). Improving policing: A problem-oriented approach. *Crime &
      Delinquency, 25*(2), 236-258. https://doi.org/10.1177/001112877902500207

98.   Goldstein, H. (1987). Toward community-oriented policing: Potential, basic
      requirements, and threshold questions. *Crime & Delinquency*, *33*(1), 6-30.
      https://doi.org/10.1177/0011128787033001002

99.   Goodrick, E., & Reay, T. (2011). Constellations of institutional logics: Changes in the
      professional work of pharmacists. *Works and Occupations, 38*(3), 372-416.
      https://doi.org/10.1177/0730888411406824

100.  Granfield, A., & Giles, H. (1975). Towards an analysis of humor through symbolism.
      *International Journal of Symbology, 6,* 17-23.

101.  Greene, J. R. (1987). Foot patrol and community policing: Past practices and future
      prospects. *American Journal of Police, 6*(1). 24-31.

102.  Greenwood, R., Raynard, M., Kodeih, F., Micelotta, E. R., & Lounsbury, M. (2011).
      Institutional complexity and organizational responses. *Academy of Management
      Annals, 5*(1). 317-371. https://doi.org/10.5465/19416520.2011.590299

103.  Grodal, S., Anteby. M., & Holm, A. L. (2020). Achieving rigor in qualitative
      analysis: The role of active categorization in theory building. *Academy of
      Management Review, 46*(3), 591-612. https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2018.0482

104. Gupta, A. K., Smith, K. G., & Shalley, C. E. (2006). The interplay between exploration and exploitation. *Academy of Management Journal, 49*(4). https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2006.22083026

105. Hall, A. V., Hall, E. V., & Perry, J. (2016). Black and blue: exploring racial bias and law enforcement in the killings of unarmed Black male citizens. *American Psychologist, 71*(3), 175–186. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0040109

106. Haro-de-Rosario, A., Sáez-Martin, A., & Caba-Pérez, M. (2016). Using social media to enhance citizen engagement with local government: Twitter or Facebook? *New Media & Society, 20*(1), 29–49. https://doi.org/10.1177/1461444816645652

107. Harwood, J. (2017). *Communication and music in social interaction.* Cognella.

108. Harwood, J. (2018). Music and intergroup communication. In H. Giles & J. Harwood (Eds.). (2018), *The Oxford encyclopedia of intergroup communication* (Vol. 2, pp. 149-162). Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/acrefore/9780190228613.013.457

109. Harwood, J., Giles, H., & Palomares, N. A. (2005). Intergroup theory and communication processes. In J. Harwood & H. Giles (Eds.), *Intergroup communication: Multiple perspectives* (pp. 1-17). Peter Lang.

110. Hassell, K. D., & Brandl, S. G. (2009). An examination of the workplace experiences of police patrol officers: The role of race, sex, and sexual orientation. *Police Quarterly, 12*(4), 408–430. https://doi.org/10.1177/1098611109348473

*111.* Hassell, K. D., & Maguire, E. R. (2003). Structural arrangements in large municipal police organizations: Revisiting Wilson's theory of local political culture. *Policing:*

*An International Journal of Police Strategies & Management, 26*(2), 231-250.

https://doi.org/10.1108/13639510310475741

112.    Hay, S. (1995). *Lengthening the stride: Employing peace officers from newly arrived ethnic groups.* National Crime Prevention Council. https://www.ojp.gov/pdffiles/stride.pdf

113.    Haveman, H. A., & Gualtieri, G. (2017). Institutional logics. In D. G. Bergh (Ed.), *Oxford research encyclopedia of business and management*. Retrieved from: https://doi.org/10.1093/acrefore/9780190224851.013.137

114.    Hill, S. L., & Giles, H. (2021). Police culture: Us versus them communication. In H. Giles, E. R. Maguire, & S. L. Hill (Eds.), *The Rowman & Littlefield handbook of policing, communication, and society* (pp. 17-34). Rowman & Littlefield.

115.    Heath, C., Hindmarsh, J., & Luff, P. (2010). *Video in qualitative research*. Sage.

116.    Hegel, G. W. F. (1969). *The philosophy of history* (J. Sibree, Trans.). Wiley. (Original work published 1837).

117.    Hemphill, E., & Kulik, C. T. (2016). Help wanted: People with disabilities and recruitment advertising. *Journal of Employment Counseling, 53*(2), 71–85. https://doi.org/10.1002/joec.12029

118.    Hickman, M. J., & Reaves, B. A. (2006). Local police departments, 2003 (NCJ 210118). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Bureau of Justice Statistics.

119.    Hill, S. L., & Giles, H. (2021). Police culture: Us versus them communication. In H. Giles, E. R. Maguire, & S. L. Hill (Eds.), *The Rowman & Littlefield handbook of policing, communication, and society* (pp. 17-34). Rowman & Littlefield.

120.  Hill, S. L., Giles, H., & Maguire, E. R. (2021). VOICES: a theory-driven intervention for improving relationships between police and the public. *Policing*, *44*(5), 786-799. https://doi.org/10.1108/PIJPSM-09-2020-0154

121.  Hong, S. (2017). Does increasing ethnic representativeness reduce police misconduct? *Public Administration Review 77*(2), 195–205. https://doi.org/10.1111/puar.12629

122.  Hong, S. (2020) Representative bureaucracy and hierarchy: interactions among leadership, middle-level, and street-level bureaucracy. *Public Management Review, 23*(9), 1317-1338. https://doi.org/10.1080/14719037.2020.1743346

123.  Horan, S. M., Chory, R. M., Craw, E. S., & Jones, H. E. (2021). Blended work/life relationships: Organizational communication involving workplace peers, friends, and lovers. *Communication Research Trends*, *40*(2), 33-51. https://doi.org/10.1108/13639519810228723

124.  Huxham, C., & Beech, N. (2003). Contrary prescriptions: Recognizing good practice tensions in management. *Organizational Studies, 24*(1), 69-93. https://doi.org/10.1177/0170840603024001678

125.  Intraub, H. (1980). Presentation rate and the representation of briefly glimpsed pictures in memory. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Human Learning and Memory*, *6*(1), 1-41. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0040109

126.  Jackson II., R. L. (2002). Cultural contracts theory: Toward an understanding of identity negotiation. *Communication Quarterly, 50*(3-4), 359-379. https://doi.org/10.1080/01463370209385672

127. Jolicoeur, J. R., & Grant, E. (2018). Form seeking function: An exploratory content analysis evaluation of the imagery contained in law enforcement agency police officer recruitment brochures. *The Police Journal, 91*(4), 339–355. https://doi.org/10.1177/0032258X17740318

128. Jonathan-Zamir, T., Mastrofski, S. D., & Moyal, S. (2015). Measuring procedural justice in police-citizen encounters. *Justice Quarterly, 32*(5), 845-871. https://doi.org/10.1080/07418825.2013.845677

129. Jones, J. M. (2020). *Black, White adults' confidence diverges most on police.* Retrieved from: https://news.gallup.com/poll/317114/black-whiate-adults-confidence-diverges-police.aspx

130. Jordan, W. T., Fridell, L., Faggiani, D., & Kubu, B. (2009). Attracting females and racial/ethnic minorities to law enforcement. *Journal of Criminal Justice, 3*7(4), 333-341. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcrimjus.2009.06.001

131. Kahn, K. B., & Marin, K. D. (2016). Policing and race: Disparate treatment, perceptions, and policy responses. *Social Issues and Policy Review, 10*(1), 82-121. https://doi.org/10.1111/sipr.12019

132. Katz, C. M., & Maguire, E. R. (2020). *Transforming the police: Thirteen key refor*ms. Waveland Press.

133. Kearns, E. M. (2017). Why are some officers more supportive of community policing with minorities than others? *Justice Quarterly, 34*(7), 1213-1245. https://doi.org/10.1080/07418825.2017.1380837

134.   Kellaris, J. J., & Kent, R. J. (1991). Exploring tempo and modality effects on consumer responses to music. In R. H. Holman & M. R. Solomon (Eds.,) *Advances in Consumer Research, 18*, 243-248. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0040109

135.   Kendon, A. (1990). *Conducting interaction: Patterns of behavior in focused encounters*. Cambridge University Press.

136.   King, W. R. (2000). Measuring police innovation: Issues and measurement. *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies & Management, 23(*3), 303-317. https:doi.org/10.1108/13639510010342994

137.   Klahm, C., Frank, J., & Brown, R. A. (2011). Police use of force: Tales from another city. *Journal of Crime and Justice*, *34*(3), 205-220. https://doi.org10.1080/0735648X.2011.609735

138.   Kochel, T. R. (2012). Can police legitimacy promote collective efficacy? *Justice Quarterly*, *29*(3), 384-419. https://doi.org/10.1080/07418825.2011.561805

139.   Koschmann, M., & Laster, N. M. (2011). Communicative tensions of community organizing: The case of a local neighborhood association. *Western Journal of Communication, 75*(1), 28–51. https://doi.org/10.1080/10570314.2010.536965

140.   Koslicki, W. M. (2017). SWAT mobilization trends: testing assumptions of police militarization. *Policing: An International Journal, 40*(4). 733-747. https://doi.org/10.1108/PIJPSM-08-2016-0136

141.   Koslicki, W. M. (2020). The militarization of the police? Ideology versus reality. *Journal of Criminal Justice Education, 31*(4), 621-623. https:///doi.org/10.1080/10511253.2020.1785518

142.    Koslicki, W. M. (2022). Criticism does not constrain: testing for evidence of de-policing following the murder of George Floyd. *Policing: An International Journal*, *45*(4). 586-599. https://doi.org/10.1108/PIJPSM-08-2021-0114

143.    Kraatz, M. S., & Block. E. S. (2008). Institutional pluralism revisited. In R. Greenwood, C. Oliver, T. B. Lawrence, & R. E. Meyer (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of institutionalism* (pp. 532-557). Sage. https://doi.org/10.4135/9781526415066

144.    Kraska, P. B. (2007). Militarization and policing—Its relevance to 21st century police. *Policing: a Journal of Policy and Practice*, *1*(4), 501-513. https://doi.org/10.1093/police/pam065

145.    Kryeziu, D. (2019). *The main elements of the film composition in television*. UBT International Conference. https://knowledgecenter.ubt-uni.net/conference/2019/events/130

146.    Kristensen, M. L. (2020). Introducing dialogic as a research methodology. *International Journal of Management Concepts and Philosophy*, *13*(3), 196-216. https://doi.org/10.1504/ijmcp.2020.10031739

147.    Laguna, L., Linn, A., Ward, K., & Rupslaukyte, R. (2010). An examination of authoritarian personality traits among police officers: The role of experience. *Journal of Police and Criminal Psychology, 25*, 99-104. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11896-009-9060-0

148.    Lai, Y-L., & Zhao, J. S. (2010). The impact of race/ethnicity, neighborhood context, and police/citizen interaction on residents' attitudes toward police. *Journal of Criminal Justice, 38(*4), 685-692. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcrimjus.2010.04.042

149. Lambert, J. (2016). Cultural diversity as a mechanism for innovation: workplace diversity and the absorptive capacity framework. *Journal of Organizational Culture Communications and Conflict, 20*(1), 68–77. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0040109

150. Lammers, J. C., & Barbour, J. B. (2006). An institutional theory of organizational communication. *Communication Theory, 16*(3), 356-377. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2885.2006.00274.x

151. Lammers, J. C., & Garcia, M. A. (2014). Chapter 8: Institutional theory. In D. K. Mumby & L. L. Putnam (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of organizational communication: Advances in theory, research, and methods* (pp. 195-216). Sage.

152. Langworthy, R. (1986). *The structure of police organizations*. Praeger.

153. LeBaron, C., Christianson, M. K., Garrett, L., Ilan, R. (2016). Coordinating flexible performance during everyday work: An ethnomethodological study of handoff routines. *Organization Science, 27*(3), 514–534. https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.2015.1043

154. LeBaron, C., Jarzabkowski, P., Pratt, M. G., & Fetzer, G. (2017). An Introduction to Video Methods in Organizational Research. *Organizational Research Methods*, *21*(2), 239–260. https://doi.org/10.1177/1094428117745649

155. Lederach, J. P. (2003). *The little book of conflict transformation*. Good Books.

156. Lee, H. (2019). Does increasing racial minority representation contribute to overall organizational performance? The role of organizational mission and diversity climate. *American Review of Public Administration, 49*(4), 454–468. https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.2015.1043

157. Legewie, J., & Fagan, J. (2019). Aggressive policing and the educational performance of minority youth. *American Sociological Review, 84*(2), 220-247. https://doi.org/10.1177/0003122419826020

158. Lennard, N. (2016). In recent trials of violent cops, the broader police force gets a pass. *The Intercept.* https://theintercept.com/2016/03/03/in-recent-trials-of-violent-cops-the-broader-police-force-gets-a-pass/

159. Lewis, W. M. (2000). Exploring paradox: Toward a more comprehensive guide. *The Academy of Management Review, 25*(4), https://doi.org/10.2307/259204

160. Lewis, W. M., & Smith, W. K. (2014). Paradox as a metatheoretical perspective: Sharpening the focus and widening the scope. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 50*(2), https://doi.org/10.1177/0021886314522322

161. Liederbach, J., & Travis III, L. F. (2008). Wilson redux: Another look at varieties of police behavior. *Police Quarterly, 11*(4), 447-467. https://doi.org/10.4073/csr.2013.1

162. Lounsbury, M. (2007). A tale of two cities: Competing logics and practice variation in the professionalization of mutual funds. *Academy of Management Journal, 50*(2), 289-307. https://www.jstor.org/stable/20159855

163. Lynch, O. H. (2006). Humorous communication: Finding a place for humor in communication research. *Communication Theory*, *12*(4), 423-445. https://doi.org/10.1177/0003122419826020

164. Lyttle, J. (2001). The effectiveness of humor in persuasion: The case of business ethics training. *Journal of General Psychology*, *128*(2), 206–216. https://doi.org/10.1080/00221300109598908

165. MacDonald, J. M. (2019). De-Policing as a consequence of the so-called Ferguson Effect. *Criminology & Public Policy*, *18*(47). 229-238. https://doi.org/10.1111/1745-9133.12430

166. Maguire, E. R. (2003). *Organizational structure in American police agencies: Context, complexity, and control*. SUNY Press.

167. Maguire, E. R., & Mastrofski, S. D. (2000). Patterns of community policing in the United States. *Police Quarterly, 3*(1), 4-45. https://doi.org/10.1177/1098611100003001001

168. Manning, P. K. (1977). *Police work*. MIT Press.

169. Manning, P. K. (2006). The United States of America. In T. Jones and T. Newburn (Eds.), *Plural policing* (pp. 98-125). Routledge.

170. Mao, J.-Y., Mu, X. and Liu, X. (2021) "Discouraging gender-biased job seekers by adapting job advertisements. *Journal of Managerial Psychology, 36*(2), 170-182. https://doi.org/10.1108/JMP-11-2019-0624

171. Martin, R. A., & Ford, T. (2018). *The psychology of humor: An integrative approach*. Academic Press.

172. Mastro, D. (2009). Racial/ethnic stereotyping and the media. In R. Nabi & M. B. Oliver (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of mass media effects* (pp. 377–391). Sage.

173. Mastrofski, S. D. (1993). Varieties of community policing. *American Journal of Police, 12*(3), 65-78. https://heinonline.org/HOL/P?h=hein.journals/ajpol12&i=359.

174. Mastrofski, S. D., & Ritti, D. (1995, November). Making sense of community policing: A theory-based analysis. Presented at the *American Society of Criminology Conference,* Boston.

175. Mazerolle, L., Bennett, S., Davis, J., Sargeant, E., & Manning, M. (2013). Legitimacy in policing: A systematic review. *Campbell Systematic Reviews, 9*(1), i-147. https://doi.org/10.4073/csr.2013.1

176. McCauley, R. P., Barker, W. F., Boatman, J., Goel, V., Short, T. H., & Zhou, F. (2008). The police canine bite: Force, injury, and liability. *Criminal Legal Bulletin, 46*(2), 62-63.

177. McGhee, P. E. (1979). *Humor: Its origin and development*. Freeman.

178. McLean, K., Wolfe, S. E., Rojek, J., Alpert, G. P., & Smith, M. R. (2020). Police officers as warriors or guardians: Empirical reality or intriguing rhetoric? *Justice Quarterly, 37*(6), 1096-1118. https://doi.org/10.1080/07418825.2018.1533031

179. McPhee, R. D., & Zaug, P. (2008). The communicative constitution of organizations: A framework for explanation. In L. L. Putnam & A. M. Nicotera (Eds.), *Building theories of organization: The constitutive role of communication* (pp. 21-47). Routledge.

180. Meier, K. J., & Nicholson-Crotty, J. (2006). Gender, representative bureaucracy, and law enforcement: The case of sexual assault. *Public Administration Review, 66*(4), 850–860. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6210.2006.00653.x

181. Meijer, A., & Thaens, M. (2013). Social media strategies: Understanding the differences between North American police departments. *Government Information Quarterly, 30*(4), 342-350. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.giq.2013.05.023

182. Mentel, Z. (2012). *Racial reconciliation, truth telling, and police legitimacy*. Department of Justice - Office of Community Oriented Policing Services. https://portal.cops.usdoj.gov/resourcecenter/content.ashx/cops-p241-pub.pdf

183. Metz, C. (1974). *Film language: A semiotics of the cinema*. Oxford University Press.

184. Meyer, J. C. (2000). Humor as a double-edge sword: Four functions of humor in communication. *Communication Theory*, *10*(3), 310-331. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2885.2000.tb00194.x

185. Meyer, J. W., & Rowan, B. (1977). Institutionalized organizations: Formal structure as myth and ceremony. *American Journal of Sociology*, *83*(2), 340-363. https://doi.org/10.4073/csr.2013.1

186. Miles, M., Huberman, M., & Saldana, J. (2014). *Qualitative data analysis: A methods sourcebook* (3rd ed.). Sage.

187. Miller, S. L. (1999). *Gender and community policing: Walking the talk*. Northeastern University Press.

188. Monro, D. H. (1951). *Argument of laughter*. Melbourne University Press.

189. Morreall, J. (1983). *Taking laughter seriously*. SUNY Press.

190. Morris, J. D., Boone, M. A. (1998). The effects of music on emotional response, brand attitude, and purchase intent in an emotional advertising condition. In J. W. Alba & J. *Wesley* Hutchinson (Eds.), *Advances in Consumer Research*, *25*, 518-526.

191. Mosher, F.C. (1982) *Democracy and the public service* (2nd ed.). Oxford University Press.

192. Moyer-Gusé, E., & Nabi, R. L. (2010). Explaining the effects of narrative in an entertainment television program: Overcoming resistance to persuasion. *Human Communication Research*, *36*(1), 26-52. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJRDM-08-2018-0157

193. Nabi, L. R., Moyer-Gusé, E., & Byrne, S. (2007). All joking aside: A serious investigation into the persuasive effects of funny social issue messages. *Communication Monographs, 74*(1), 29-54. https://doi.org/10.1080/03637750701196896

194. Oldani, J. (1988). Is the Pope Catholic? A content analysis of American jokelore about the Catholics' clergy. In C. Powell & G. Paton (Eds.), *Humor in society: Resistance and control* (pp. 67– 84). St. Martin's Press.

195. O'Neill, M. (2014). Ripe for the chop or the public face of policing? PCSOs and neighborhood policing in austerity. *Policing: A Journal of Policy and Practice, 8(*3), 265–273. https://doi.org/10.1093/police/pau018.

196. Orlikowski, W. J. (2002). Knowing in practice: Enacting a collective capability in distributed organizing. *Organization Science, 13*(3), 249-273. https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.13.3.249.2776

197. Owen, W. F. (1984). Interpretive themes in relational communication. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 70, 274–287. https://doi.org/10.1080/00335638409383697

198. Pache, A-C., & Santos, F. (2012). Inside the hybrid organization: Selective coupling as a response to competing institutional logics. *Academy of Management Journal, 56(*4). https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2011.0405

199. Parrott, S. (2016). When everyone is laughing: The presence, characteristics, and enjoyment of disparagement humor in online TV. *Mass Communication and Society, 19*(1), 49-73. https://doi.org/10.1080/15205436.2015.1072724

200. Paoline III, E. A., Myers, S. M., & Worden, R. E. (2000). Police culture, individualism, and community policing: Evidence from two police departments. *Justice Quarterly, 17*(3), 575-605. https://doi.org/10.1080/07418820000094671

201. Perez, D. W. (1997). *The paradoxes of police work: Walking the thin blue line*. Copperhouse Publishing Company.

202. Petty, R. E., & Cacioppo, J. T. (1986). Chapter 1. *Communication and persuasion.* Springer.

203. Perlmutter, D. D. (2000). *Policing the media: Street cops and public perceptions of law enforcement*. Sage.

204. Piaget, J. (1962). The stages of the intellectual development of the child. *Bulletin of the Menninger Clinic, 26*(3), 120–128. PMID: 14486280.

205. Phillips, W. H. (2009). *Film: An introduction*. St. Martin's.

206. Poole, M. S., & van de Ven, A. H. (1989). Using paradox to build management and organization theories. *The Academy of Management Review, 14*(4), 562-578. https://doi.org/10.2307/258559

207. Porsché, Y. (2021). Reluctant collaboration in community policing. How police team up with youth prior to 1st of May demonstrations in Germany. *Discourse Studies, 23*(1), 67-83. https://doi.org/10.1177/1461445620942908

208. Poston, B., & Chang, C. (2019, October 8). LAPD searches blacks and Latinos more. But they're less likely to have contraband than whites. *Los Angeles Times.* https://www.latimes.com/local/lanow/la-me-lapd-searches-20190605-story.html

209. Potter, M. C., Staub, A., & O'Connor, D. H. (2004) Pictorial and conceptual representation of glimpsed pictures. *Journal of Experimental Psychology. Human*

*Perception and Performance*, *30*(3), 478-89. https://doi.org/10.1037/0096-1523.30.3.478

210. Potter, M. C., Wyble, B., Hagmann, C. E., & McCourt, E. S. (2014). Detecting meaning in RSVP at 13ms per picture. *Attention, Perception, & Psychophysics, 76*, 270-279.

211. President's Task Force on 21st Century Policing. (2015). *Final Report of the President's Task Force on 21st Century Policing.* Office of Community Oriented Policing Services. https://cops.usdoj.gov/pdf/taskforce/taskforce_finalreport.pdf

212. Purpel, D. E. (1981). Humor in the great scheme of things: A response to Elizabeth Vallance. *Curriculum Inquiry, 11*(3), 231-237. https://doi.org/10.1080/03626784.1981.11075256

213. Putnam, L. L. (2019). Constituting order and disorder: Embracing tensions and contradictions. In C. Vásquez & T. Kuhn (Eds), *Dis/Organization as Communication* (pp. 17-35). Routledge.

214. Putnam, L. L., Fairhurst, G., & Banghart, S. (2016). Contradictions, dialectics, and paradoxes in organizations: A constitutive approach. *The Academy of Management Annals, 10*(1), 65-171. https://doi.org/10.1080/19416520.2016.1162421

215. Rao, H., Monin, P., & Durand, R. 2003. Institutional change in Toque Ville: Nouvelle cuisine as an identity movement in French gastronomy. *American Journal of Sociology, 108*(4), 795-843. https://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1086/367917

216. Reaves, B. (2012). *Hiring and retention of state and local law enforcement officers.* Office of Community Oriented Policing Services. https://bjs.ojp.gov/content/pub/pdf/hrslleo08st.pdf

217. Reiner, R. (2013). Who governs? Democracy, plutocracy, science and prophecy in policing. *Criminology & Criminal Justice 13*(2), 161–180. https://doi.org/10.1177/1748895812474282

218. Reiner, R. (2000). *The politics of the police.* Oxford University Press.

219. Rhodes, T. N., & Tyler, D. H. (2019). Is it cool to be a cop? Exploring the differential impact of Ferguson on police applicants. *Policing: A Journal of Policy and Practice, 15*(1), 492-507. https://doi.org/10.1093/police/paz013

220. Riccucci, N. M., Van Ryzin, G. G., & Li, H. (2015). Representative bureaucracy and the willingness to coproduce: An experimental study. *Public Administration Review, 76*(1), 121–130. Wiley. https://doi.org/10.1111/puar.12401

221. Rice, R. E. (2008). Unusual routines: Organizational (non)sensemaking. *Journal of Communication, 58*(1), 1-19. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1460-2466.2007.00371.x

222. Rice, R. E., & Cooper, S. D. (2010). A detailed case study of unusual routines. In R. E. Rice & S. D. Cooper (Eds.), *Organizations and unusual routines: A systems analysis of dysfunctional feedback processes* (pp. 155-199). Cambridge University Press.

223. Roberson, Q. M., Ryan, A. M., & Ragins B. R. (2017). The evolution and future of diversity at work. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 102*(3), 483–499. https//doi.org/10.1037/apl0000161

224. Rock, D., & Grant, H. (2016). Why diverse teams are smarter. *Harvard Business Review*. https://leadersforgood.net/wp-content/uploads/2016/01/H038YZ-PDF-ENG.pdf

225.    Roe, E., & Schulman, P. R. (2008). *High reliability management: Operating on the edge*. Stanford University Press.

226.    Rosenbaum, D. P., Schuck, A. M., Costello, S. K., Hawkins, D. F., & Ring, M. K. (2005). Attitudes toward the police: The effects of direct and vicarious experience. *Police Quarterly, 8*(3), 343–365. https://doi.org/10.1177/1098611104271085

227.    Ryan, G. W., & Bernard, H. R. (2003). Techniques to identify themes. *Field Methods, 15*(1). https://doi.org/10.1177/1525822X02239569

228.    Salt, B. (1992). *Film style and technology: History and analysis*. Starword.

229.    Schad, J., Lewis, M. W., Raisch, S., & Smith, W. K. (2016). Paradox research in management science: Looking back to move forward. *Academy of Management Annals, 10*(1), 5-64. https://doi.org/10.5465/19416520.2016.1162422

230.    Schaap, D. P. (2018). *The police, the public, and the pursuit of trust. A cross-national, dynamic study of trust in the police and police trust building*. Eleven International Publishing.

231.    Scheer, C., & Wilson, J. M. (2021). The critical role of communication in the recruitment of police officers. In H. Giles, E. R., Maguire, & S. L. Hill (Eds.) *The Rowman & Littlefield handbook of policing, communication, and society* (pp. 47-61). Rowman & Littlefield.

232.    Schneider, B. (1987). The people make the place. *Personnel Psychology, 40*(3), 437-453. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.1987.tb00609.x

233.    Schneiberg, M., & Clemens, E. S. (2006). The typical tools for the job: Research strategies in institutional analysis. *Sociological Theory, 24*(3), 195-227. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9558.2006.00288.x

234. Schnobrich-Davis, J. (2016). The changing landscape of policing: the Metro-LEC approach. *Police Practice and Research*, *17*(1), 22-36. https://doi.org/10.4073/csr.2013.1

235. Schuck, A. M. (2014). Female representation in law enforcement: the influence of screening, unions, incentives community policing, CALEA, and size. *Police Quarterly, 17*(1), 54–78. https://doi.org/10.1177/1098611114522467

236. Schulman, P. R. (1993). The negotiated order of organizational reliability. *Administration & Society, 25(3)*, 353-372. https://doi.org/10.1177/009539979302500305

237. Sharma, M., Mindermann, S., Rogers-Smith, C., Leech, G., Snodin, B., Ahuja, J., Sandbrink, J. B., Monrad, J. T., Altman, G., Dhaliwal, G., Finnveden, L., Norman, A. J., Oehm, S. B., Sandkühler, J. F., Aitchison, L., Gavenčiak, T., Mellan, T., Kulveit, J., Chindelevitch, L., Flaxman, S., Gal, Y., Mishra, S., & Brauner, J. M. (2021). Understanding the effectiveness of government interventions against the resurgence of COVID-19 in Europe. *Nature Communications:* 5820. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-021-26013-4

238. Shultz, T. R. (1976). A cognitive-developmental analysis of humor. In A. J. Chapman & H. C. Foot (Eds.), *Humor and laughter: Theory, research, and applications* (pp. 11–36). Transaction Publishers.

239. Schultz, J. T. (2019). *Community policing and executive leadership: An understanding of African American police executives*. Doctoral dissertation, University of Charleston-Beckley.

240. Scott, W.R. (2008), *Institutions and organizations: Ideas and interests*. Sage.

241. Scott, W. R., Ruef, M., Mendel, P. J., & Caronna, C. A. (2000). *Institutional change and healthcare organizations: From professional dominance to managed care.* University of Chicago Press.

242. Seo, M-G., & Cred, W. E. D. (2002). Institutional contradictions, praxis, and institutional change: A dialectical perspective. *Academy of Management Review, 27*(2), 222-247. https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2002.6588004

243. Seo, M-G., Putnam, L. L., & Bartunek, J. M. (2004). Dualities and tensions of planned organizational change. In A. H. Van de Ven & M. S. Poole (Eds.), *Handbook of organizational change.* (pp. 73-107). Oxford University Press.

244. Shjarback, J., Decker, S., Rojek, J. J., & Brunson, R. K. (2017). Minority representation in policing and racial profiling: a test of representative bureaucracy vs community context. *Policing, 40*(4), 748–767. https://doi.org/10.1086/210361

245. Sias, P. M. (2009). *Organizing relationships: Traditional and emerging perspectives on workplace relationships.* Sage.

246. Skogan, W. G. (2006). *Police and community in Chicago; A tale of three cities.* Oxford University Press.

247. Skogan, W. G. (2008). An overview of community policing: Origins, concepts and implementation. In T. Williamson (Ed.), *The handbook of knowledge-based policing: Current conceptions and future directions.* Wiley.

248. Skogan, W., & Frydl, K. (Eds.). (2004) *Fairness and effectiveness in policing: The evidence.* National Academies Press.

249. Skolnick, J. H., & Bayley, D. H. (1988). Theme and variation in community policing. *Crime and Justice, 10,* 1-37. https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:143630578

250. Simpson, R. (2022). Police recruitment videos and their relevance for attracting officers. *Policing: A Journal of Policy and Practice*, *7*(1), 22-38. https://doi.org/10.1093/police/paac057

251. Slovak, J. S. (1986). *Styles of urban policing: Organization, environment, and police styles in selected American cities*. New York University Press.

252. Smith, C. G., & Powell, L. (1988). The use of disparaging humor by group leaders. *Southern Speech Communication Journal, 53*(3), 279-292. https://doi.org/10.1080/10417948809372729

253. Smith, D. A. (1984). The organizational context of legal control. *Criminology*, *22*(1), 19-38. 10.1111/j.1745-9125.1984.tb00286.x

254. Smith, W. K., & Lewis, M. W. (2011). Toward a theory of paradox: A dynamic equilibrium model of organizing. *The Academy of Management Review, 36(*2), 381–403. https://doi.org/10.5465/AMR.2011.59330958

255. Southall, R. M., Nagel, M. S., Amis, J. M., & Southall, C. (2008). A method to March madness? Institutional logics and the 2006 National Collegiate Athletic Association Division I men's basketball tournament. *Journal of Sport Management, 22*(6), 677-700. https://doi.org/10.1177/1098611119870263

256. Speck, P. S. (1991). The humorous message taxonomy: A framework for studying humorous ads. *Current Issues and Research in Advertising, 13*(1-2), 1-144. https://doi.org/10.1080/01633392.1991.10504957

257. Stein, R. E., & Griffith, C. (2016). Resident and police perceptions of the neighborhood: Implications for community policing. *Criminal Justice Policy Review, 28*(2). https://doi.org/10.1177/0887403415570630

258.  Sternthal, B., & Craig, C. S. (1973). Humor in advertising. *Journal of Marketing, 37*(4). https://doi.org/10.1177/002224297303700403

259.  Streeck, J., Goodwin, C., & LeBaron, C. (2011). Embodied interaction in the material world: An introduction. In J. Streeck, C. Goodwin, & C. LeBaron (Eds.), *Embodied interaction: Language and body in the material world* (pp. 1-26). Wiley.

260.  South, W. (2022). Recruitment, retention, and attrition. *Police Chief, 89*(2), 34-39. Retrieved from: https://www.policechiefmagazine.org/recruitment-retention-and-attrition/

261.  Suddaby, R., & Greenwood, R. (2005). Rhetorical strategies of legitimacy. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 50*(1), 35-67. https://doi.org/10.2189/asqu.2005.50.1.35

262.  Sutcliffe, K. M., & Vogus, T. J. (2003). Organizing for resilience. In K. S. Cameron, J. E. Dutton, & R. E. Quinn (Eds.) *Positive organizational scholarship: Foundations for a new discipline* (pp. 94-110). Berrett-Koehler.

263.  Sutherland, F., & Smith, A. C. T. (2011). Duality theory and the management of the change-stability paradox. *Journal of Management & Organization, 17*(4), 534–547. https://doi.org/10.1017/S1833367200001437

264.  Sycz, D. (2014). Defining the ideal applicant: Examining patrol officer perspectives on police organizational recruitment standards. Masters Thesis, Waterloo University. http://hdl.handle.net/10012/8902

265.  Tajfel, H. (1982). Social psychology of intergroup relations. *Annual Review of Psychology, 33*. 1–39. https:// https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.ps.33.020182.

266.    Tajfel, H., & Turner, J.C. (1986). The social identity theory of intergroup behavior. In
        S. Worchel & W. G. Austin (Eds.), *Psychology of Intergroup Relations* (pp. 7-24).
        Hall Publishers.

267.    Taylor, S. E., & Fiske, S. T. (1978). Salience, attention, and attribution: Top of the
        head phenomena. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), *Advances in Experimental Social
        Psychology, 11*, 249-288. ScienceDirect. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0065-
        2601(08)60009-X

268.    Thornton, D. (2002). Constructing and testing a framework for dynamic risk
        assessment. *Sexual Abuse, 14*(2), 139-153.
        https://doi.org/10.1177/107906320201400205

269.    Thornton, P. H. (2004). *Markets from culture: Institutional logics and organizational
        decisions in higher education publishing.* Stanford University Press.

270.    Thornton, P. H., & Ocasio, W. (2008). Institutional logics. In D. Grant, L. L. Putnam,
        & C.

a.      Hardy (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of organizational discourse* (pp. 99–128). Sage.

271.    Thornton, P. H., Ocasio, W., & Lounsbury, M. (2012). *The institutional logics
        perspective: A new approach to culture, structure and process*. Oxford University
        Press.

272.    Thornton, P. H., & Ocasio, W. (1999). Institutional logics and the historical
        contingency of power in organizations: Executive succession in the higher education
        publishing industry, 1958– 1990. *American Journal of Sociology*, *105*(3), 801–843.
        https://doi.org/10.1086/210361

273.    Tom, V. R. (1971). The role of personality and organizational images in the recruiting

        process. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 6*(5), 573-592.

        https://doi.org/10.1016/S0030-5073(71)80008-9

274.    Toubiana, M. (2020). Once in orange always in orange? Identity paralysis and the

        enduring influence of institutional logics on identity. *Academy of Management*

        *Journal*, *63*(6), 1739-1774. https://doi.org/10.1017/S1833367200001437

275.    Townley, B. (2002). The role of competing rationalities in institutional change. *The*

        *Academy of Management Journal, 45*(1), 163-179. https://doi.org/10.2307/3069290

276.    Tracy, S. J. (2013). *Qualitative research methods*. Wiley-Blackell.

277.    Tracy, S. J., & Hinrichs, M. M. (2017). Phronetic iterative data analysis. *The*

        *international encyclopedia of communication research methods*. Wiley. Retrieved

        from: https://www.sarahjtracy.com/wp-content/uploads/2020/08/Tracy-

        Hinrichs_Iterative-approach-encyc-17.pdf

278.    Trethewey G. E. A., & Ashcraft K. L. (2004). Special issue introduction: Practicing

        disorganization: The development of applied perspectives on living with tension.

        *Journal of Applied Communication Research, 32(*2), 81-88.

        https://doi.org/10.1080/0090988042000210007

279.    Trout, J., & Ries, A. (1986). *Positioning: The battle for your mind*. McGraw-Hill.

280.    Tucker, E., & Nickeas, P. (2022, March 19). *Chicago Police Department is latest to*

        *lower hiring standards amid staffing shortages*. *CNN*. https://www.cnn.

        com/2022/03/18/us/chicago-police-recruiting-standards/ index.html

281. Turner, N., Swart, J., & Maylor, H. (2013). Mechanisms for managing ambidexterity: A review and research agenda. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, *15*(3), 317-332. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0065-2601(08)60009

282. Tyler, T. R., & Fagan, J. (2008). Legitimacy and cooperation: Why do people help the police fight crime in their communities? *Ohio State Journal of Criminal Law, 6*(231), 231-266. https://scholarship.law.columbia.edu/faculty_scholarship/414

283. Tyler, T. R., & Jackson, J. (2014). Popular legitimacy and the exercise of legal authority: Motivating compliance, cooperation, and engagement. *Psychology, Public Policy, and Law, 20(*1), 78–95. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0034514

284. Uhl-Bien, M., & Arena, M. (2018). Leadership for organizational adaptability: A theoretical synthesis and integrative framework. *Leadership Quarterly*, *29*(1), 89-104. https://doi.org/10.1017/S1833367200001437

285. Van Langenhove, L., & Harré, R. (1994). Cultural stereotypes and positioning theory. *Journal for the Theory of Social Behavior, 24(*4), 359–372. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-5914.1994.tb00260.x

286. Van Maanen, J. (1973). Observations on the making of policemen. *Human Organization, 32*(4), 407-418. https://www.jstor.org/stable/44127631

287. Van Maanen, J. (1974). Police socialization: A longitudinal examination of job attitudes in an urban police department. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 20*(2), 207-228. https://doi.org/10.2307/2391695

288. Vermeulen, I., & Beukeboom, C. J. (2016). Effects of music in advertising: Three experiments replicating single-exposure musical conditioning of consumer choice in

an individual setting. *Journal of Advertising*, *45*(1), 53-61.

https://doi.org/10.1016/S0065-2601(08)60009-X

289.   Walker, D. H. T., Bourne, L. M., & Shelley, A. (2008). Influence, stakeholder

mapping, and visualization. *Construction Management and Economics, 26*(6), 645-

658. https://doi.org/10.1080/01446190701882390

290.   Walker, S. (1977). *A critical history of police reform: The emergence of*

*professionalism*. Heath.

291.   Walker, S., & Katz, C. M. (1995). Less than meets the eye: Police department bias-

crime units. *American Journal of Police, 14*(1), 29-48.

https://https://doi.org/10.1108/07358549510799099

292.   Wallace, M. (1990). *Rewards and renewal: America's search for competitive*

*advantage through alternative pay strategies.* American Compensation Association.

293.   Weick, K. E. (2001). *Making sense of the organization*. Blackwell Business.

294.   Weick, K. E., & Sutcliffe, K. M. (2007). *Managing the unexpected: Resilient*

*performance in the age of uncertainty* (2nd ed.). Jossey-Bass.

295.   Weinberger, M. C., & Gulas, C. S. (2019). The emergence of a half-century of

research on humor in advertising: What have we learned? What do we still need to

learn? *International Journal of Advertising, 38*(7), 911-956.

https://doi.org/10.1080/02650487.2019.1598831

296.   Weisburd, D., & Eck, J. E. (2004). What can police do to reduce crime, disorder, and

fear? *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 593*(1),

593-619. https://doi.org/10.1177/0002716203262548

297. Wenus, L. (Host). (2022, September). Why can't San Francisco police hire faster than cops are leaving? [Audio podcast episode]. In *SFNext: Fixing Our City Podcast.* San Francisco Chronicle. https://www.sfchronicle.com/podcasts/article/Listen-Why-can-t-San-Francisco-police-hire-17416023.php

298. White, M. D., Orosco, C., & Terpstra, B. (2023). Investigating the impacts of global pandemic and George Floyd's death on crime and other features of police work. *Justice Quarterly, 40*(2), https://doi.org/10.1080/07418825.2021.2022740

299. Wilkins, A. L. (1983). The culture audit: A tool for understanding organizations. *Organizational Dynamics, 12*(2), 24-38. https://doi.org/10.1016/0090-2616(83)90031-1

300. Wilkins, V., Williams, B. (2008). Black or blue: Racial profiling and representative bureaucracy. *Public Administration Review, 68*(4), 654–664. https://doi.org/10.1017/S1833367200001437

301. Wilson, J. M. (2010). *Police recruitment and retention for the new millennium: The state of knowledge*. RAND Corporation.

302. Wilson, J. M., & Cox, A. G. (2008). *Community policing and crime: The process and impact of problem-solving in Oakland.* RAND Corporation.

303. Wilson, J. Q. (1967). The bureaucracy problem. *The Public Interest, 6*(3), 22-39. Retrieved from: //efaidnbmnnnibpcajpcglclefindmkaj/https://www.nationalaffairs.com/storage/app/uploads/public/58e/1a4/a28/58e1a4a283722849653287.pdf

304. Wilson, J. Q. (1968). *Varieties of police behavior: The management of law and order in eight communities*. Harvard University Press.

305.    Wilson, J.Q. (1968). Dilemmas of police administration. *Public Administration Review, 28*(5), 407-417. https://www.jstor.org/stable/pdf/973756.pdf

306.    Wilson, J. Q. (1962). *The amateur democrat: Club politics in three cities*. University of Chicago Press.

307.    Woo, D., (2019) Reconceptualizing interorganizational collaborations as *tensile structures*: Implications of conveners' proactive tension management, *Communication Monographs, 86*(2), 158-183. https://doi.org/10.1080/03637751.2018.1526389

308.    Wycoff, M.A. and Oetmeier, T. (1994). *Evaluating patrol officer performance under community policing: The Houston experience*. National Institute of Justice.

309.    Yoon, H. J., & Tinkham, S. F. (2013). Humorous threat persuasion in advertising: The effects of humor, threat intensity, and issue involvement. *Journal of Advertising, 42*(1), 30–41. https://doi.org/10.1080/00913367.2012.749082

310.    Young. D. Y. (2004). Late-night comedy in election 2000: Its influence on candidate portrait ratings and moderating effects of political knowledge and partisanship. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media, 48*(1), 1-22. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15506878jobem4801_1

311.    Yus, F. (2017) Incongruity-resolution cases in jokes. *Lingua*, 197, 103-122. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lingua.2017.02.002

312.    Zhao, J., Ren, L., & Lovrich, N. (2010). Police organizational structures during the 1990s: An application of contingency theory. *Police Quarterly, 13*(2), 209-232. https://doi.org/10.1177/1098611110365691

313. Zhao, J., Thurman, Q.C., & Lovrich, N.P. (1995). Community-oriented policing across the US: facilitators and impediments to implementation, *American Journal of Police, 14*(1), 11-28. https://doi.org/10.1108/07358549510799143

314. Zillman, D., & Cantor, J. R. (1976). Effect of timing of information about mitigating circumstances on emotional responses to provocation and retaliatory behavior. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 12*(1), 38-55. https://doi.org/10.1016/0022-1031(76)90085-8

315. Zoller, H. M. (2014). Power and resistance in organizational communication. In L. L. Putnam & D. K. Mumby (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of organizational communication: Advances in theory, research, and methods* (3rd ed., pp. 595–618). Sage.

# TABLE 1

Table 1

*Connecting logics to first-level codes*

| Institutional Logic | Wilson's Styles | Defining Features | Descriptions/Characteristics in existing literature | Coding examples in recruitment videos |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Traditional Enforcement | Watchman | Solves community problems via **selective enforcement of the law** against less favorable groups. Department seeks to maintain status quo. | Encourages favoritism through disparate treatment (Wilson, 1962). Addresses the issue of police legitimacy by increasing the authority and agency of individual officers (Mastrofski, 1991). Willingness to bend rules (Wilson 1968). Emphasis on personal authority (Crank, 1994). Priority on keeping the peace (Annan, 1992). | Officers being expected to "think on their feet". Officers protecting against outsiders. Officers walking a beat. Aggressive/Challenging positioning indicated by questions such as: "Do you have what it takes?". Officers standing guard in public. Threats to criminals. Riot policing/crowd control |
| | Legalistic | Solves community problems via **strict enforcement of the law** with impartiality. Employs a hierarchical leadership structure and focus on professionalism. | Characterized by *dispassionate efficiency* (Welsh et al., 2015). Addresses the issue of police legitimacy through strict adherence to guidelines and policies (Mastrofski, 1991). Exemplified in broken windows policing (Terrill et al., 2016). Bureaucratic organizational structure for citizens and officers (Kelling and Moore, 1988). Formal control of decision-making for rank-and-file officers to ensure citizens' needs are met (Hassell et al., 2003). Highly differentiated job roles encourage specialization (Langworthy, 1986). Typified by aggressive and highly organized crime-fighting tactics such as *Compstat* (McDonald, Greenberg, & Bratton, 2001). | Citing official performance indicators such as crime rate. Car chase. Officers enforcing the law against juveniles. Officers arresting a suspect. Officers shouting commands such as "Come out with your hands up!". Militarized combat training. Ceremony/Parade Marching. Pursuit of suspect on foot. SWAT Team. Regional/National competitions and rankings |
| Community Oriented Policing | Service | Solves community problems via **community building** and program creation. Integrates citizens into departmental decision-making | Differentiated from other departments due to purposeful re-structuring (Koshel, 2012). Addresses the issue of police legitimacy by expanding citizens' role in decision-making (Mastrofski, 1991). Significantly increased time spent with community members (Goldstein, 1987). Participates in cooperative problem solving via the implementation of community programs (Cordner, 1997). Purposeful ambiguity in decision-making for rank-and-file officers to allow officers to meet citizens' needs on an individual basis (Hassell et al., 2003) | Statement about department being non-traditional. Officer at a formal public meeting. Officer repairing something with/for citizen. Minorities specifically targeted in recruitment video. Women specifically targeted in recruitment video. Positive interaction with homeless. Officers teaching classes. Department working with a community partner. Non-English language spoken/mentioned |