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Abstract

This thesis, the fieldwork for which was undertaken between 2010 and 2012, examined an initial police training programme in one police force, ‘Ashton Police’\(^1\) and of one cohort of 20 student officers, over a two year period. I conducted interviews with student officers and training staff, observations of classroom and operational training and documentary analysis to produce a longitudinal case study of initial police training and early career socialisation. Whilst this was a small-scale research project, its findings are applicable to initial training and policing more broadly as well as to current reforms.

I found that many of the cohort of student officers in my study already had policing experience, some in Ashton Police itself. This meant that pre-existing features of police culture served to partially undermine some of the formal intentions of the programme, from the outset. Furthermore, I found that the different types of training were all problematic. Formal, classroom based training was insufficiently connected with operational police work. Supervised field training was overly reliant on the allocation of a single field trainer for the duration of that period and was adversely affected by organisational change. Informal training (as members of operational reliefs) became so attenuated from the training process, it resembled far more a period of work rather than of training. For these reasons student officers often appeared inadequately prepared for police work. I conclude that despite the introduction of a new programme (the Initial Police Learning and Development Programme) in 2006 in Ashton Police, intended to allow innovation in the way in which initial training was delivered, considerable continuity existed alongside change. This was particularly noticeable in the long-standing conflict between, on the one hand, legalistic and procedural approaches to initial training and on the other, a more humanistic approach. It appeared at times that the purpose of initial training was not clear.

In relation to the wider arena of initial police training, I argue that many of its problems originate in the historical and socioeconomic context. The reforms of initial training and the new programme, from 2006, took place in politically contentious times for the police and so, carried too great an expectation of their impact. Some aspects of reform were possibly necessary to make but were not sufficient for long-term change. I argue that a social democratic perspective of the police that focuses on the detrimental impact on the police of social conditions in ‘liberal’ (rather than

\(^1\) ‘Ashton Police’ is used here and throughout the thesis, as an alias to provide anonymity for the police force that was the subject of this study.
‘social’) democracies provides a fuller understanding of the limits of these and future initial training reforms.
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Introduction

What follows is a study of the initial training of a cohort of student police officers in an English police force, Ashton Police. It focuses on police socialisation and the development of police culture largely, but not entirely, within the confines of a training programme called the Initial Police Learning and Development Programme.

The initial training of police officers has attracted considerable interest from police historians, social scientists and policy-makers across the world (Niederhoffer, 1967; McNamara, 1967; Harris, 1973; Critchley, 1978; Scarman, 1981; Lusherma, 1981; Fielding, 1988a; Emsley, 1991; Weinberger, 1995; Chan, 1997; Macpherson, 1998; HMIC, 2002; Chan et al, 2003). In the police forces of England and Wales, the intention of early reformers of the police to provide an organisation that attracts public support, in part, by recruiting officers from ‘ordinary but honourable’ backgrounds (Critchley, 1978) in the expectation that their backgrounds would ensure they would make ‘good’ police officers was always a contentious and fragile approach (Brogden and Graham, 1988). The need for initial training took some time to establish but it too was contentious, in part, because its purpose was to ensure standards of police discipline (Emsley, 1991: Weinberger, 1995). Subsequent attempts to steer recruitment and initial training in a variety of directions have usually been associated with problematic periods for the police (Peacock, 2010) and have met with only partial success (Scarman, 1981; Macpherson, 1998). Those problems
are often associated with the nature of police work, its associated culture and the 
socialisation process by which it develops (Van Maanen, 1973; Chan, 2003). One of 
the most important periods when this takes place is during the initial training 
programme. This thesis aims to explore the whole process of initial training, which 
necessarily involves an examination of recruit background characteristics, the initial 
training programme and the wider context of the police in British society.

Context

In the lead up to my research, considerable concerns had been raised about a lack 
of representativeness of police recruits, poor screening practices for recruits that fail 
to identify those with pernicious attitudes (BBC, 2003) or desirable ones and 
outdated, overly formal training methods (HMIC, 2002). In 2002, the report by Her 
Majesty’s Inspectorate of Constabularies, *Training Matters*, identified the continued 
existence of a militaristic, formal initial training environment, didactic approaches to 
teaching, learning and assessment, poor connections with local communities and 
unreliable field training practices. In response, a new training programme was 
devised, the Initial Police Learning and Development Programme, with the aim of 
addressing some of those problems (NPIA, 2007). The existing programme was 
thought to be inappropriate for an occupation that aspired toward higher professional 
status and for a policing era that required flexible, critical and self-directed police 
officers (Neyroud, 2005; MacVean et al, 2012; Wood and Tong, 2008). There were, 
therefore, high hopes for the new national programme, which commenced across all
forces in 2006.Recruits were to be known as ‘student officers’, not ‘probationers’ (although the employment and legal status of the probationer remains) and the curriculum was focussed on a number of National Occupational Standards (Skills for Justice, 2016) to ensure good practice through the assessment of police personal qualities and ethical practice. The programme was intended to be a ‘learning’ programme rather than a ‘training’ programme and so, the language of learning replaced the language of training (White, 2006; Bryant and Bryant, 2015). As Blakemore and Simpson (2010) point out, the contribution that higher education might make to the new programme was to better prepare student officers for their role, to facilitate a better understanding of the community and to contribute to a changed police culture.

For the first 4 years of the programme cohort sizes were large but from a period of prodigious growth in police officer numbers a period of contraction had started in 2010, effected in large part by suspending recruitment and initial training (Burton, 2013; Rowe, 2013). This had considerable impact on the student officers in this study.

Research aims

I wanted to focus my attention on the experience of the new programme for student officers and training staff themselves. I was also keen to understand the context of initial training in the police in England and Wales and in policing more broadly. I
wanted to know how changes took place within the chronology of the programme, which has been demonstrated to be of particular importance for initial police training, where the temporal structure of the programme has been shown by research to be impactful (McNamara, 1967; Niederhoffer, 1967; Van Maanen, 1973; Fielding, 1988a; Chan, 1997). Because of this, I also wanted to provide a relatively longitudinal study of initial training, which has been undertaken rarely (Heslop, 2009) since Fielding’s study in the late 1980s (Fielding, 1988a). I aimed to build on the research literature that demonstrates considerable complexity and variation amongst recruits in their acquisition of features of police culture (Fielding, 1988a; Chan et al, 2003). I also aimed to build on the observation that recruit social background impacts upon the police socialisation process within and without the training programme, especially in a period of ‘anticipatory socialisation’ (Van Maanen, 1973; 1975) that can shape the experience of initial training (McNamara, 1967; Bennett, 1984; Fielding, 1986; 1988a).

The national context

The fieldwork for this thesis was conducted in a police force in England and I have chosen to analyse the literature largely through the issues that exist in that national context. However, much of the research I also draw on has been conducted in different national contexts, often in English speaking countries and I use that work to draw wider comparisons and to analyse the wider issues in police recruitment and
initial training (McNamara, 1967; Van Maanen, 1975; Chan et al, 2003; Alan and Grégoire, 2008).

Contribution to debates on recruitment and initial training

Heslop (2013, p.212) argues that one of the consequences of the introduction of the new programme, introduced in 2006, has been a fragmentation of the initial training system. But, there has been little research on the impact of the current strategy and programme (Peace, 2006; Heslop, 2009). Some recent studies exist of police forces where collaboration has been established with universities (Heslop, 2009) but none where this does not exist. Tong and Wood (2011) point out that, there is little evidence of whether ‘new’ approaches differ significantly from traditional training regimes” but we appear to know as much about new developments and practices as about ‘traditional’ ones in the new context. My study took place in a police force known not to have followed the lead of some forces in forming collaborations with higher education in the provision of initial training (MacVean, 2012). In this context my study provides an understanding of an important part of a fragmented system. It details the operation of a traditional training regime, in the context of a national programme designed, in part, to allow innovative approaches to be designed.

Research indicates that police recruit cohorts are often homogeneous particularly in terms of the prior occupational experience (Van Maanen, 1975, Niederhoffer, 1967; Fielding, 1988a; Chan et al, 2003) and longitudinal research finds that background
characteristics can advance or retard the development of police culture (Bennett, 1984; Fielding, 1988a). At the time of this research police forces had been recruiting, to the police officer role, those who already had prior police experience (Home Office, 2015). My research addresses the impact of this practice amongst a cohort of recruits whose homogeneity was striking in that the majority had been Special Constables, Police Community Support Officers or police staff. I was aware of the practice of and support for recruitment to police officer roles of those with police related occupational experience (Glenn et al, 2003), of a variety of kinds, but not of any research that detailed their characteristics and experiences of initial training. In that respect, elements of this study represent a contribution to knowledge of the initial training and organisational socialisation of recruits with experience in the wider police family.

The picture presented represents both continuity and change but initial training in Ashton Police, I argue, erred far more toward continuity than change. There was a marked presence of traditional practices (Stanislas, 2012) with traditional consequences such as the informal development of occupational values contrary to those formally desired (Van Maanen, 1975). Amongst recruits, the “high expectations and lofty ideals” (Chan et al, 2003, p.3) that research has demonstrated to exist (Van Maanen, 1973; Fielding, 1988a) appeared significantly muted from the outset.
A longitudinal, qualitative case study

In this thesis, I present an evaluation of the initial training of student police officers throughout the duration of the programme that constitutes the first two years of service. I focus on the experiences of student officers themselves, of the nature of the programme existent in Ashton Police, on the process of socialisation and the acquisition of police culture. I negotiated with Ashton Police to conduct the fieldwork for the study between June 2010 and June 2012 after which, initial police training was prorogued, in the wake of the election of a government committed to austerity politics (Burton, 2013). I employed qualitative research methods including semi-structured interviews, focus groups, documentary analysis and observations in the operational environment. I also employed a case study approach to the training programme which allows the researcher to gain a depth of understanding of a particular example of a social phenomenon that other, more widely based, research practices may not be able to achieve (Darke et al, 1998). The police forces of England and Wales often have quite singular histories and cultures and in the case of Ashton Police initial training, this method had the advantage of allowing the examination of idiosyncratic training practices in a particular context. It also allows a comparison to known features of other studies of similar training programmes (Peace, 2006; Heslop, 2009) although the significance of this case revealed itself gradually during my analysis of the fieldwork findings (Bryman, 2012).
Nomenclature

The nomenclature of the training programme in police organisations changes quite frequently, over time. Indeed, within the confines of the current national programme, terminology varies between police forces who have some flexibility about how they structure their local iterations and so, what terminology they use (Bryant and Bryant, 2016). Where I refer to Ashton police’s programme I will endeavour to use its terminology of phases. This is how I have structured the chapters of the thesis. But, where I refer to generic types of initial training I use the following particular terms. For the training that takes place, largely in police classrooms and is pre-operational, I use the term ‘formal training’. Where training takes place in the operational environment and is immediately supervised, I use the term ‘field training’. Training beyond that, often indirectly supervised and in the shift-based, normal operational environment, I refer to as ‘informal training’. However, this does clash, to some extent, with terminology used to refer to the process of police socialisation and the development of occupational culture. (See Table 1 below) and I endeavour to make that clear where necessary.
The structure and key arguments of the thesis

I have adopted an approach to the chapter structure of the thesis that is largely based on Ashton Police’s own initial training structure, which was divided into a series of phases and sub-phases. The substantive chapters are based on the findings from my fieldwork and structured in this way. Many of the changes that took place for student officers linked closely with the phases of training developed by Ashton Police. This structure allows the capacity to notice common issues that transcend those phases such as the development of police culture and developments within the training programme itself.

**Table 1. Nomenclature**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initial training</th>
<th>Initial Police Learning and Development Programme in Ashton Police</th>
<th>National Initial Police Learning and Development Programme</th>
<th>Police socialisation/culture</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recruitment process</td>
<td>Induction</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Anticipatory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal training</td>
<td>Induction</td>
<td>Induction</td>
<td>Anticipatory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Learning Modules</td>
<td>Supervised Patrol (class-based learning)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Officer safety training programme</td>
<td></td>
<td>Formal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field</td>
<td>Consolidation</td>
<td>Supervised Patrol (work-placed practice)</td>
<td>Informal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal training</td>
<td>Community engagement</td>
<td>Independent Patrol</td>
<td>Informal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Independent Patrol</td>
<td>Community engagement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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In **Chapter 1**, I discuss the literature which has informed my thesis. In the first section, I explain how police researchers have defined the police and discuss its role in liberal democracies. This leads to a discussion of police occupational culture, socialisation and the connection with initial training (Chan, 2003). What constitutes police culture and what its impact is are contested ideas, as is the process by which it is generated, police socialisation (Van Maanen, 1973; Bennett, 1984; Chan, 2003). Both police culture and police socialisation are important in understanding the experiences of the student officers in my research. At the end of this section I raise some key questions about occupational culture and recruit socialisation against which the fieldwork for the project can be assessed. In the second section, I examine the developments that have taken place in initial training in the police forces of England and Wales. This provides an understanding of the specific context of the training programme that is the object of my study. The historical, social science and policy literature demonstrates that something is frequently seen to have 'gone wrong' with the police, the cause of which is often thought to lie with police recruitment and initial training (Emsley, 1991; Weinberger, 1995; Rawlings, 2002). Again, at the end of this section I raise some key questions about initial training against which the fieldwork for the project can be assessed.

In **Chapter 2**, I identify the nature of the research methods I used in the fieldwork and how they were employed. In particular, I describe some of the difficulties I experienced including the way in which I came to have partial access to the training
of the whole cohort of student officers and full access to a sub-group of them I came
to call the Research Participants Group. I explain the rationale for and critique of the
qualitative and longitudinal methods (Fielding, 1986) used in the study and of the
practice of presenting it as a first person account (Hochschild, 1979; Young and Lee,
1996). I provide a discussion of the ethical and risk issues involved too, especially
cconcerning research on powerful organisations, sensitive issues and dangerous
research circumstances (Lee, 1995; Lee and Renzetti, 1993). I also examine some
of my personal and professional motivations for choosing initial police training as a
topic.

In **Chapter 3**, I focus on the context of initial training in Ashton Police itself (its
particular iteration of the national initial training programme) and the social
characteristics of the whole cohort of student officers, including the motivational
characteristics of the Research Participants Group. These were, in many respects,
similar to those described in previous studies (Van Maanen, 1975; Fielding, 1988a;
Chan et al, 2003) and there was also a good deal of homogeneity amongst the
cohort. They were predominantly comparatively young, male, from ‘ordinary’ family
backgrounds and white, but what was most prominent was that many of them
already had prior policing experience in Ashton Police and so, the way in which they
expressed their reasons for joining were very much influenced by that experience
and their already developed police occupational cultural traits. In this chapter, I also
establish the need to trace the impact of recruit background characteristics over the
duration of the programme and to consider its connections with the development of occupational patterns. In this chapter, I argue that despite some variety and progressiveness of occupational outlook, the recruit cohort presented problematic features of police occupational culture from the outset. The programme, as it was structured in Ashton Police (despite its adherence to the new programme) very much resembled past iterations and as such, led to the lowering of the status of formal training. Both the student officer cohort and the programme were, I argue, problematic from the outset.

In Chapter 4, I provide an assessment of the Induction phase, one of the three formal, classroom-based phases of the programme. I argue that the programme got off ‘on the wrong foot’, because of the immediate influence of occupational and organisational cultural attitudes. Some Student officers had already developed an antipathy to aspects of initial training before it had started that were confirmed for them during the Induction phase. The organisation itself, via staff responsible for initial training, adopted an approach to this phase that had the effect of closing off important lines of discussion and thought. The very important, formal aspirations of the organisation were, in part, derailed by the pre-existing occupational values of student officers and training staff, although considerable variation existed as well.

In Chapter 5, I explore the phase known as Learning Modules, which was the longest of the formal phases and took place largely in a classroom environment located in a management entity called a Police Development Unit of which there
were 3; one for each of the three Divisions of the force area. Because of their location in different parts of the force territory, its separation from operational policing, its traditional teaching and learning practices and controversial but variable disciplinary atmosphere, this phase assumed a low status in the minds of some student officers and some often felt, ‘stuck in the classroom’.

In **Chapter 6**, I examine a sub-programme of the Learning Modules phase, the officer safety programme. This took place in a location separate from the Learning Modules phase, which became significant in itself. It included training in restraints, use of baton and handcuffs and a number of scenarios that incorporated the use of force and the application of law to police encounters. Its distance from operational policing and some of its cultural features (regarding masculinity and what constituted ‘real’ police work) meant that its training potential was restricted but its symbolic importance was prodigious. Some of the traits associated with traditional formal training were very evident in this programme where the hidden curriculum was usually barely ‘hidden’ at all.

In **Chapter 7**, I focus on the first phase of training based in the operational environment, called, by Ashton Police, Consolidation that was 11 weeks in duration. This constituted the student officer’s field training during which activities called Police Action Checklist items had to be completed by student officers under the supervision of a Police Development Officer. In practice, not all student officers were assigned to one of these officers and even those that were sometimes felt it to be a fragile
process. This was also how I felt as the phase proved difficult to observe as part of my fieldwork because of organisational changes in Ashton Police associated with the period of austerity politics from 2010 onward. In particular, the Police Development Officer role was abandoned and most were reassigned to other duties. The reflections of student officers indicated it was a very significant phase that demonstrated the profound difficulties of blending pre-operational training with operational training. As a result, I argue that student officers were, in varying ways, ‘thrown in at the deep-end’ in order that they became operational resources, as quickly as possible, like any other member of their response policing Relief team.

In Chapter 8, I explore the processes and experiences of operational policing without immediate supervision, which I call informal training but was called by Ashton Police, Independent Patrol. This chapter includes the analysis of the interviews I carried out of the practices and experiences of student officers on response policing shifts, called ‘Reliefs’. The observations demonstrate the kind of activities they took part in and exemplify the development of occupational cultural values and practices, the pressures of operational policing and its effects on training and of the unbalanced structure of the training programme. The Reliefs very much relied on the work of student officers who were not supernumerary. I examine the Student officer’s experience of the implementation of ‘competence’ based assessment requirements. For some Student officers in my study, this was felt to be an intrusion into their working lives and more of a bureaucratic process than an educational or training
Because of these things I argue that student officers were ‘on probation’ rather than ‘training’.

In Chapter 9, I develop a theme that stood out strongly in the fieldwork concerning difficulties faced by student officers in relation to their progress on the training programme. On the basis that those who leave organisations can indicate a good deal about what those organisations are like from the inside, I was very much interested in recording the experience of the two officers who left the programme (one very early on and one much later). These case studies indicated that Ashton Police recruited some who could have been foreseen as ‘unsuitable’ for police work and failed to keep some who had made particularly ‘appropriate’ police officers in relation to the values of the current wider policing context. However, the exact way in which this transpired was complex and connects with many of the other issues that arose during the programme. What was evident was the strength and complexity of the occupational culture that appeared profoundly influenced by response policing work that student officers were primarily engaged in. The constraints and the personal limits of the police occupation and its occupational culture were eventually laid bare for the student officers.

In Chapter 10, I provide reflections and conclusions on a number of questions that I raised in Chapter 1 and Chapter 2. Firstly, I examine the strengths and weaknesses of my research methods. Secondly, I focus on my findings concerning cultural and socialisation issues. Thirdly, I consider my findings in relation to the initial training.
features of the project. Fourthly, I develop the argument that recruitment and initial training reforms aimed at addressing the problems of the police are necessary but not sufficient and that a social democratic perspective of the police is applicable to my findings and explains the limitation of initial training reform in Ashton Police.

Fifth, I reflect on what research might follow from my thesis and finally, I provide a brief postscript on developments in police education and training since my fieldwork concluded.

Writing of the Australian context, Wimshurst and Ransley (2007) observe that, “...efforts to introduce major changes to police education and training arise from crises of public confidence in police organisations. My findings show that despite the introduction of a new programme, the Initial Police Learning and Development Programme in Ashton Police, introduced in the context of just such a crisis, considerable continuity existed alongside change. The reasons for that stemmed from the cultural characteristics of student officers and from the recruitment and training practices of Ashton Police. In particular, recruitment from those with occupational experience in Ashton Police advanced the development of police culture, some (but not all) of the features of which, served to undermine the formal intentions of the programme. Furthermore, the different types of training were all problematic. Formal training was insufficiently connected with operational police work, field training was overly reliant on the variable approaches to policing of field trainers and was adversely affected by organisational change and informal training
became so attenuated from the training process it resembled a period of work rather than of training. For these reasons student officers often appeared inadequately prepared for routine police work. The problems identified in the fieldwork chapters, had their origins in the fundamental problems faced by the police that, in turn, have connections with the wider socioeconomic context. This serves to limit the efficacy of recruitment and initial training reform, which has often taken place in politically contentious times for the police and so, has carried too great an expectation of its impact. A social democratic perspective of the police that focuses on the detrimental impact of social conditions in ‘liberal’ (rather than ‘social’) democracies (Reiner, 2010) provides a more realistic understanding of the parameters of initial training reforms, which can be seen as (sometimes and in some cases) necessary but not sufficient in achieving more significant and long-term change.
Chapter 1: Police culture, recruit socialisation and initial training reform

Introduction

In this chapter I detail the underpinning literature that has guided my thesis and describe how it proposes to build on and contribute to already existing literature and debates in the study of initial police training. There are two broad strands of literature that I address. The first concerns the connections between recruit socialisation and police culture. The second focuses on the development and reform of police recruitment and initial training, over time, in the police forces of England and Wales. The consideration of each one leads to a number of important questions against which the fieldwork for this thesis can be assessed.

Police culture and recruit socialisation

Whilst the exact nature and impact of police culture is highly contested, as Loftus (2010, p.3-4) points out, its study is important because the police occupy a powerful position in which they are accorded a good deal of discretionary power, particularly to use force as a legitimate practice. It is, therefore, important to understand the way in which police officers understand the nature of the world that they police as an
indicator (although not a straightforward determinant) of how they conduct police work.

This thesis is concerned with the nature of initial police training and it is during that period that important occupational values, attitudes and practices (police culture) become evident. Inevitably, this touches on debates in the study of the police per se but my intention in this part of the chapter is not to discuss in detail the myriad complexities therein (see McLaughlin, 2007, Chapters 3 and 4 for a review of ‘traditional’ and ‘new’ police studies perspectives) but to address the issue of police culture through its connection with studies of recruit socialisation.

I start this part of the chapter by examining a long-standing question concerning the causal importance for police culture of the psychological and social characteristics of those that join the police. I then establish the importance of police work for occupational culture and examine what Loftus (2009) calls the ‘orthodox’ social science account and identify studies of recruit socialisation that support that view. I finally consider criticisms of the ‘orthodox account’ and similarly, identify studies of recruits that support those criticisms. This discussion gives rise to a number of key questions to consider the empirical findings of my study against and I return to assess the understanding of police culture and recruit socialisation, in the conclusion of the thesis.
Imported from without or constructed from within?

The typical traits of the ‘authoritarian personality’; a concern for convention, both submission to authority and aggressive implementation of it, cynicism and anti-intellectualism resulting in an incapacity to empathise with others ((Adorno, T. Frenkel-Brunswick, E. Levinson, D.J, Nevitt Sanford, R, 1950; Ginzberg, Ginzberg, Axelrad and Herma, 1951) are all thought by some to be imported upon entry to the police and to be more prevalent amongst those entering the police than others in the population. A study by Colman and Gorman (1983) suggested that the attitudes of police recruits were more illiberal and conservative compared to a comparable control group (Colman and Gorman, 198). They concluded that, “…the police force attracts conservative and authoritarian personalities…” (Colman and Gorman, 1983, p. 1). However, this approach has been criticised on the basis that much stronger evidence exists that police officers are not motivated to join for malign reasons (rather the opposite is the case) and do not hold authoritarian attitudes any more than others in the population (Neiderhoffer, 1967; McNamara, 1967; Reiner, 1978; Raganella, 2004).

It has also often been claimed that such pernicious (at worst) or inadequate (at best) traits originate in the social groups from which police officers are drawn (Rowe, 2014, p.136). Whilst finding no evidence of authoritarianism, from data obtained largely from questionnaire completions in a survey of New York police recruits, McNamara (1967) did argue that the nature and homogeneity of recruit’s background
(young, average education, limited occupational experience and white) seemed to poorly prepare them for the legal, prestige and tactical uncertainties of police work. He writes that,

“many of the attitudes and past experiences of newly appointed recruit police officers are relevant to a discussion of the functions of recruit training… [but] that their background characteristics and attitudes at the outset of their careers in police work do not prepare the recruits…for the uncertainties of effective interpersonal skills [and] the legality of their actions”.

In particular, McNamara (1967) argued that these characteristics would not enable recruits to function autonomously, be self-directing, apply law sympathetically and be sure of the importance of their work, despite indications from others to the contrary. In their expectations and attitudes, recruits were prepared, though, for the hierarchical nature of the organisation and the low status of the police occupation. The idea that recruit social background is causally connected with police practice and culture has also been criticised and Reiner (2000) argues that, demographic characteristics…per se do not have an impact on the varying ways that police officers work. Instead Reiner (2000, p.103) argues that, “…the culture of the police depends not on individual attributes but on elements in the police function itself”. Indeed, as Fielding (1988 p.5 points out, most social scientific studies of police culture focus on the idea that, “…the work the police are given to do, and its institutional placing, largely accounts for the character of police practice”. It is these studies and perspectives that I consider below.
In modern, industrialised societies one of the principal locations of individual and group identity is derived from work. The values, attitudes and behaviours associated with it are often shared with others and communicated over time in the workplace which gives rise to what is termed ‘occupational culture’. As Riesman (1955, p.177-178) argues, “The question of the meaning of work, of how it is experienced, is primarily a cultural problem; and cultures vary enormously in the way work is interpreted in their value-scheme.” The beliefs and values about work that are acquired by those working in organisations and occupations is usually referred to as organisational or occupational culture. This has been defined as, “The deeper level of basic assumptions and beliefs that are shared by members of an organisation that operate unconsciously and define in a basic taken-for-granted fashion an organisation’s view of itself and its environment” (Schein, 1985, p.6 cited in Foster 2005, p. 221).

Police culture itself, has been defined in a number of ways that focus on a wide range of beliefs, customs and practices common to police officers that endure over time and are largely communicated informally. Loftus (2010, p.3-4) argues that, “Central to these definitions is the idea that the police hold a distinctive set of norms, beliefs, and values which determine their behaviour, both amongst themselves and operationally out on the streets”.

34
The ‘orthodox view’

The original impetus for social scientists to study police culture came from a developing concern with excessive use of force by the police and a concern for democratic citizenship rights (Loftus, 2010, p.4). This developed alongside the focus, in the social sciences, on the socially constructed nature of crime (labelling theory), thought best revealed by ethnographic research methods that allowed close contact with the police as enforcers of the law rather than with those who committed crime (McLaughlin, 2007, p.51-57). This gave rise to what Loftus (2010) calls the ‘orthodox account’ of the nature of police culture. In this view, police work as it is seen in practice, was thought to be shaped by officers at the lowest end of the police hierarchy where formal rules counted for little and the peer group powerfully transmitted informal rules that were inimical to progressive reform. Although, as McLaughlin (2007, p.50) points, “there were differences in emphasis and actual methodological approach, this body of research established that only ‘thick description’ could ‘tap that initial encounter on the streets…”

This perspective was demonstrated by numerous ethnographic studies (Banton, 1964; Cain, 1973; Holdaway, 1983) that have shown the existence of a range of distinctive features of police culture. Westley (1970), in the United States, found that police officers often resorted to violence in the belief that it was necessary to establish physical control over those who challenged their authority. Skolnick (1966) highlighted the police’s pre-occupation with danger, authority and the need for
efficiency in constructing a common police personality. Reiner (2000) describes the distinctive ‘core characteristics’ of police culture. These are; a sense of mission (the moral imperative); cynicism and pessimism; a suspicion of others (encouraged by training); isolation from those outside the police and solidarity with those inside it; political conservatism (derived from its controlling role and its employee’s social origins); machismo; racism; pragmatism. Loftus (2010, p.8-15) describes these characteristics in similar terms. Police culture prioritises the ‘pursuit of crime’, is ‘intolerant and prejudiced’, ‘suspicious and cynical’, isolated, internally solidary and conservative in outlook. The consequence of this, according to the ‘orthodox account’, is that police officers venerate some activities (crime control practices) whilst denigrating others (service related practices) (Bittner, 2005) and so, the crime control model of police work has been dominant in the culture (Johnston, 2000). This was exemplified by the now infamous statement by the then Chief of the New York Police Department Bill Bratton that, “Crime is going down in New York City, blame the police” (Bratton, 2005).

Initial training is one of the most important periods of an officer’s career with regard to the ‘transmission of police culture’ and police socialisation is thought to constitute the process by which this takes place (Bennett, 1985; Chan, 2003). Chan (2003, p.3) argues that organisational socialisation is traditionally regarded as, “…the process through which a novice learns the skills, knowledge and values necessary to become
a competent member of an organisation or occupation....” As Bennett (1984, p.47) observes,

…the attitudinal and value differences between police and citizens are due to the unique demands of the occupation. This socialization hypothesis focuses upon both the structure of the occupation and the process by which recruits drawn from the general public become experienced officers with a police “personality”.

With regard to recruit socialisation, as Chan (2003, p.4) points out, “The conventional wisdom is that as recruits become integrated into the operational (‘street cop’) culture, they adopt conservative, cynical attitudes as well as deviant practices.” They are thought to have started with high hopes but these are dashed upon contact with the ‘real’ occupation although, assuming they survive the recruit socialisation process they are, “…firmly committed to their vocation and bonded with their work mates” (Chan et al, 2003, p.3). Brown and Willis’ (1985) study of police recruits advocated support for this idea and found that once recruits started informal ‘beat’ work, hostility, conservatism and authoritarian attitudes quickly developed.

One of the earliest studies of recruit socialisation was Van Maanen’s (1973:1975) study of New York police recruits was derived from survey and field observational methods and as a participant in a recruit class. Van Maanen (1975, p.207) argues that, “…during the “breaking-in” period, the organisation may be thought to be most persuasive for the individual has few, if any, guidelines to direct his behaviour”. The findings led to the development of a trans situational framework to describe and explain the nature and consequences of the socialisation process. Van Maanen
identified a number of stages that recruits progress through were identified. The first, “entry” into the police occupation was probably motivated by intrinsic and altruistic reasons - a high esteem for the job - and was supported by friends and family. Because of the extensive, intrusive and long recruitment process, positive attitudes to the police were exhibited during this period of ‘anticipatory socialisation’. The recruit cohort was also highly homogeneous with most being relatively young, white, lower middle class, male and educated to high-school level. In the study, this homogeneity was thought to have contributed to the eventual uniformity of cultural beliefs and occupational practices. The second stage, “introduction”, occurred in the police academy where this naïve orientation was systematically stripped away with the ‘mortification of self’ and its replacement by a police-self, during the formal phase of training, in a military style training academy. This training was about attitude not skills. Recruits left the academy with their original aspirations considerably lowered. The “encounter” stage, during the field training process, was critical in shaping neophyte officer’s attitudes. As Van Maanen (1975, p.222) points out, the “…traditional feature of police work-patrolmen training patrolmen-insures continuity from class to class of police officers regardless of the content of the academy instruction”. It is the time when they are most open to learning new philosophies that will influence their police work throughout their careers. The problem of this for Van Maanen (1975, p.226) was that,

“…a one-on-one relationship such as the police apprenticeship situation leads generally to an intense, value oriented socialisation program in which the
outcome is dependent upon the affective bonds typifying the dyad. Thus the newcomer must be more concerned with satisfying the expectations of the coach than with satisfying the expectations of the organisation – although such expectations are often congruent”.

Van Maanen, 1975 referred to the stage of first exposure to ‘real police work’ ‘on the streets’, as the ‘encounter’ stage that frequently produces ‘reality shock’. This was a difficult time for recruits as the hopes they entertained for their chosen high status job faded somewhat. This forced an eventual metamorphosis where recruits internalised the features of occupational culture of their more experienced role models (Van Maanen, 1973) who showed them ‘how things are done around here” and they came to accept the motto, “lay low, hang loose and don’t expect too much”. This directed Van Maanen to develop a ‘transituational model’ where four characteristics were crucial in influencing the outcomes of socialisation. First, the degree of formality or informality of the rules and their enforcement that exist. Second, the extent to which recruits are individually or collectively processed. Third, whether it is a serial or disjunctive process and fourth, the duration in which the recruit is considered a novice. As Van Maanen (1975) argues, “Regardless whether the setting is designed consciously or unconsciously, the outcomes of the process depend upon the degree to which each feature is present or absent during the transition period”. (Van Maanen, 1975, p.226).

Niederhoffer’s (1967) study of police cynicism amongst a sample of 220 officers in New York and derived from questionnaire responses, shows that the police relied on recruitment strategies in a misguided belief that this would provide them with ‘good’
The organisation responded to external criticisms of police behaviour by imposing strict bureaucratic procedures to eliminate what they felt were unsuitable applicants. The cohort in the study was highly homogeneous and represented the organisation’s understanding of what was a ‘safe bet’. They were predominantly male, upper working and lower middle class, motivated to join for security of employment (that is strongly connected with and changes according to the prevailing labour market conditions), had average educational attainment and were fit and healthy. They were, according to Niederhoffer, “distinctly average” people. As Niederhoffer (1967, p.42) argues, “…in the important qualities he will turn out to be closer to the average, and more conforming, than ever before. No new variable will have been introduced to upset the customary pattern of the police career”. When the recruits experienced police work it constituted a ‘reality shock’ (Niederhoffer, 1967, p.51) from which they had been shielded in the academy. The formal rules of the occupation become somewhat irrelevant, a message communicated through the hidden curriculum of initial training, largely by training staff and more experienced officers who implied that formal training is not really necessary because police work can be learnt informally, ‘on the street’.

Harris’ (1973) study of formal training in a United States police academy in the 1970s, the fieldwork for which, was derived from participant observation in a class of recruit officers, found that a defensive occupational culture was encouraged. He found that initial training appeared hurried at the outset to foster, in the mind of the
‘recruit’ a sense of urgency but as the programme progressed considerable boredom set in and complaints about the irrelevance of the academy work became significant features of the programme. In contrast, time ‘in the precinct’ was seen as much more valuable (Harris, 1973. p.87). Professionalism was used as a defence from criticism rather than an attempt to underpin practice with ethical principles. He observed the rapid transformation from the recruit’s initial optimism to cynicism and defensiveness.

“…police officers perceive themselves as controllers of misconduct through the invoking of punitive sanction, rather than as legal actors within a democratic society. They conceive of themselves as skilled workers who should be free of external authorities, rather than as civil servants who are obliged to comply with the rule of law.” (Harris, 1973, pp.74-5)

Beyond the ‘orthodox’ view

However, the ‘orthodox account’ of the nature, causes and consequences of police culture has been the subject of considerable criticism. One of the criticisms of the ‘orthodox’ view is that it neither represents accurately the agency of officers nor the structural context within which they work. This critique was partly inspired by developments in social science and in criminology that took issue with labelling theory and associated ethnographic research methods (McLaughlin, 2007, p. 57-59). In relation to agency, ironically, in the ‘conventional wisdom’ whilst police culture is seen as a product of informal rules constructed by officers themselves, some argue that little agency is actually attributed to them in their acquisition of it (Fielding, 1988; Chan, 1997). All appear to take it on without choice. As Loftus (2010, p. 16) points out, the portrayal in the ‘conventional view’ is, “…too deterministic and fails to
appreciate the agency of officers in making up their own mind as to whether or not to accept the features of the culture…”

In relation to structure, the idea that officers routinely disregard formal rules in exercising their discretion and thereby determine cultural practices, fails to acknowledge the structured context in which police work exists. The structuralist critique, developed by McBarnet (1981) established the impact of the legal and political structure that allows such discretion. This may mean that officers are influenced by formal rules far more than had been portrayed in the ‘conventional view’ and that they do have an influence on police practice. However, a position that combines both agency and structure is developed by Reiner (2000, p.86) who points out that, “…legal rules are neither irrelevant to nor completely determining of police practice…”. In that respect and more generally he also argues that, “…people create their own cultures, but not under conditions of their own choosing…” As Loftus (2009, p.17) points out, ‘culturalist’ accounts emphasise the centrality of the police peer group in determining police practice, which, “overlooks the wider contextual influences that shape police thinking and practice”. By contrast a much greater connection with the wider society is made by some perspectives of police culture, which is seen to be shaped by the, “broader policing environment (Loftus, 2009, p.20, citing Chan, 1997). In this view, the institutions and social structures of the police and wider society, not the ‘low-level operatives’ become the source of police culture. As McLaughlin (2007, p. 58 quoting Galliher, 1971, p. 317) notes, “…it is
incredible to think that social scientists would believe that a highly stratified society would allow lower class or marginally middle class people such as the police to control major social policy”. Indeed, for Reiner (2010), arguing from a social democratic perspective, the police are defined by their unique capacity for the legitimate use of force in support of the prevailing social order. This draws them into conflict in maintaining a stable but unequal society. Inevitably then, in this view, police work impacts on some (disadvantaged) groups more heavily than others and so, accounts as much for its differential patterning (focused most heavily on those in vulnerable social positions) and occupational culture as, “the interactional processes of each encounter” (Reiner, 2000, p.87). Brogden,(1988), taking a Marxist perspective, contends that police culture results from its hidden systemic and structural purpose, to enforce the political ordering of society on behalf of the state.

A further problem with the ‘orthodox account’, some argue, is that little variation in police culture is acknowledged (Chan, 2003, p. 65-66) in part, because it appears to conflate police culture with patrol officer’s culture only. In this sense, it has tended to portray police culture as homogeneous and without variation (Fielding, 1988, p. 2: McLaughlin, 2007, p58). For McLaughlin (2007, p144), “The critical question is whether we are witnessing the painful birthing of the multiple police identities that can symbolise the complexity of a fractured police culture?”

The variation in orientation and style of police officers is well exemplified by a number of studies. Muir (1977) identified that officers differently negotiated the moral
and intellectual challenges of ‘street-level’ policing. Whilst all were ‘street politicians’, some were able to accept both the moral difficulty of achieving just ends by coercion and the intellectual acceptance of human suffering, better than others. The study identified the ‘avoider’ who shirks duties, the ‘ reciprocator’ who hesitates to use coercion when necessary, the ‘enforcer’ who acts rashly, and the ‘professional’, who is a ‘good police officer’ The latter is, “….able to use violence where necessary in a principled way, but is adept at establishing solutions to police problems without using coercive force wherever the opportunity exists” (Muir, 1977, p.102). Other studies found the existence of antagonism felt by ‘street cops’ in relation to ‘management cops’ (Reuss-Ianni and Ianni, 1983) and that officers engaged on mainly ‘community’ level work exhibited a softening in their approach to policing and a change in attitudes and skills (Miller, 1999). Some police cultures were considered to be very authoritarian or in some cases quite liberal (Fielding, 1991). Brodeur (1983) identified the existence of ‘high’ policing and ‘low’ policing. The former refers to what Brodeur sees as the policing of political activity that has come to dominate much of modern policing.’ Low policing’ refers to policing designed to deter people from criminality.

Studies have also found variation in whole police organisations (Wilson, 1968), between rural and urban police officers (Cain, 1973) and even between police stations sited close to one another (Foster, 1989).

The focus on variation has led to a debate concerning change in police culture. The ‘orthodox’ perspective advocated change but its analysis was pessimistic and offered
little practical help to control and modify police work (Loftus, 2009, p16). In contrast, other studies argue that changes in police culture are possible, have taken place and can be developed further (Foster, 2005; Chan, 1997). As Loftus (2009, p.20) points out, “The British policing landscape has been fundamentally transformed within recent years…” This transformation centres on the development of more progressive police leadership, the recruitment of a more culturally and educationally diverse workforce, a more prominent discourse concerning respect for diversity and the widespread practice of community policing (Loftus, 2009, p. 20).

Further changes have also taken place such as the pluralising of the police, the introduction of managerialist practices and principles and the privatisation of some police activities (Jones and Newburn, 2006, pp. 4-6; Crawford, 2007). The cause, extent and impact of these changes on police culture is much debated and there is a tension between analyses that stress change or continuity and those that stress optimism or pessimism about its consequences. In that respect, a popular understanding of current police culture argues that it has been fundamentally altered by the changing role of the police in the late modern context (Johnston, 2000). McLaughlin (2007, p.170) refers to a, “…hegemonic police culture that is now shredding itself on the unpredictable twitches and jerks of identity politics”. The so-called ‘transformation’ of policing (Reiner, 2010) argument suggests that, two developments define the change – the ‘pluralising’ of policing and the search by the public police for an appropriate function (Crawford, 2007). The cause of this, it is
suggested, is the ‘hollowing out’ of the state and the diffusion of its roles to non-state parties (Ericson and Haggerty, 1997) has also altered the police role and its associated culture. The police, in this view, is no longer distinct as an occupation with the monopoly of legitimate force and as such its culture has been transformed by its requirement to work in partnership and in networks with others.

However, the extent and dominance of change is contested and Newburn (2005) sees as much continuity as change. Loftus (2009, p.20) asks, “Is it reasonable to suppose that the stability of police culture can no longer remain dominant?” Loftus (2010, p.16) in an empirical study of an English police force, demonstrates the enduring nature of the police role despite changes in the police landscape. Indeed, some changes served to, “…reinforce the existing and pervasive crime-control mindset”. Drawing on Skolnick’s (1966) identification of common aspects of the police role - authority, danger and the requirement to appear efficient, Loftus demonstrates the continued dominance of the police role and its product, crime control orientated police occupational culture. As she remarks, “On the ground, the predicament of policing an increasingly divided world only exacerbates the cultural resources of the police” (Loftus, 2010, p.17). As Reiner (2000, p.87) argues,

“The culture of the police – the values, norms, perspectives, and craft rules that inform their conduct – is neither monolithic, universal nor unchanging…None the less, certain commonalities of the police outlook can be discerned …This is because they are rooted in constant problems which officers face in carrying out the role they are mandated to perform, Cop culture has developed as a patterned set of understandings that help officers cope with and adjust to the pressures and tensions confronting the
Finally, it has been argued that the positive benefits of police culture have been subsumed by the condemnatory tone taken by the ‘conventional view’. For Waddington (1999) most research on police culture is overly condemnatory and results from a reliance on what police say in ‘canteen’, unguarded conversation. He argues that the variation that appears to exist in police culture is reducible to two cultures. First, the ‘canteen culture’ of police talk, which constitutes, “rhetoric that gives meaning to experience and sustains occupational esteem…[and is]…a palliative not a guide to action” (Waddington, 1999, p.295) and second, the operational culture that is driven by the problems of police work. In Waddington’s view, both the canteen culture and the operational culture are to be ‘appreciated’, although not always condoned. The result of such condemnatory language, as Foster (2005) points out that, is that the idea of police culture is frequently used as a way of describing negative aspects of police behaviour and that the,

“…have…been the predominant focus of academic research which leaves the police view of their own culture, and the academic research on it, in rather polarised positions”.

Some studies of recruit socialisation demonstrate many of the issues raised above. A study by Fielding (1988b), derived from both quantitative and qualitative research, examined socialisation amongst recruits in an English police force. The results demonstrated a greater variation of outcome and complexity of process than had been hitherto acknowledged. Fielding observed that, “Police training involves brief
and highly condensed periods of classroom instruction, drill and physical training, and much longer periods of attachment to operational police shifts” (Fielding, 1988b, 59). He considered the former as formal socialisation influences and the latter as informal ones but the two very much intertwined. This study demonstrated that recruits became more pragmatic about police work and less idealistic. Their attraction to the job became more instrumental, focussed more on pay and good working conditions and came to be seen more like ‘any other job’. Attitudes to race became more problematic, evidenced by a lack of understanding of ethnic minority communities and a reliance on stereotypes. These shifts in attitudes were profound and demonstrated both the impact and limits of initial training. However, as Fielding (1988b, p.68) observes, “…convergence is not absolute…the occupational culture is not as solidary and monolithic as it has often been depicted”. In this respect, Fielding (ibid, p.9) argues that,

“We need to know how recruits experience and respond to formal socialisation and how they resolve conflicts between the procedures taught in formal socialisation and those derived from informal sources…Consequently, the formal/informal model of socialisation in occupations remains only partial unless account is taken of the mediation of these influences by individuals making their own adaptations, constructing an ‘organisational reality’ special to themselves from these various sources of influence. The research data reveals the resilience of recruits and their capacity to resist as well as embrace the influences arising from formal and informal sources”

For Fielding (ibid, p.2) alterations to formal training represented the best way to, “…influence its members’ adjustment to the police role” and he recommended it should be lengthened, that the syllabus should be widened and deepened, that the
field training should be ‘interleaved’ with it and be more formally and reliably constituted and that the pedagogy should adopt a discursive, questioning, interactive approach rather than its preferred rote practices. (Fielding, 1988b, p.73).

Chan’s (2003, p.13) study of the organisational socialisation of police recruits in New South Wales Police, Australia, focussed on a cohort over the duration of its training programme. The study confirmed the existence of some well-established features of police culture. Recruits formal initial training, “was going to have little currency on the street” and that police socialisation was, “…typically collective, formal, sequential, fixed at the academy stage and serial (where experienced members groom newcomers) at the field training stage...[and that]...Institutionalised socialization tends to encourage conformity rather than innovation” (Chan et al, 2003, p.13). However, the study also took issue with the ‘received wisdom’ (discussed above) about police socialisation and argued persuasively that it was important to acknowledge the agency of the recruit in mediating influences on them and to allow for change as well as resistance in relation to cultural values and practices. It also demonstrated how recruits were able to identify what they considered to be ‘good’ policing that often centred on equanimity in police encounters (Chan et al, 2003, p.176). She argued that occupational culture was, “much less homogeneous and much more open to change than was once assumed” (Chan, 2003, p.4). The study argued that police culture is not necessarily negative or unprofessional but is diverse and contains ‘good’ and ‘bad’ practices found in both formal and informal settings.
For Chan, this circumvents the problem detected in other presentations of the process of socialisation that the ‘good’ example set in formal training decays once recruits encounter the ‘bad’ practice found in informal training. She argues that, “How often ‘good’ and ‘bad’ models are encountered will depend on the prevailing culture of the police organisation and how training is organised” (Chan et al, 2003, p.12).

The 2003 study drew on an earlier study (Chan, 1997) that focused on both the micro-level and the wider political and socioeconomic context of police culture. The contribution of this study was to employ Bourdieu’s concept of cultural capital that stresses the way in which power is constructed and reproduced not only through economic mechanisms but also through cultural ones. Unlike some earlier studies, the wider social and political context of the police occupies a prominent place, with regard to both its resistance to and acceptance of change. The study came after considerable change in New South Wales Police because of evident racism, malpractice and corruption. She was, nevertheless, sceptical of the extent to which the police can change their cultural practices (the ‘habitus), in large part, because of the wider political context in which it sat (the ‘field of policing).

Chan recognised the importance of professionalisation but that it frequently takes place in the context of a perceived crisis and a consequent perceived need to control the police. Whilst it may be perceived by those designing and implementing reforms aimed at professionalisation to be positive, in practice it is also about establishing power both within and without occupations, can appear imposed from above and so,
may not lead to better police services. As a consequence, those lower in rank can come to see it as “irrelevant to the practice of ‘locking up crooks’ (Etter, 1992, p.22 cited in Chan, 2003, p.6). Chan recognises the desire of some that the police become a profession like law or medicine but also that this may not lead to improvements in practice. She prefers to think of professionalism as, “…high standards of practice…” (Chan, 2003, p.7). Chan (2003, p.8) asks, “How can professionalism be taught? And how can it be learned by recruits so as to be reflected in their subsequent practice? For Chan, the key issue in training is whether formal training has any lasting influence on practice. She describes the aspirations for initial training well. “Police training is one of the most direct ways available to foster police professionalism. By designing training curricula to promote professional values and ‘best practices’ among new recruits, reformers hope to bring cultural change to the occupation” (Chan, 2003, p.8). Her argument is summed up well in the quotation below,

“…it is unhelpful to think of police culture as the culprit that ‘corrupts’ practice and leads to ‘training decay’. Furthermore, it is not useful to compare formal and informal influences when trying to understand police practice. It is simpler to consider that within police organisations, recruits will encounter both ‘good’ and ‘bad’ practice models during formal instruction and in less formal occupational settings” (Chan, 2003, p.11)

Key questions

The discussion of police culture and recruit socialisation above leads to a number of key questions against which the case study in this thesis will be assessed.
• What is the relative impact of both recruit background and police work?
  Second, how do both the agency of recruits and the social structural confines of initial training manifest themselves?
• What evidence is there of both variation and homogeneity in the acquisition of cultural attitudes and practices?
• What evidence is there of both change and continuity in cultural features and the process of socialisation.
• What kind of normative positions might be taken?

I specifically return to consider these questions again, in the conclusion to the thesis and in relation to the fieldwork findings themselves.

The history and politics of initial police training reform in England and Wales

In this part of the chapter, I draw on historical, social science and policy literature to examine concerns about police recruitment and the form and function of initial training from the inception of the New Police in England and Wales (Emsley, 1991; Rawlings, 2002). Much of the literature that supports this has been written in the context of policy-related questions, in this and other national contexts (President’s Commission on Law Enforcement, 1967; Scarman, 1981; Macpherson, 1999; Chan, 1997; HMIC, 2002; Neyroud, 2011) and has identified opportunities for reform that can be and have been taken by police organisations. Something is frequently thought to have 'gone wrong' in relation to the police, the explanation and solution for
which is often thought to reside in the background characteristics of police recruits and/or the nature of their initial training itself (Punch, 1979; Scarman, 1983; Macpherson, 1998; BBC, 2003; Savage, 2007; Heslop, 2013). However, it is also important to note that, as Mather (2012) argues, over time, successive initial training programmes have not led to the outcomes desired by police forces.

In what follows, I consider the development of police recruitment and initial training in turn, over a number of historical periods. I take a sequential and chronological approach to these developments that reflects some of the themes developed by police historians and social scientists of the police. I also connect these developments with political issues that have been so important in the development of the police in England and Wales. As with the section of this chapter concerning issues of police culture, my aim here is to provide a platform for assessing the fieldwork that forms the bulk of the following thesis. I return to address these matters more specifically, in the light of the fieldwork findings, in the conclusion.

**Early years**

Early industrialisation in Britain generated considerable social complexity, prodigious inequality and a highly stratified social order. This necessitated the development of new institutions to address problems and challenges that subsequently emerged. Whilst not inevitable, the police in Britain developed to address problems of social order generated by its particular form of industrial capitalism (Reiner, 2010). As
Reiner (2000, p. 15) notes, the orthodox Peelian historical perspective of the formation and development of the ‘New Police’, in England and Wales, regards it, “…as an inevitable and unequivocally beneficent institution, a cornerstone of national pride, which had been developed by English pragmatic genius as a response to fearsome threats to social order and civilised existence.” However, this is historically contestable since the police emerged as much from conflict as it had from consensus (Storch, 1975) and was one amongst a number of options for addressing the crime and public order problems of the period.

One of the key variables in the development of the police over this period concerned the selection and employment of recruits. In the orthodox perspective it would take a particular type of person to be a police officer and Critchley (op cit, p.52) indicates that, “From the outset it was a deliberate policy to recruit men…of ordinary but honourable status”. The background of the recruit, as demonstrated by a variety of indicators of apparent respectability such as area of residence, family history, occupational background, criminal record and motivation, was seen to be paramount. Emsley (1991, p.191) argues that, “…the recruitment regulations drafted in the beginning largely governed police recruitment for the next century and a half. As Reiner (2000, p.55) points out, the, “…new police had high standards of entry drawing upon manual working class backgrounds representative of the mass of the people…”, who would join what was expected to be, a well-respected occupation. At this point, training (as a formal process) was not thought necessary. The perceived
‘respectability’ of the recruit was thought to be the causal factor in providing ‘good’ police officers.

However, the Peelian aspiration with regard to recruitment did not transpire in the way intended (Emsley, 1991; Shpayer-Makov, 2002). During its early period, the police encountered numerous concerns that the supply and quality of applicants was not ‘adequate’ (Emsley, 1991). In the nineteenth century, concerns existed that the motivation to join the police was largely for its wage and that few applied for altruistic reasons. A debate existed over whether to recruit from those with a variety of prior occupational experience, to avoid narrowness of outlook, or to select those with police-related experience such as former soldiers (Reiner, 1978). Recruits, in fact, came from much deeper and wider occupational backgrounds than was often assumed (Emsley, 1991) and not solely from the agricultural labouring class, as was hoped by some. Concerns also existed that too many former soldiers were employed, which was thought to lead to aggressive and violent policing. The aspiration to recruit ‘fit and healthy’ people also stuttered with so many presenting with illnesses common at the time and many, after appointment, were dismissed (usually for drunkenness) (Rawlings, 2002, p.180). Neryoud, (2011, p. 30) notes,

“Concerns about the pre-entry educational standards of recruits have been prevalent for at least the last ninety years, yet there remains no nationally set minimum educational criterion for recruit selection”.

During this period, a variety of strategies and practices concerning recruitment were followed, none uniformly so (Emsley, 1991; Reiner, 2000) and the police appeared to
be affected as much by wider social problems that challenged their legitimacy as by the characteristics of police recruits themselves (Emsley, 1991; Reiner, 2000). As Shpayer-Makov (1990) points out, this was, in part, because the relationship between recruit characteristics and particular features of police practice was not entirely direct or predictable.

During this early period, it was largely thought that police work could be learnt in situ, informally, by observing others and by drawing on the officer’s ‘good’ background. At the time, this practice was evidently not seen as training, per se. However, a need for some level of formal initial training was accepted early on but it was minimal and for the purposes of technical instruction and behavioural control only (Emsley, 1991 p.206). This meant that for long periods, initial training was considered to be constituted by formal initial training only and did not take place in the operational environment (Emsley, 1991; Weinberger, 1995). The approach to teaching and learning in formal training was didactic and ‘instructional’, befitting its status as ‘training’ not ‘education’ (Stanislas, 2012) where learning took place, often by rote, in a highly structured and formalised environment (Emsley, 1991). This kind of initial training was thought to reflect the hierarchical and disciplined nature of police organisations (Critchley, 1967; Emsley, 1991; Mawby, 1991; Etter, 1992; Rawlings, 2002). For much of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries its location was an ad hoc affair. Most forces had combined arrangements with other forces, although the Metropolitan Police had its own training school (Emsley, 1991). Initial training took
place away from the operational environment and its duration was short to provide a cultural shock to recruits and quickly produce the disciplined behaviour thought necessary for police work. It was also designed to satisfy the organisation’s need for ‘adequate’ manpower as quickly as possible. As Emsley (1991, p.206) writes, “… the new constable patrolled with an experienced man for about a week; he was then moved to his division and sent out on his own”. A culture of machismo, anti-intellectualism, sexism, solidarity and exclusiveness quickly developed amongst new recruits as did a trade orientated, informal way of learning police work (Emsley, 1991).

The ‘golden age’

Toward the end of the twentieth century, wider social conditions saw a greater expansion of state provision of public services to counter social inequality and the emergence and development of a relatively more consensual society. The principle that all should meet the costs of public services through progressive taxation achieved popular approval and by the end of the 1950s Britain had reached a high-point of social democracy (Reiner, 2010). Over this period, despite earlier problems, the police enjoyed a good deal of support that only gradually started to recede. Despite it being a comparatively stable and consensual society, Weinberger’s (1995) oral history of the police at this time demonstrates that even during those conditions, when concerns about the police role in relation to crime were minimal, when the police had considerable support amongst the population (its so-called ‘golden age’),
there were many perceived problems concerning the adequacy of the supply and standard of recruits.

Weinberger (1995, p.23) notes that a tradition formed that police officers should have experience beyond the police before recruitment, especially from the army. Although after the Second World War many recruits were former conscripted men not career soldiers. Rawlings (2002, p. 199) also notes a widespread practice of recruiting women as police officers during this period but this was coupled with an expectation that they would work only with, “women, children and young people”. The police were trenchantly resistant to the idea that women might police alongside men (Heidenshohn, 2005). Whilst concern existed that educational standards at recruitment were too low, they did in practice fluctuate and were higher than the norm in the wider society. In relation to motivation, Weinberger (1995, p.9) and Peacock (2010) both show that recruits joined largely because of economic hardship and that concerns existed that motivation was weak and inappropriate. Concerns were expressed that recruits were overly focussed on instrumental motivations and extrinsic rewards (security wage and financial benefits) rather than non-instrumental motivations and intrinsic rewards (its inherent interest and usefulness). Reiner (1978) demonstrates that these motivations change according to the context in which they are expressed and are not deterministically connected with ‘better’ or ‘worse’ police practice. What was problematic, as Weinberger (1995) points out, was that the qualities needed of police recruits were not clear, except for varying physical and
educational requirements. Ironically, it was only during periods of high unemployment and high wages that the, “calibre, flow and retention of recruits was considered satisfactory” (Weinberger, 1995, p.24).

Weinberger’s oral history of the police demonstrates that by the 1930s, “…everyone who joined the police had to undergo some period of formal training before being assigned to a division and station…” (Weinberger, 1995, p.27). At this time, the aim of formal initial training, as Weinberger (1997, p.28) notes, was to ‘break-in the recruits’. The culture stressed the importance of strict military style deference to authority in the training environment and adherence to legal rules and formal procedure in police work. There was though, a differentiation between military training and police training. The latter was based on self-defence not attack and drill that included hand-signalling for traffic duties and marching slowly was designed to aid a ‘sauntering’ style of foot patrol (Weinberger 1997 p. 29). As Weinberger (1995, p.29) goes on to note, “Having passed through their training period, recruits now faced the task of becoming ‘real’ policemen, over a two year probationary period in their first posting.” Evidently, that task was not considered as ‘training’. ‘Probationer’ officers were not supernumerary and could be drawn upon as an operational resource like any other officer.

From the end of the Second World War formal initial training was residential and regionalised in Central Training Schools. The isolation these Schools afforded was thought to be important in the creation of cultural bonds to the police organisation.
and way of life (Critchley, 1967; Emsley, 1991; Peacock, 2010). The formal intention was to minimise potential partisanship and bias in police work, thought to be associated with more localised training, but also to more efficiently train large numbers of officers to re-populate the police after the war (Emsley, 1991; Allard, 1997; Peacock, 2010). The centralised formal initial training system remained intact until 2006. Those that remember the Central Training Schools (Scollan, 1982) that emerged in the post-war period describe a highly militaristic culture that introduced officers to,

> “a disciplined world of marching around the training centre, classrooms laid out with rows of desks with an instructor stood at the front. Recruits stood up to speak to the instructor whether it be to ask or answer a question. Exams were held on a weekly basis and students were expected to complete a guard duty during the course” (Peacock 2010, p.89).

The syllabus was composed largely of police law (learnt by rote), procedure, military style drill and physical education to foster an image of probity and efficiency. Training reflected the legal focus of the police as ‘officers of the law’ (Zedner, 2004). Those responsible for ‘delivering’ formal initial training activities with recruits were experienced, male officers who were thought best able to maintain the disciplinary régime and instructional practices and who had the most knowledge of police work (Stanislas, 2012). Peacock (2009. p.73) shows how, at the end of the 1970s, a new approach to formal initial training, with an explicit academic research history, ‘Training by objectives ’, based on the work of Romiszowski (1970) and Mager (1962) became dominant. In this model it was thought that the identification of
specific elements of the teacher’s role would facilitate accurate measurement of their
efficacy in the initial training context. As a result, teaching and learning became more
rigid in an attempt to secure what were thought to be desirable improvements
(Peacock, 2010).

With regard to initial training after its formal element, recruits had a short field
training period coached by a Tutor Constable who was thought to be the best
available and chosen for their strong sense of the value of routine patrol work. The
other side of this aspiration implicitly recognised that it was necessary to avoid
selecting some officers that may have been cynical and liable to communicate that
cynicism to new recruits.

After field training, the beat was the centre of the probationer officer’s life and they
quickly picked up the culture of police work, which often involved, “…bending the
rules and outwitting the sergeant” (Weinberger, op. cit. p. 30). Solidarity with peers,
leisure time spent together and long hours of ‘walking the beat’ characterised this
informal training period, There also existed, at this time, a debate about whether to
make recruits supernumerary and whether to extend the duration and alter the
sequencing of formal and field training (Peacock, 2010).

However, the concerns at this time about recruitment and initial training seemed to
matter little in practice. The importance of the “flow and calibre” of recruits
(Weinberger, 1995, p.24) and their subsequent initial training was as much symbolic
as literal. Of the ‘golden age’, Weinberger (1995, op cit, p.25) writes that, “The police manpower shortage does not seem to have mattered much in practice, since society - it would appear - was largely policing itself”. What appears to have been more important in determining the public perception of the police was the wider social context, which was comparatively stable and deferential and to which, the police were extremely well adapted (Weinberger, 1995). As Reiner (2000, p.203) notes, “Police legitimation owed at least as much to the more general long-term social process of greater social integration and consensus over the century between the 1850s and the 1950s.“ But, as the wider society changed, so the ‘golden age’ receded along with its avuncular Dixonian image (Reiner, 2000), whereupon the social background of recruits and the nature of their initial training came to occupy centre stage once more. As Reiner (2000, p.10) points out, “After the 1960s a set of interrelated changes once more politicized the police, and by the 1980s political conflict raged about the direction and control of policing”.

Beyond the ‘golden age’

The political, social and economic changes of the Thatcher governments in the 1980s are associated with the privatisation of public industries, the introduction of managerialist approaches to public services and considerable social unrest. This continued into the 1990s but in the last few years of the twentieth and first decade of the twenty-first century, the New Labour government’s ‘modernisation’ of public services purported to move beyond the crude managerialism of the 1990s reforms.
The Comprehensive Spending Review in 2000 devoted much increased resources to the organisation of public services but in return for improvements in ‘performance’ (Senior, Crowther-Dowey and Long, 2007).

With regard to the police in this period, during the Conservative governments of the 1980s and 1990s concerns developed of a loss of public support for the police, fears of its purported politicisation (Reiner, 2000) and a growing concern about its costs, efficiency and effectiveness (Crawford, 2011). As the Brixton disorders dominated debates about the police in the 1980s, the inquiry by Lord Macpherson (Macpherson, 1998) into the racist murder of Stephen Lawrence dominated the late 1990s and early part of the twenty first century. Writing of the reforms of this period, Reiner (2000, p. 62) argues that, “despite the merit of these developments, they have not prevented an erosion of public confidence in police professional standards.”

By contrast with its ‘golden age’, issues about police recruitment took place against a backdrop of a more conflictual relationship between the police and communities (Weinberger, 1995; Reiner, 2000; Johnston, 2000; Senior et al, 2006; Crawford, 2008). The Brixton disorders in 1981, the subsequent report by Lord Scarman and the policies of Conservative governments came to dominate the reform of police recruitment at this time.

After the Brixton disorders, concern was expressed that police officers were recruited with pre-existing authoritarian and racist attitudes which, it was inferred, had a part to
play in those disorders. The inquiry, by Lord Scarman, suggested that strategies for identifying those attitudes amongst applicants should be developed with a view to preventing their recruitment (Scarman, 1983). Indeed, a study by Colman and Gorman (1982, p.8) that influenced the inquiry took the view that, “It seems reasonable to conclude that the police force tends to attract to it people who are more conservative and authoritarian than those of comparable socioeconomic status in other occupations.”. The veracity of this study was heavily criticised by Brown and Willis (1985) who found no greater evidence for the existence of authoritarian attitudes prior to recruitment than amongst recruits in similar occupations, that formal training (what Scarman called the “initial course”) had a liberalising impact but did find that those attitudes developed after contact with the informal training practices in the police work environment (during what Scarman called the ‘probationary period’), especially in areas where crime rates were high.

The Scarman inquiry also focussed attention on the low proportions of recruits from ethnic minority communities. Attempts were made to increase those proportions by addressing barriers to application such as the fear of alienation from communities of origin and prejudicial treatment inside the police (Scarman, 1982; Holdaway, 1991; Stone and Tuffin, 2000; McLaughlin, 2007) but progress was much slower than intended. Research also showed that ethnic minority officer experienced the police as a racist organisation and as a result, the ‘wastage rate’ was high for black officers (Holdaway and Barron, 1997), including newly recruited ones.
Other issues were important in recruitment during this period. Following changes in legislation regarding sexual discrimination, “any resistance to equal opportunities policies became increasingly difficult to justify” (Walklate, 2000, p.232). However, despite gender discrimination legislation enacted in the 1970s, Rawlings (2002, p.199) notes that, “…progress towards full equality for women in the police remained painfully slow”. Similar concerns existed in relation to recruitment of women as existed in relation to ethnic minorities. The occupation appeared unattractive to women, in large part, because of its sexist, male dominated, action-orientated culture (Heidensohn, 2005).

After the election of a Conservative government in 1979, the pay of the police was significantly improved and so, the occupation became more attractive to graduates whose numbers increased significantly at this time (Reiner, 2000, p.62). The long-standing issue of direct entry and fast-track promotion to higher ranks re-emerged at this time too, amidst concerns that the rank structure discouraged high achieving graduates from joining the police (Mawby and Wright, 2011).

As the Scarman inquiry had advocated the recruitment of more officers from ethnic minority backgrounds, the Macpherson inquiry did the same but focused more closely on retaining those officers and facilitating better their career progression (Loftus, 2009, 32). Progress on these recommendations was not entirely successful and the target for recruiting higher proportions of ethnic minority officers was dropped.
In the early part of the twenty-first century, police modernisation reforms saw the burgeoning and diversification of the workforce (the so-called ‘wider police family) and police officer numbers rose to more than 144,000 (Home Office, 2010). Attempts were made to recruit, retain and facilitate the progression of ‘hard to reach’ groups in the police (Senior et al, 2007) and the introduction of the new Police Community Support Officer role was relatively successful in increasing proportions of those from ethnic minorities in the police workforce. It provided an opportunity to ‘test out’ a police career (Johnston, 2006) but concerns existed about the educational and subsequent disciplinary standard of recruits to those roles in the first place and that recruitment to police constable rank from this source should be approached with some caution (Johnston, 2006). Older applicants were also employed in the Police Community Support Office roles (Johnston, 2006) some of whom were subsequently recruited as police officers. This was thought to be beneficial because older recruits were thought to demonstrate more sympathetic police-community relations skills.

At this time, the service erred toward a recruit assessment system using competence tests and introduced national recruitment standards in 2003 (Mawby and Wright, 2011). A national recruit assessment process was introduced, where applicants complete standardised tests, based on National Occupational Standards (Skills for Justice, 2016). Whilst apparently an effective approach to recruiting the ‘right’ applicant, it has been criticised as lacking the capacity to recognise a wide enough range of abilities and potentialities amongst applicants (White, 2006). Indeed, the
motivation for joining the police and the attitudes of recruits came under scrutiny once more with the discovery, in 2003, by an undercover journalist, of visceral but stealthy racism amongst recruits at a police training school in England (BBC, 2003; McLaughlin, 2007). Amongst many other problems with the police, the recruitment system seemed to be failing to drill down sufficiently into the backgrounds of applicants and to identify those with prior problematic attitudes and behaviours. Research by Foster (2009) confirms that this may be the way in which racism is now expressed in the police following the Macpherson inquiry, rather than the overt way in which research has demonstrated it has existed in the past (Holdaway, 1983; Holdaway and Barron, 1997).

With regard to the prior educational attainment of police recruits, in a memorandum to a Home Affairs Committee inquiry into police recruitment and training, Foster (1999) argued that the police should move to a fully national, graduate entry recruitment structure, using the Universities and Colleges Admissions Service model amidst concerns that the police were unrepresentative of the increasing proportions of those with higher educational qualifications in the community at large (HMIC, 2002; Police Review, 2009 cited in Heslop, 2013). The proportion of people aged 25-34 with a Bachelor’s degree was 47% (OECD, 2013) in 2013 and those with a Bachelor’s degree entering the police in 2011 was 30% (Neyroud, 2011). It was further suggested by Foster (citing US research by Sterling, 1974, Roberg, 1978 and Carer, Sapp and Stevens, 1989) that a link existed between graduate recruits and
officially desirable police practices and attitudes (open-mindedness, tolerance, independence and professionalism). As such, she advocated that the police should strive for, “majority graduate recruitment” (Home Affairs Select Committee, 1999, paragraph 142).

Initial training, over this period, underwent considerable reform prompted by The Brixton disorders in 1981. In Lord Scarman’s report, that heavily criticised initial training, he sought to emphasise, “…that training did not stop once officers had completed what he called “initial recruit training” (Scarman, 1983, p.130). The suspicion was that recruits were fed into the operational environment too soon, thus satisfying the police organisation’s financial concerns and the occupational culture’s need to knock the recruit ‘into shape’ quickly, according its own priorities (Peacock, 2010). This raised an important concern about the development of a malign occupational culture during initial training that reflected a wider debate about police occupational culture and its impact on police/public relations.

At this time, the pedagogy of formal initial training was criticised as ineffective in the operational context, where skills of communication and complex decision-making were thought by some as more important than simplistic rule-following (Scarman, 1983; Adlam, White, 2006). It was also argued that the syllabus was narrowly focussed on police related law and contained far too little study of society, the police role in maintaining order rather than prosecuting crime and the police relationship with ethnic minority communities (Scarman, 1983, p.130). A liberalising pressure to
widen the syllabus of formal initial training developed, to include the study of society and human psychology.

After the Scarman inquiry, following a short-lived attempt at reform, The Home Office commissioned a team of researchers at the Centre for Applied Research in Education at the University of East Anglia (CARE) (known for their progressive approach to education and training) to undertake a review of the initial training programme. As a result, a ‘case study’ and modular approach was introduced in 1989 which contained an early element of operational experience, breaks for reflection, incremental increases in operational policing responsibility and a focus on experiential learning and practical intelligence (CARE, 2016). As Wood and Tong (2009, p. 297) point out, the report by the UEA team, “…recommended training for police instructors training for instructors, flexibility on the period of probation, enhancement of the tutor constable scheme and reorganisation of responsibilities, curriculum development and assessment.” These changes during the 1980s were intended to intersperse field and classroom training. (Peacock, 2010, p.106).

Although the later elements of the programme encountered problems because probationer officers had had experience in the field and were critical of some of their training that was not in the operational environment (Peacock, 2010, p.109).

However, of the Scarman inspired reforms, Waddington (1985, p.7) argues that subjects like these tended to be taught as wholly theoretical ones and so, came to be seen by recruits as largely irrelevant. Indeed, Brogden (1988) takes a much more
circumspect view of these kind of education and training reforms, of academics that seek to be involved in their development and of the apparent professionalisation of initial training. He argues that,

“…the rigidity, the predispositions of the narrow parameters from which such material is interpreted-the hidden curricula of police studies [is] aided and abetted by a new breed of parasitic academics…Police training (at whatever level) contains a hidden curriculum, a submerged reality that denies in its priorities and in its qualitative judgements the new ecumenicalism of content” (Brogden, 1988 p.87).

“[It has]…reduced the structural features of police work to the domain of interpersonal relations…With a little verbal and physical dexterity, with a smile on the face of the beat bobby, with better ‘professional’ supervision they (tensions between the police and public) could be massaged into oblivion….The political questions…are reconstructed within an apparent scientific and professional realm and consequently politically neutered (Brogden, 1987 p. 2-3).

A national body, National Police Training, was created in the late 1980s and in the 1990s further significant change for the police and for initial training took place. The modular programme was replaced, in part, because there were those who continued to support the idea that initial training should focus more closely on the acquisition of
police legal knowledge (Peacock, 2010 p.100). Those involved in developing the modular approach, forthrightly counselled against this and warned the police not to return to the mistaken idea that 'the law provides all the answers' (Kushner, 1994).

In the 1990s, the Macpherson inquiry report recommended that diversity training be more effectively integrated into police education that did manifest itself in initial training reforms. There were also calls for a national approach to initial training, although it remained fragmented and concerns did exist that racist attitudes had been driven underground (Peacock, 2010).

The considerable increase in police recruitment in the early years of the twenty-first century (mentioned above) raised a concern that initial training resources could not cope with such large numbers (HMIC, 2002). During the New Labour governments of the late 1990s and early 2000s, a new body, Centrex was created that apparently had more independence from the Home Office but was under its watchful control via the setting of performance targets required by the Criminal Justice and Police Act 2001 (Peacock, 2010). In 2002, the report *Training Matters* (HMIC, 2002) argued that initial police training in England and Wales, as constituted, was not ‘fit for purpose’ for a number of reasons. The military style Passing-Out Parade conveyed a message that training had ended at that point, the Tutor Constable system was unreliable, recruits were separated from the communities they would be policing and the Central Training Schools were under an intolerable burden of high numbers. The Initial Police Learning and Development Programme came into operation nationally
in 2006. The call for the police to move further toward professional status picked up pace and one aspect of this was the call for the initial training programme to be established at higher education level and to take place, in part, at universities (Foster, 1999; Flanagan, 2008; Wood and Tong, 2009). As Neyroud (2005) points out, one element of the professionalisation of an occupation concerns the way in which early training takes place. In longer established and higher professions, this is usually achieved through collaboration between higher education institutions and employers and Sanders (2006) highlights the growing pressure to move some aspects of initial police training to universities.

Initial police training progressed, somewhat inexorably, to a Competence Based approach when the Probationer Training Programme superseded the modular programme in the late 1990s. At the same time, attempts were made to integrate adult learning principles (Knowles, 1990) into initial police training programmes but this was often not successful (Peace, 2006; White, 2006; Heslop, 2009; Wood and Tong, 2009). Vocationalism in initial police training has been heavily criticised for its regression to traditional practices and principles but also for its adoption of an approach to professionalism insufficiently based in ethical principles (White, 2006). It has also been criticised more broadly by Hyland (1994) and Peston (2017) who argue that a narrow understanding of competence has been incorporated into occupational training that fails to identify superior performance in work tasks or the complex ways in which humans learn. White (2006, p.399) argues that,
“the mechanistic and behavioural approaches to initial training that are now dominating initial police training, permit the service to reinforce the tendency to command and control, rather than enabling an open questioning of its intrinsic value to society and the context of values that should guide it.”

Further criticisms of the approach to initial training and suggestions for more effective professionalising reforms were offered by Foster (1999) who argues that initial training should be established at a higher education level and take place, in part, at universities. This would facilitate a number of changes. Firstly, it would allow reflective practice to counter a narrow ‘managerialist’ approach. Secondly, it would ameliorate the obsession with the ‘craft’ perspective that prevents effective professionalisation. Thirdly, it would facilitate an external provision of law and criminology to contextualise learning beyond the police environment and counter cynicism. Fourthly, it would create a need for trainers to be better qualified in teaching and learning and finally it would allow initial training to be much more closely and dynamically connected to the operational environment (Foster, 1998).

Recent developments

The election in 2010 of a government committed to ‘austerity’ politics in the aftermath of the 2008 financial crisis meant that all public services faced considerably reduced budgets (Burton, 2013). Over this period, the police, like many other public services, have had to adapt to significant cost savings that have been largely met by reductions in workforce levels (Loveday, 2015) (see Table 1). Furthermore, in 2011, riots in London and other parts of England demonstrated the considerable unrest...
that lay beneath the surface of society and specifically concerned the perceived poor relations between the police and some elements of the community (Guardian/LSE, 2011).

Because of this, moratoriums on recruitment were introduced in many police forces in England and Wales. From 2010 onward, Sigurdsson and Dhani, (2012) noted an increase in the recruitment of police officers who had been Special Constables, from 3% to 16% of all ‘joiners’. Concerns were expressed that the motivation of those recruited from the Special Constabulary may only have been to gain better access to recruitment as a regular officer and that their original motivation may not have been consistent with the community and service orientation of the Special Constabulary or those aspects of policing as a regular police officer that stress similar ideas (Gaston and Alexander, 2001; Pepper, 2014). Special Constabulary recruitment increased sharply after 2010, driven by the need to reduce labour costs, as a result of which, some forces required service in the Special Constabulary as a pre-condition of recruitment as a police officer. Pepper (2014) argues that this favours those with the resources to devote to training and duty time in order to increase their chances of success in the application and recruitment process for police officer roles and so, may restrict the diversity of those eventually recruited.

As Wood and Tong (2009, p. 297) point out, recent changes in initial training have to been seen in the context of a, “…gradual shift since 1945 that has seen police training in the UK move away from a militaristic style with a focus on drill, towards a
more reflective, public relations focused approach.” Continuing the developments that had been started after the HMIC (2002) report *Training Matters*, the review of police leadership and training by Neyroud (2011) argued that in order to further enhance professionalism universities could be accredited to provide some elements of initial training. Indeed, the process of establishing closer relationships between universities and initial police training is taking place. In particular, a new era of closer contact between universities and police forces in relation to initial training provision has developed, in part, fostered by the introduction of the Independent Police Learning and Development Programme and abolition of the regional residential training centres (McVean and Cox, 2012). Wood and Tong (2009) outline their support for university involvement in police education and training through pre-employment police education and training programmes. These can resolve the problem of ownership of student officers and raise the status of training. They also fit with the need for a more sensitive police service and for a service that can better police risk, broker knowledge and perform well. They identify and counter 3 principal objections to university involvement. The first, is that initial training constitutes, ‘training’ and not ‘education’ and so should be entirely contained in the police environment. To this they suggest that pre-employment, collaborative programmes would ameliorate this unhelpful and erroneous separation that does not exist in a binary form, in practice, in either the university or the police environment. The second, is that discipline in universities is insufficient for the police officer and is too liberal in atmosphere and thought. The response to this is that the university can
develop self-discipline away from the operational environment where the consequences of its deficiency are not so problematic. The third, is that university involvement might result in the loss of control of the deployment of student officers. To this they argue that effective learning can take place ‘on the job’ fit and ca fit with learning in the classroom too. This doesn’t solve the abstraction problem but it would be ameliorated by better resources Police Development Units.

“The only way to satisfy the learning requirements of police employees is to externalise their training and education. For initial police training this means pre-employment programmes in which the status of the student officer becomes much clearer. Without this move, changes to curriculum, the rebalancing of skills and knowledge, where student officers are taught, etc. will all have limited impact, so long as learning remains a secondary issue for those who have primary responsibility for providing it.”

However, these changes have encountered a number of problems, not least of all, a clash of both police and academic cultures (Wood and Tong, 2009; MacVean, 2012). The slow pace of effective collaboration may not only be related to the resistance of the police but also originate within university organisational and occupational cultures too, which can have a stereotypical and derogatory picture of police training and police organisations (Stanislas, 2012; MacVean, 2012). Indeed universities themselves may display some of the characteristics of police work so heavily criticised in the literature. As Bayley (2011, p.313) argues, “Universities deliver classes and hope for education in just the way police deliver patrol and hope for the prevention of crime”. Research by Heslop (2010) has shown how the university and police recruits do not mix well, culturally. The former resented the presence of
student officers in the university environment whilst the latter resented being treated as less than capable of understanding complex intellectual ideas. MacVean and Cox (2012), drawing on 3 empirical studies in police forces in England, argue that these types of collaborations yield familiar (not always ‘welcome’ ones) occupational subcultures in a new context amongst student/Special Constables and police trainers teaching in the university context. However, the evidence base for the benefits of this practice is limited (Stanislas, 2013). Collaborations appear to err toward the operational and management needs of the police side. In Australia, as Wimshurst and Ransley (2007, p.119) point out, “…the research literature is ambivalent about the relationship between university education and the ‘professionalisation’ of the policing [and that] how this translates into doing a better job of policing still remains largely unexplored. Reforms originate from upheavals in the police organisations and rely on a faith that higher education can help the reform process. Furthermore, relationships between police and HE can be adversely affected by one another’s internal politics and susceptibility to external pressures. MacVean (2012) identifies the cultural impact of 3 collaborative pre-employment programmes in English police forces. Students who wanted to or had become Special Constables and police trainers teaching in the university displayed exclusionary and solidary cultural attitudes and practices. MacVean (2012, p. 23) points out that,

“As the group developed, the negative behaviour was not challenged by other members within the group. This division between both the students and the teaching staff impacted negatively on the learning environment, creating a set of sub-cultures between student and student, students and lecturers, and lecturers and lecturers; thus, enabling members of groups to identify with as well as against each other...Thus, it is suggested that the occupational culture
of the police was in part being transferred into the university setting, albeit in a silo, bringing with it negative elements as practitioner lecturers attempted to reproduce the solidarity familiar within the police environment. As demonstrated some of the emerging culture from the partnership has the potential for negative characteristics. The relationship between police training and higher education institutions is new and in a state of transformation, and as such the culture is also subject to transformation. However, to date there is little evidence to demonstrate that the new forms of police student training have challenged the negative aspects of police culture that was expected of it.”

Whilst collaboration is more advanced in some other countries and provides useful comparisons for its development in Britain but should not be assumed to have had positive effects (Chan, 2003; Wimshurst and Ransley, 2007; Stanislas, 2012; Furuhagen, 2015).

Key questions

The discussion of the historical and political features of recruitment and initial training reform raises a number of questions against which the fieldwork that forms the basis of this case study should be assessed.

- What is the nature and impact of the social characteristics of the recruit cohort?
- What are the pedagogical and curriculum characteristics and impact?
- How is training organised and what is its impact?
• How is the debate about police professionalisation (particularly the contrast between the ‘craft’ approach and the ‘professional’ approach and the question of university involvement) manifested in the case study?

• In the lead up to and during this case study, what is the relationship between the specific political context of the police and initial training reforms themselves?

Conclusion

In this chapter, I have set out the key themes which guide the presentation and analysis of the fieldwork I undertook. In the first part of the chapter, I identified that the acquisition of police cultural values and practices through a process of socialisation and is vital for all recruits but how this takes place and what its impact is are contested in the literature. In this thesis, I want to explore the relationship between background characteristics and initial training (McNamara, 1967) in the time-bound context of the initial training programme (Bennett, 1984; Fielding, 1988a; Chan et al, 2003). I am concerned to demonstrate the way in which that takes place from the perspective of recruits themselves. I also want to explore in detail the nature of the socialisation of recruits, including the period of anticipatory socialisation (Van Maanen, 1973) and the process of resignation during initial training (Fielding, 1986).

In later parts of this chapter I focussed on the historical, political and policy context of initial training in England and Wales. I want to explore the nature of initial training in
the context of a programme created to address contemporary problems that had
high hopes for improving initial training (HMIC, 2002; Adult Learning Inspectorate,
2005; NPIA, 2009). The literature demonstrates the way in which periodic crises
regarding the police are often addressed by reforms to recruitment and initial training
training (Lusher, 1981; Scarman, 1983; Macpherson, 1998; HMIC, 2002; Heslop,
2009). These are always articulated in the specific contexts in which they arise
(Reiner, 1978; Wimshurst and Ransley, 2007). My research aims to understand the
relationship between this context, the particular programme that is the object of this
study and the experiences of the student officers undertaking it. The historical review
above, suggests that traditional practices die hard but that there frequently exist
competing practices and principles of initial training within police organisations
(Shpayer-Makov; Emsley, 1991; Peacock, 2010; Stanislas, 2012). Because of that, I
am also keen to explore the continuities that may exist, as well as change and
complexity. Issues about initial training are usually accompanied by those of
recruitment and I want to examine how those manifest themselves in the whole
context of the initial training programme. It is thought that considerable variation
exists in the exact nature of the Initial Police Learning and Development Programme
across police forces (Bryant and Bryant, 2015; Heslop, 2013). I want this study to
provide a detailed example of initial training, against which others may be compared.
Chapter 2: ‘Once a copper, always a copper’? Research methods

Introduction

This chapter outlines the rationale and key features of the research methods used in my thesis. I discuss my choice of topic, research questions, how I gained access to the research environment, conducted the research itself, the ethical difficulties negotiated and the key characteristics of the research population. However, whilst a temptation exists to present the process as straightforward, as Holdaway and Barron (1997, p27) point out, “Research is usually a messy business…and, once this is acknowledged, the real story of research can be told.”

First person accounts of social and police research have a long tradition (Whyte, 1943; Cohen, 1971; Van Maanen, 1975). This chapter is intended to be a personal account of how I went about conducting my fieldwork and to provide some explanation of the difficulties encountered and achievements made (Young and Lee, 1996). Hochschild (1979) identified ‘emotion work’ (Hochschild, 1979) that takes place during social research, which often involves researchers evoking or suppressing feelings, which can be accessed by reflecting upon what took place. This practice has emerged from the work of Young and Lee (1996) who argue that, “…the production of first person fieldwork accounts is part of the process of doing research and as such the accounts should be treated as raw data which require further reflective analysis.” I have provided some of that reflection at some points in this
chapter, particularly where it became evident that I had been inadvertently invoking and suppressing my own feelings.

Choosing a research topic

There were two principal reasons that I wanted to study police recruitment and initial training. Firstly, my occupation as a lecturer in the social sciences, teaching students, some of whom had particular interests in police work, coupled with the opportunity to complete a PhD, supported by my employer, formed the occupational motivation to undertake this project. The obvious choice of topic seemed to be police recruitment and training. I became aware that initial police training had changed and had developed stronger connections with higher education and that the future of initial police training would be connected with it (Wood and Tong, 2008; Heslop, 2009, Stanislas, 2012). In 2006 the new Initial Police Learning and Development Programme had been introduced. One of the prominent changes was the abolition of the residential element (HMIC, 2002) and its devolution to individual forces. In addition, some forces had started to align their initial training with higher education qualifications and organisations, which seemed not to be without its problems (Wood and Tong, 2008; Heslop, 2011). The new programme, in particular, was trumpeted as one that would ameliorate the effects of some of the problems of the past, in particular, the militarism of the residential element, the lack of emphasis on and geographical connection to local and community policing issues and the unreliable way in which recruits were introduced to the operational environment (HMIC, 2002;
ALI, 2005; NPIA, 2005). The reading I had done at that point, especially concerning the history of initial training (Emsley, 1991; Kushner, 1994; Weinberger, 1995; Rawling, 2002; Peacock, 2010), of reforms implemented in the 1980s and 1990s (Kushner, 1992; 1994) and my own experience made me sceptical about these claims but interested to investigate further.

Secondly, this project, for me, represented an opportunity to revisit my personal past. I joined the police service in 1978 at the ‘tender age’ of 18. At the time I thought that the police would be the answer to a lot of questions about my future. I passed the ‘stress test’ (Berg, 1990) of formal initial training (Fielding, 1988) with its rote learning of the law, parade and ‘drill’ training, strict discipline, endless role-plays and a good deal of ironing, brushing and polishing police uniform. I enjoyed the camaraderie and friendships made, particularly the military style ‘Passing-Out Parade’, attended by family and friends at the end of what we called in those days just, ‘training’. However, during my short career as a police officer, I found the patrol work (unit beat, foot and vehicle patrol) extremely tedious, despite the occasional moments of ‘sheer terror’ (Bittner, 1984; Chatterton,1979). In retrospect, the quality of professional development and supervision of my training was minimal and of a poor quality. I was, though, under some pressure to achieve results as measured by arrests made or ‘process’² initiated and I felt hesitant about the usefulness of that approach. There did not seem to be any other criteria for success as a probationer. I enjoyed the

² Reporting for minor offences such as illegal parking, vehicle license offences and some traffic offences and dealt with by the issuing of tickets and fines.
‘action’ and felt comfortable making arrests of people I felt had ‘over-stepped the mark’. However, I developed an uneasy feeling about what I was doing. I witnessed instances of police misconduct and criminality and, of course, racism, sexism and ‘classism’ (Loftus, 2010) about which I also felt extremely uncomfortable. My initial enthusiasm for ‘the job’ waned and after a conversation with my ‘Section’ inspector, decided that resignation was the best option. I resented what I thought was a petty-minded approach to discipline and I was sure the force thought I was a bit too liberal for their tastes. So, off I went to re-start my prorogued education, having not well understood what had caused my loss of motivation. Perhaps this thesis provides some answers? Nevertheless, the vividness and I think, accuracy with which I can remember those early training experiences are a testimony to their impact (Fielding, 1988; Chan et al, 2003). If that was the case for me, it was likely to be the case for student officers that participated in my research.

Orientation

In part, because of my occupational and educational background I had and continue to have a generally ‘appreciative’ disposition toward the police which I may justify on the basis that, as Waddington (1999) argues, it reflects a long tradition in social science that seeks to appreciate even the most ‘distasteful’ behaviour. I considered it valuable to carry out research on initial police training to attempt to demonstrate the complexity and the nuances that accompany it and so to move away from the often bald assertions about its inadequacy and its contribution to the problems of the
police (Waddington, 1999). When considering this project, I was aware that I supported the view that complete value neutrality in social research is not possible or desirable and that cautious value-judgements are necessary (Gouldner, 1962) but was aware of the ease with which I might be drawn into ‘taking sides’ (Hammersley, 2000).

Whilst the police are a powerful organisation and individual officers (including recruits) have the power of the whole organisation at their disposal, they are also ‘outsiders’, working on the fringe of society, between ‘conventional’ and ‘deviant’ behaviour (Hughes, 1958). As Van Maanen (1973) argues, this generates cultural features that resemble other ‘outsiders’ and brings the police, crime and deviation very close to one another. The sociological tradition from which this originates has often trumpeted the voice of the underdog and the outsider (Gouldner, 1973; Lumsden, 2013). The police can be seen as both but certainly as the latter. In this respect police recruits are doubly disadvantaged, occupying a low position in the police occupational hierarchy and a somewhat classless position in the wider society (Reiner, 1978; Weinberger, 1995). I was keen to allow all those involved in the initial training programme, particularly student officers, an opportunity to voice their own understanding of training. I was also, though, cognisant of the need to challenge the police view of their work and the organisation’s view of initial training. I was hoping to adopt a critical but supportive approach (Liebling et al, 2001) but also hope I did not
entirely, ‘become what I researched’, to paraphrase Lumsden (2013) or that being appreciative did not, “render the negative insignificant” (Cosgrove, 2010).

A longitudinal, qualitative case study

I chose to study a single cohort of student police officers, in a single police ‘force’, that was accessible and familiar to me, for the duration (24 months) of the initial training programme. This allowed me to have relatively frequent access to a small study population and to easily move around the physical space over a long duration. This, I thought, would make it possible to study the temporal changes that are very important in initial police training and those between training in and out of the operational environment (Van Maanen, 1973; Bennett, 1984; Fielding, 1988; Chan et al, 2003). As Reiner (1978, p.158) argues, “…only a longitudinal study could discern the way in which original definitions come to be altered by subsequent experiences”.

To do this, I assumed that it would be important to establish strong developmental research-based relationships with student officers and others involved in their training to provide a detailed case study (Bryman, 2012) of the new training programme. I was very keen to get close to the training environment and to the experiences of Student officers. In this sense, being present by observing training practices and allowing Student officers to articulate in speech their experiences through interviews seemed the most obvious methods to use. Although writing of an earlier context, changes that took place at the time of my research meant that
Reiner’s (1992, p.471) statement that, "There is a clear need for further research of a more qualitative kind on the experience as well as the long-term impact of recent training reforms…” was extremely apposite.

This thesis is also a case study of initial police training in one police force. The case study approach allows the researcher to gain a depth of understanding of a particular example of a social phenomenon that other, more widely based, research practices may not be able to achieve (Darke et al, 1998). In the case of Ashton Police initial training, it had the advantage of allowing the examination of very particular, often idiosyncratic, training practices in a ‘real life’ context. It also allowed a comparison to known features of other studies of similar training programmes (Heslop, 2009), although the significance of this case has revealed itself gradually as I have gone through the process of analysing the fieldwork findings (Bryman, 2012). Case study is a particularly effective method to uncover the nature of a social phenomenon that may not be well known because of its relatively recent appearance (Darke et al, 1998). This was the case with initial training reform in Ashton Police and across England and Wales broadly (Heslop, 2013). However, I also thought Ashton Police to be a typical case (Bryman, 2012. p.71) of initial training in a relatively recently changed context.

Interviews as structured and directed conversations and observations as unobtrusive as possible were my preferred ‘tools of the trade’. I hoped these methods would capture the spontaneity of the process of initial training and hearing recruits voice
their understanding of this in as unguarded a way as possible. Norris (1994) argues that the description of spontaneous talk with colleagues and the description of officers practising police work are two of the best ways to understand its ‘reality’.

In this sense, being present by observing training practices seemed important and I knew, from my own training experiences, that some elements were observed by researchers and others, which I thought might have a minimal impact on the behaviour of Student officers. I had also read John Van Maanen’s (1973) study of early police socialisation and so, thought it may be possible to observe recruits in the operational environment. Van Maanen acted in the capacity of what he called the “modified participant observer”, which for him was as an, “armed backseat observer in patrol units” (Van Maanen, 1975, p.208). I thought it best to act as a ‘police observer’, now a relatively common sight in policing (if the wording on the tabard I usually wore in the field was anything to go by). I had also read Richard Harris’ (1973) study The Police Academy and was somewhat envious that he had been able to complete the training programme himself, an impossible task for me, not only because of work commitments but also because of a much more risk-averse university environment than existed in the 1970s when Harris completed his study.

Some studies of initial police training also use interviews to provide evidence of the personal articulations of student officer’s experiences (Fielding, 1988; Holdaway and Barron, 1997; Chan et al, 2003). I had had some limited experience of undertaking semi-structured interviews in a professional research capacity in the past (Webster
and Constable, 1990) and so, felt relatively comfortable with the techniques involved, especially the need to respond to signals from the interviewee in order that topics can be pursued that become important at the time. This conversational setting was intended to have little formality and allow the direction to be controlled, to some extent, by them, as well as for me to ‘follow my nose’.

Whilst enormously important for understanding the wider picture, I did not feel confident employing quantitative techniques (Bryman, 2012). Even so, I contented myself knowing that I had the support of one of the pioneers of qualitative research practices, William Foote Whyte (1943, p. viii), when he wrote that, “…any sound generalizations must be based upon detailed knowledge of social relations.” In that sense my understanding of initial training became an idiographic one of “…the concrete…sequence of events, thought or actions” (Bachman and Schutt, 2014, p.14).

Research questions

The aim of my research was to understand the nature of initial police training, the development of police culture and the process of police socialisation, in one police force, for one cohort of student police officers in a relatively new initial training programme. From that, I developed a number of important research questions that the fieldwork focussed on.
1. What kind of personal and social characteristics do recruits have and how are they connected with initial training?

2. What is the nature of the process of organisational socialisation?

3. How do recruits acquire police occupational cultural values and practices?

4. How is the initial training programme organised and what impact does that have on the experience of initial training?

5. What evidence is there of the impact of changes to initial police training made since 2006 and the introduction of the Initial Police Learning and Development Programme?

6. How does the wider historical, political and socioeconomic context of initial training impact on the particular context that is the object of this study?

The Fieldwork

Because of the imminent suspension of initial training in June 2010, the usual literature review period and the period of negotiating access to the research environment overlapped one another considerably. Nevertheless, I felt a little reassured that Pryce (1979) deposited himself in the research environment after a
minimal review of the literature and not being certain of where it would take him, which allowed him to see the context with minimal preconceptions of it.

As Holdaway argues,

“Research is not really possible without the cooperation of the police. On the other hand, police cooperation can constrain sociological enquiry…” (Holdaway, 1989, p.59).

I negotiated research access to Ashton Police’s initial training programme, which took approximately 6 months, partly because it insisted that I went through the Non-police Personnel Vetting process to ‘level 4’ (ACPO, 2012). It also had to be agreed to, in principle, at a senior level in the force and at the force training management level. I did engage in a little selling of the importance of research on initial training, as Cosgrove (2010) describes doing, in part, through a contact already made in Ashton Police. As Holdaway and Barron (1997) point out, the process of research access to police forces is not without difficulties. Some in the force were supportive and regarded academic research as important for the organisation, but others were more concerned about what the force might get in return for access. I was very much dependent on Ashton Police for access and I needed to fit in around their organisational and operational environment. In that respect, they did steer me toward a group they felt best reflected their desired programme.

After negotiating initial access, I needed to build a group of Student officer participants for the project. I first met the whole cohort shortly before the
commencement of the Programme at what was called a ‘pre-induction’ meeting. I was able to talk with the student officers in the Police Development Unit groups, to which they had already been assigned, and explained that I was interested in studying the process of the training of student police officers over the whole length of their programme, that there was to be no connection with their individual progress and that they had a choice about whether they wanted to take part in that element of the research. In doing this, I handed the initiative in relation to participation over to them. I might have gone along more closely with the idea that this was a project that was part of the training programme whilst still stressing the de-coupling of the project from their progress in training. Chan (2003) identifies the phenomenon of ‘refusal through avoidance’. I experienced this in relation to Student officers from Division 1 who were a little ‘frosty’ from the start. I observed them in a classroom setting during the Induction period, interviewed one of their number once and conducted a brief focus group but did not get the ‘buy in’ that I had from student officers in other Divisions.

What I ended up with was a group who agreed to participate in the research over the whole programme and to take part in interviews and observations, whom I called the Research Participants Group and the Whole Cohort Group, who I had access to for limited parts of the programme. Their characteristics are detailed in Table 2 below.
Table 2. June 2010 Student officer whole cohort and Research Participants characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Whole Cohort Group</th>
<th>Research Participants Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average age:</td>
<td>26.85</td>
<td>27.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modal age:</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22 and 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age range:</td>
<td>Oldest - 47;</td>
<td>Oldest 47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40% under 22</td>
<td>36% under 22 (4 of 11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>75% under 30</td>
<td>64% under 30 (7 of 11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25% over 35</td>
<td>27% over 30 (3 of 11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Nuer:</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Force Division:</td>
<td>Division 1 = 7;</td>
<td>Division 2 = 6;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Division 3 = 7;</td>
<td>Division 3 = 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Division 2 = 6</td>
<td>Division 1 = 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender:</td>
<td>8 female (40%) 12 male (60%)</td>
<td>4 female (36.4%) 7 male (63.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Qualification Framework educational level:</td>
<td>Level 3= 17;</td>
<td>Level 3= 8;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Level 5 - 1:</td>
<td>Level 5 - 1:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Level 6 = 1;</td>
<td>Level 6 = 1;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Level 7 = 1</td>
<td>Level 7 = 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity:</td>
<td>White British = 19</td>
<td>White = 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>White non-British = 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police experience:</td>
<td>PCSO = 5</td>
<td>PCSO = 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Special Constable = 7</td>
<td>Special Constable = 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Police Staff = 1</td>
<td>Police staff = 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>None = 7</td>
<td>None = 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resignation/wastage rate (officers leaving as proportion of those joining)</td>
<td>3 = 15%</td>
<td>2 = 18%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
When the programme started, in June 2010, I began observing aspects of the Induction programme and by the end of that 2 week stage, 13 of the 20 Student officers had agreed to be interviewed and observed in the working environment. I was then able to meet Student officers outside of ‘the job’ and the training course itself. However, 2 Student officers decided, very early on in the process, not to continue. I was, however, able to get two further participants, a little later. Student officer 12, for example, took me to one side during an observation approximately 2 months into the programme and told me she wanted to take part in the research. She was experiencing some difficulties in relation to the force bureaucracy and regulations and possibly thought I needed to know about them. This officer proved to be an articulate and candid witness to many aspects of the training programme and was a welcome addition to my interviews. I was concerned, though, that her employment concerns might be the reason for her interest in the research and could skew some of my findings, as Chan (2003, p. 58) found. Student officer 12, told me about another Student officer (Student officer13) who had resigned shortly after the beginning of field training. I contacted him and this proved a welcome addition to my observations of the process of resignation. Furthermore, two Student officers dropped out of the study before initial interviews could be carried out and one after the initial interview had taken place.

What was a surprise and a frustration to me, at times, was that access, once agreed at the level of the training programme management, had to be renegotiated on a
number of occasions and at different levels. After the Induction phase, when the cohort was divided into 3 Division-based, Police Development Units, I had to negotiate access through the sergeants and trainers managing those units. Because of delays therein, I was unable to carry out any fieldwork that focussed specifically on the Community Engagement phase.

Considerable changes were made to initial training in Ashton Police. In particular, the Police Development Units were dissolved and the role of the Police Development Officer abandoned. This meant it was impossible to arrange to meet Police Development Officer/student officer pairings for observation or interview and I had to rely on the interviews of student officer’s alone, concerning the Consolidation phase of training. Chan (2003, p.52) notes the impact of organisational restructuring on delaying and disrupting field work.

The final point of negotiation for contact was with those responsible for managing operational response policing in Ashton Police. I had to do this with each of the Divisions of the force which Student officers were posted to and subsequently to each Relief that the Student officers were working for. In one Division, the Inspector was keen to corroborate (with my initial gatekeeper) that I had already negotiated access to the training programme. This was somewhat typical of those in the operational environment making it clear that they were ‘in charge’. I was also able to obtain Work-place Attachment forms for student officer observations though (See appendix 3), which proved to be very useful and as long as I had submitted this form,
was with a Student officer and was (usually) wearing a tabard, I could go almost go exactly where the Student officer went.

Once the project had been agreed, I made contact with my immediate ‘gatekeeper’, the sergeant/managing quality assurance and coordinating initial training in Ashton Police, and discussed the aims of the research. Shortly after that we met again and reviewed the Participant Information I had prepared, as well as signing the Consent forms, required by University ethics regulations (Anglia Ruskin, 2016). We established an effective relationship but I often felt our interests did not always align. Punch (1986: 12) notes that in order to conduct observations effectively, researchers need to establish relationships of trust with officers and invest time in gaining both their acceptance and an insight into their social world. As he argues,

“Far more so than with other styles of social research…the investigator engages in a close relationship during a considerable period of time with those he or she observes. This is of vital significance because the development of that relationship is subtly intertwined with both the outcome of the project and the nature of the data’ (Punch, 1986: 12).

The intention of the interviews (see Appendix 4) was to understand, in terms articulated by interviewees themselves, the nature of the training experience. I conducted interviews with Student officers and force training staff at locations that were most convenient to either myself or the interviewee, the great majority of which were at Student officer’s homes or in my office, as the latter was conveniently located. The intention was to provide some distance from the training context itself so that Student officers could feel as unconstrained as possible in what they might
say. As will become evident, two student officers, 3 and 12 were very frank and passionate in their reflections and raised a number of crucial issues regarding training. In part, the interview context became a place for them to release some tension and vent some passionately held feelings. I also got to know of the personal circumstances of most of the Student officers. For example, Student officer 7 and Student officer 4 were both extremely hospitable, agreeing to give interviews in the midst of very difficult family and personal circumstances. Because of this, I was also able to generate a wider knowledge and understanding of the Student officer’s circumstances.

The relationships between interviewer and interviewee in semi-structured interviews also contributed to the direction and focus of research. I reflected on the process of interviewing Student officers with one of my supervisory team and it became evident that my own police background had an impact on the outcomes of some interviews. For example, in interview, Student officer 8 recounted his experiences of getting into a fight during his attendance at a call concerning domestic violence. He was very proud that he had come out of the fight with a new found reputation as someone who could ‘swing a punch’ and that he had attracted some veneration from Control Room staff who could hear him swearing and getting ‘stuck in’. He had been listed in the ‘good work listings’ too. I found this fascinating and impressive, to the extent that I did not think to ask about the circumstances themselves or what precipitated this event. There had always been a nagging doubt in my mind that I had not really been
‘hard’ enough to be a ‘real’ police officer. It was all well and good to police those who were relatively unthreatening but to police those that were ‘outside the law’ was serious. It reminded me of an occasion when I and a colleague had ‘withdrawn’ or ‘run away’ from a confrontation. The reason for this was that we had been invasive in the way in which we tried to effect an arrest and tried to push past the suspect’s wife, at the front door. This caused a violent reaction from the ‘very large’ suspect and both I and my colleague instantly had the same idea; ‘get in the car and get away’. We returned with other officers later to make the arrest but with our ‘tails firmly between our legs’. All this indicated to me that I really was not comfortable with the very serious business of policing, although my colleague continued to have a long and successful career as a police officer. Student officer 8 felt comfortable telling me his story because I think he thought that I would understand his pride in what he thought was his ‘coming of age’ as a ‘real’ police officer. I did, but for more conflicted reasons than he would have known. He did also have a tendency to be candid, which provided ‘good copy’ at times and my willingness to ‘lap up’ his tales of derring-do served to spur him on. Whilst the interview revealed precious little about some aspects of the way he policed domestic violence, it did reveal something about his understanding of occupational culture (and my own). This was another example of the researcher invoking feelings in the research process (Young and Lee, 1996) and did draw me in some directions rather than others.
The interviews were largely recorded on a digital voice recording device but some were conducted using hand-written notes taken at the time. The latter occurred as a result of the failure of technology on one occasion and seemed to work well in that and subsequent interviews as the absence of a recording device seemed to relax some interviewees. Whilst they thought and talked, I wrote. It gave them a space to think without the face-to-face contact that can sometimes create too much expectancy for responses. Stanislas (2012) is sceptical of the value of asking young recruits about the impact of some aspects of training on their professional development because they do not have the experience necessary to do so. I beg to differ. Their responses may be affected by age but this, in itself, is of interest.

Interviews would usually last up to 90 minutes but some were shorter than this and some a little longer and I did gain a number of candid comments after recording was finished, when conversations would run on. Trikha (2012) found this in a study on ethnic minority officers who were more comfortable when they knew they were not being recorded, in part, because of the sensitivity of the subject being researched. I transcribed all interviews verbatim and stored them on a secure area of the University’s digital storage facilities. This was time-consuming but it did at least mean that I came to know the spoken material very well.

I conducted observations of some of the classroom activities and of operational phases of initial training, the latter with 4 Student officers, two from Division 3 and two from Division 2. I spent between 6 and 8 hours with each Student officer. All
these observations took place at varying times, on different Reliefs. I knew that I would not be able to capture, ‘first-hand’, the entire complexity of the experience of the training programme but I wanted to get as close to the Student officer’s experience of the programme as possible. As John Van Maanen (1973, p.5) writes, “While observation of the police in naturally occurring situations is difficult, lengthy and often threatening, it is imperative.”

I carried out 89 hours of observation over the course of the training programme. Some observations happened to coincide with the period of the academic year where teaching had finished and I was relatively free to carry out fieldwork but others took place in the context of my ‘normal’ working week (and weekends). I did, though, miss a considerable amount of the process and whilst I kept hearing the voice of Howard Becker telling me to collect everything possible, even that which seems irrelevant, I could not always abide by it (Becker, H., 1998).

As Van Maanen (2003, p. 55) points out,

“the activities that fill out the ethnographic curiosity represent a most uncommon adult role in virtually any social setting – hanging around, snooping, engaging in seemingly idle chitchat, note taking, asking odd (often dumb) questions, .. and so forth”.

And Conti (2010, p.8) describes maintaining a presence outside formal classroom sessions, which enables the researcher to, “observe and interact with the recruits at informal moments when they could be more candid in their interpretation and
retelling of the narratives in question”. In this sense, it was necessary to find a role which enabled me to observe some activity, ask questions, chat and sometimes participate. To that end, I did find myself taking the police fitness test during the Induction phase of the programme. In the classroom based training. I usually sat somewhere that was convenient and where my presence would be less intrusive. I often took notes during these sessions but not always. If it seemed rather intrusive I would desist but I often wondered what they thought I was writing about. In observations elsewhere, I would often find a convenient time and place to take further notes. At one of the police stations very late one night, I did find myself writing my notes in an office close to the store of police confiscated material. The pungent scent of cannabis drifted up the stairwell and across the desk I was writing at. I hope it had no impact on my powers of ‘observation’ that night.

My practice in observations was to make notes in fieldwork diaries, usually having returned to my office at the University or home, often at some ‘ungodly hour’. Whyte (1943, p. x) writes about how he developed a relatively accurate practice of remembering conversations and events that, in large part, reflected “what was actually said.” I would like to think I developed a similar practice. Although, for some details I had to ‘wrack my brains’ to remember and cannot guarantee they do not contain some inaccuracies. I did, though, get into the habit of reading and supplementing my initial notes with further recollections the following day, especially where I had first written them, bleary eyed, very late the previous night. I felt a sense
of researcher camaraderie after reading Cain (1973) who writes that, “The delighted surprise and nostalgia which visit me when re-reading my field diaries are constantly checked by dismay at what I now regard as crucial gaps in my evidence.”

During my initial observations, having expected to provide a damning critique of the pedagogy of initial training as a university lecturer, I was a little surprised to discover a far more flexible approach amongst police trainers and some considerable similarity between my own practice and theirs. There was discursive dialogue between trainers and student officers which was pleasing to observe but reminded me not to assume one had any right to claim ‘good’ practice at the expense of the other. Bayley (2011) cautions against this too, in an article entitled *Et tu brute* and provides an amusing critique of the pedagogical and organisational drawbacks of contemporary higher education.

This research project took place under the auspices of the University ethics procedures (Anglia Ruskin University, 2016) which is intended to protect the interests of all concerned in social research and to anticipate and avoid any negative impacts of research. Nevertheless, attempts to ‘get close’ to the police research environment inevitably run the risk of the researcher becoming ‘over-involved’ and of being in danger (Spano and Reisig, 2006). This can lead to the loss of distance from those in the research population, of ‘going native’ and is a well-known issue in qualitative research (Bryman, 2012). My occupational history made that risk greater and at times I felt long forgotten but quickly remembered emotions of, amongst other
things, excitement, indignation, irritation and boredom but often, a strong urge to join in’. I was aware that, as Lee (1995) points out, “…an implicit research bargain emerges, in which the field-worker plays conscript to the police officer's Marine” but that my position may have not been seen to be as helpless as other researchers. I may have needed protecting from my own instincts rather than from my subject’s. I also felt protective of some student officers, particularly when they seemed not to know where to go and what to do.

I thought I had come a long way from policing when I embarked on this project but it clearly had not left me. As a police officer, I had enjoyed some of the ‘action’ elements, which I (partially unknowingly) attempted to re-discover in my research behaviour (Young and Lee, 1996). So, whilst I nominally took the role of the observer as non-participant, cognitively, bodily and expressively (Hochschild, 1979, p.561-562), I displayed elements of the researcher as participant. On my first two field observations I felt immediately at home getting into the police van and thought nothing of the fact that both Student officers I observed were young and male and did not think to question whether their particular role on those occasions was tacitly reserved for them by their Relief supervisors. The van driver role was exactly the one I had played all those years ago, one given to young male officers who enjoyed the ‘cut and thrust’ of action orientated police encounters. An aspect of the ‘police personality’ (Skolnick, 1966) that revels in the danger, appeared to have not only run deep but also to have lasted a lifetime and on occasion, I seemed to do my best to
evoke that desired feeling (Young and Lee, 1979) and in contrast to Horn (1997) who felt she was “Not one of the boys”, at times, that is exactly how I felt.

Another example of over-involvement occurred late one evening, whilst observing student officer 1 who had made a traffic stop of a vehicle failing to display lights. I was standing with him at the roadside when he decided to do a breath test of the driver. At that point I realised I had seen the driver in the reception area of the police station earlier in the shift but the student officer had not. I was then a little concerned that student officer 1 might need to know this. So, I whispered the information ‘in his ear’, at which point, it was evident that, at that moment, my perspective was that of the police officer and less of the ‘researcher as observer’, which I plaintively justified to myself on ethical grounds. The phrase, ‘Once a copper always a copper’ immediately sprang to mind and it became clear to me that I could very quickly slip back into ‘copper mode.

At another extreme, I also experienced a little observer burnout (Spano 2005). Whilst observing student officer 4 and a very lengthy investigation at the roadside of a suspected traffic offence, described in Chapter 8, I felt a little bored and irritated. It had been a long shift and I found it difficult, at the end, to keep my focus on the student officer. Furthermore, this resembled how I sometimes felt as a police officer. These were serious and important matters but also very laborious. Risk in social research has become a greater concern for universities (Craig et al, 2000). Lee (2000) delineates ambient from situational danger. The former exists as a property of
the setting itself but the latter result from the presence of the researcher that may precipitate dangerous behaviour on behalf of those being studied. I was certainly at risk from ambient danger, as most researchers are when studying policing. The context of police work means that danger is ever-present albeit infrequent and difficult to predict (Skolnick, 1966). Situational danger is somewhat less predictable and, as I discuss below, certainly existed during my fieldwork. Lee (2000) argues that there is a danger of falling into the retelling of ‘war stories’ trap that does permeate some accounts of fieldwork. I hope I have not succumbed to that temptation.

Whilst I had complied with the University’s legal requirements regarding risk assessment and ethics applications (see Appendices, 1 and 2), the limit of this was tested during my first observation. Student officer 1, a young male officer, whom I liked and got to know quite well, when driving, certainly liked to ‘put his foot down’, not always justifiably, in my opinion, and I did wonder at the potential headlines in the local news if an accident were to occur. Not good for a contemporary university concerned with potential ‘reputational damage’.

During the same shift, I accompanied Student officer 1 on a high priority call to a suspected ‘burglary in progress’. As the Student officer got out of the car, the question passed, very fleetingly, through my mind, ‘should I follow’? Whilst student officer 1 was aware of my safety, I think he also saw me as ‘an old hand’ and expected me to follow. My two internal dialogues were mutually exclusive. One
asked about research ethics and risk but the other said, ‘Researchers need to see as much as they can to get the full picture’ and so, I was right behind him. Whilst walking around the back garden of the house in the pitch black of night, effectively participating in the search, I considered whether to get straight back into the police vehicle but decided to remain with him, a decision that proved fruitful. The search continued into the house itself, where a young mother, who made the call, was found to be in a severe state of agitation. Her children appeared to be in similar circumstances. There were so many items of clothing, toys and nappies on the floor, the Student officer and I had to pick our way carefully through it. As a researcher I thought that it was important to see the scene in that detail, despite its desperateness. I also remember thinking that this level of detail did not feature in my research ethics submission and that risk assessment strategies rarely survive first contact with the ‘real world’

The Student officer did not pursue the problem that he had found (he ‘called it in’ as ‘complete’), and at the time I assumed he had some knowledge of it I did not have. Other officers had been involved earlier that evening but I was not aware of any immediate action being taken. Student officer 1 could have taken other action and I wondered about the adequacy of both the training and of the supervision his actions were under. I also, on reflection, thought that I could have pursued with him what further policing actions might have been taken to help this family. I had been caught up in the idea that this was a call about a suspected burglary ‘in progress’, rather
than a ‘call for help’. I did not sleep too well that night and the scene stayed in my mind for some time afterwards. After reading some of what I had written in my research diaries and my acceptance of the limited actions taken by the Student officer, one of my research supervisors made the very perceptive comment that I had lost some objectivity and, I may add, a little empathy. The family needed urgent help, which I may have facilitated had I enquired further about the ongoing police actions. To my regret, I had slipped effortlessly into both ‘copper’ and ‘researcher’ mode. It subsequently crossed my mind what a significant source of stress, anxiety and risk the research process can become for the researcher. In this respect, Hochschild (1983) argues that social research should be seen as emotional labour. Lee-Treweek and Linkogle (2002) note that researchers tell ethics committees how they will manage risk to participants but less so their own welfare. Hochschild (1983) argues that

“…the emotional experience of research can turn out to be highly threatening to the self and therefore we need to think about the ways in which researchers can develop strategies to cope with this…I contend that the negative emotions of the researcher often mirror those experienced by the researched (or particular sections of the researched group).”

Christians (2011, p.66) points out that those who participate in social research are entitled to privacy and that their identity be protected but that, “watertight confidentiality has proved to be impossible”. The project complied with the terms of the Research Agreement (see Appendix 1) and I took steps to anonymise identifying features of people, organisations, places, times, dates. I assigned each Student
officer, member of training staff, Police Development Unit and Division, a number and used a pseudonym for the force itself and my anonymising system was stored securely and separately from the fieldwork findings. However, because the sample size was small and the research took place in a confined organisational context, it could be possible for identification to be made by someone with knowledge of that context.

As other researchers have done, I developed strategies for recording what I had seen, heard or felt (Ditton, 1977). I tried to avoid writing sensitive observations when it might be evident that I was doing so but I did carry with me a memory stick that contained some observations I would not have wanted others to see in their unexpurgated form. On one occasion, I had left it in one of the Headquarters offices overnight and experienced blind panic that my research access was in jeopardy. Fortunately, the memory stick was there the following day, untouched…as far as I knew. I was able to circumvent this problem by using the University’s online remote computer access that is always password protected.

I maintained research contact with members of the research cohort from Induction until 12 months after successful completion of the training Programme; 3 calendar years for some of the Student officers concerned and took place between June 2010 and June 2013. I was able to track individual Student officers throughout this period but I often felt I needed to ‘make the running’ in some cases. Busy work schedules, the inevitable changes of lifestyle and probably some realisation of the commitment
involved in the research project meant that, at times, it felt like I was chasing some
Student officers. This is a well-known difficulty with sociological research over an

Analysing the findings

Both during and after the transcription and writing up of observation notes, I reflected
on the meaning of the material I had gathered. As Holdaway and Barron (1997) did
in their study of police resigners, I read the transcripts of interviews and fieldwork
diaries to identify significant themes and would like to think I was led by the data
itself and how important issues were expressed by those involved in the fieldwork. In
that respect, I have titled some chapter sub-headings in language used by Student
officers or training staff themselves. For example, in Chapter 6, I use the aphorism
often used by officer safety trainers, ‘If in doubt give ‘em a clout’. An amusing phrase
but also one in which so much is contained concerning the way in which Ashton
Police approached training student officers in the use of force. However, I was
looking for findings that supported the questions in my research aims above and was
also influenced by the literature I was reading. My understanding of the findings from
my fieldwork fell into two broad strands. The first, addressed questions of
organisational socialisation and police culture that had a stronger underpinning in the
social science literature. The second addressed historical, political and policy
orientated issues, concerning how best to recruit and train police officers. I seemed
to more easily gravitate toward those things. This reflects Banton’s (1964; following
Lambert’s original 1971 delineation) reference to the distinction between a sociology of the police and a sociology for the police. The former studies the police within particular theoretical frameworks and can lead to suggested police reforms and the latter is research carried out for the police in order to address already identified problems of police practice or presentation (Brodeur, 2015). Chan’s (2003) study of the organisational socialisation of recruits in New South Wales Police Service addresses both issues of theory and policy in the context of the initial training programme. The chapters of my thesis mirror Ashton Police’s own programme structure but I have a chapter on the background of the recruits in my study and one on resignation. By examining initial training in this way and the process of joining and leaving, I felt better able to capture the context in which it took place within and without the programme.

**Feedback to Ashton Police**

Having re-read the Research Agreement (See Appendix1), there were contained in it some lofty ideals to engage in a process of feedback about the findings of the project to Ashton Police but this did not take place in the way intended. I did feedback informally to the training staff and had one formal meeting with the Lead trainer and the Quality Assurance Manager, a police sergeant. The words of one my supervisors, ‘You’ve got to work with them…’ rang in my ears and I saw its relevance after this meeting took place. At the point that we met I had been getting a strong impression from the fieldwork that one of the later elements of training was
particularly poorly thought of by some Student officers. Its official title was the ‘Student officer Learning and Assessment Portfolio’ whose acronym was E-SOLAP but amusingly called, by Student officers, the ‘E-SOCRAP’. I let this slip during a feedback meeting and was surprised that training staff had not heard it. I did suggest that this term may have been introduced by other training staff responsible for administering that particular element of the programme but felt a little concerned that it may get some officers ‘into trouble’. At that point I felt some sense of Relief that the stressful task of having to look so many ways during the research process had finished.

There was another reason for the attenuated relationship though. I felt, from the start of the relationship that the force was ‘lukewarm’ to its relationship with the University (and by implication to higher education more broadly). There was some prior history to this. The University had, for some time, been discussing possibilities for extending mutually beneficial relationships but they foundered because of mutual suspicion. I had hoped that aspects of initial police training might formally come into the academy on a national basis, despite my reservations, and the criticisms that I was aware of concerning this kind of development (Wimshurst and Ransley, 2007; Stanislas, 2012). Ashton Police, however, did not share that interest.
Chapter 3: A traditional programme and a problematic cohort

Introduction

In 2006 the new Initial Police Learning and Development Programme was intended to usher in a new era of police ‘learning and development’, across all police forces in England and Wales, suited to the needs of adult learners in a professional ‘learning organisation’ (NPIA, 2007). The new national programme gave police forces a very broad structure on which to plan their own iterations (Bryant and Bryant, 2015).

Accordingly, Ashton Police created its own version of this programme (see Table 3.7), which it described in the following way:

“The Department of Learning and Development is committed to providing the highest quality service to you and your new colleagues. We are developing a ‘Learning Organisation’; an environment where individuals take responsibility for their own learning and development. Our staff will help to identify where your personal efforts can help you get the very best out of the training that is provided to you…[We are]…keen to see first class training and development at the heart of policing in Ashton. It feels that the radical and innovative step forward in training will ensure professional leadership that will deliver vastly improved interpersonal skills and pay dividends for police interaction with the public” (Ashton Police. Annual Report. 2006).

In 2010, when the fieldwork for this study started, the force had been through a period of comparatively high recruitment because of national increases in the police workforce (Home Office, 2016). Initial training had been prorogued at the point at
which the cohort in this study started, which meant that the force made changes to improve the experience for student officers. As was indicated by Ashton Police Headquarters staff, the particular cohort that is the focus of this project was intended to be trained as an exemplar of those improvements (LD 1).

The new programme devolved responsibility for the provision of all elements of initial training, including formal training, to police forces (NPIA, 2007; Peacock, 2010). The programme Quality Assurance Manager’s view of this, was that the Central Training School system had made, “…it difficult for certain people to join because [they had] to go away for 12 weeks…This is better because we can broaden the pool of people we can attract into the role.…” (S.1).

The national programme

In 2002 Her Majesty’s Inspectorate of Constabulary published the document *Training Matters* which argued that ‘probationer training’, as it was known at the time, was not ‘fit for purpose’. Its formal element distanced the officer from the community, contained an inappropriate military approach, was overly biased toward the acquisition of legal knowledge and police powers and gave the impression that training had finished, when it had just started (HMIC, 2002; Sander, 2006). It also argued that field training was unreliable.
A new programme (see Table 3) of initial training replaced the existing one, resulted in the closing of the Central Training Schools (that had acted as regional training centres for force’s recruits since 1945) and the particular form of the new programme was devolved to individual forces. The phrase often used in this context was that the new Initial Police Learning and Development Programme is a ‘national programme, locally delivered’ (NPIA, 2009). It remains in place at the time of writing. Some forces chose to collaborate on some aspects of delivery with further or higher education colleges on elements of their versions of the new programme (Wood and Tong, 2008).

With regard to the pedagogical approach, as Bryant and Bryant (2015, p.161) note, “The IPLDP philosophy is to encourage police forces to adopt educational principles and practices that suit adults from all personal and educational backgrounds and with all learning styles”. The ‘learning experience’ is intended to blend operational and non-operational learning, classroom and workplace learning and involve organisations and groups outside the police (Bryant and Bryant, 2015). A variety of learning methodologies are intended to be used to facilitate a range of ‘learning styles’ and is seen as an ‘innovative’ programme, in the view of the National Policing Improvement Agency (now the College of Policing) (NPIA, 2009). The syllabus itself consists of 3 groups of modules; Induction, Operations and Legislation, Policy and Guidelines (Bryant and Bryant, 2015). In turn, these modules sit within 4 phases of initial training (see Table 3).
Table 3: Phases and syllabus content of the national Initial Police Learning and Development Programme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase 1: Induction</th>
<th>A general introduction to the organisation with training in first aid, health and safety, officer safety, ICT, race and diversity, human rights and community safety strategy.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phase 2: Community Placement</td>
<td>Training in crime and disorder reduction and a community placement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 3: Supervised patrol</td>
<td>Workplace practice supported by class based learning, dealing with simulated incidents and work based learning under supervised patrol.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 4: Independent patrol</td>
<td>Combines operational duties with independent and distance learning.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: National Policing Improvement Agency, 2007)

The pattern in which the syllabus content is delivered and so, the way in which a force may use terminology to refer to these things, may vary. However, as Bryant and Bryant (2015, p.142) note, “Police forces are expected to ensure that the entire mandatory IPLDP curriculum is taught…but can choose to structure their own training as long as they remain IPLDP-compliant.” The syllabus content is contained in 3 sets of modules called Induction, Operations and Legislation, Policy and Guidelines (See Table 4).
Table 4: Legislation, Policy and Guidelines Modules

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LPG 0</th>
<th>Underpinning legislation, policy and guidelines</th>
<th>Phases 3 and 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LPG 1</td>
<td>Underpinning legislation, policy and guidelines</td>
<td>Phase 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LPG 2</td>
<td>Underpinning legislation, policy and guidelines</td>
<td>Phase 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: Bryant and Bryant, 2015)

Table 5 Induction modules

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Induction Modules</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Underpinning</td>
<td>Ethics and values of the police service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foster</td>
<td>Equality, diversity and rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop</td>
<td>Personal knowledge and practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop</td>
<td>Relationships with colleagues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensure</td>
<td>Actions to reduce risks to health and safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assess</td>
<td>Needs of individuals, advise and support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop</td>
<td>Effective partnerships outside police</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operation</td>
<td>Information technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administer</td>
<td>First aid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use</td>
<td>Powers in fair and justified way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social, community issues, neighbourhood policing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: Bryant and Bryant, 2015)
Table 6: Operational modules

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Topic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deal with…</td>
<td>…aggressive and abusive behaviour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obtain, evaluate and submit</td>
<td>…information and intelligence to support local priorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respond to…</td>
<td>…incidents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participate in…</td>
<td>…planned operations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Search…</td>
<td>… premises</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Search…</td>
<td>… individuals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Search…</td>
<td>… vehicles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Search…</td>
<td>… open areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Search…</td>
<td>… missing person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepare, conduct, evaluate</td>
<td>… interviews (witness/victim)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepare, conduct, evaluate</td>
<td>… interviews (suspects)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrest and report</td>
<td>… suspects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escort and present…</td>
<td>… suspects to custody</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepare, present, finalise</td>
<td>… case information, evidence, investigations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: Bryant and Bryant, 2015)

From 2010, the Diploma in Policing, at Level 3 (‘A Level) in the National Qualifications Framework, was introduced. The Units of learning correspond exactly with the National Occupational Standards and achievement of them occurs “when it is confirmed that student officers have provided reliable, valid, and sufficient evidence to demonstrate…competence” (Bryant and Bryant, 2015). Each Unit
contains a series of Learning Outcomes and Assessment Criteria. Student officers are required to demonstrate sufficient knowledge and skills in all Units and assessment takes place by direct observation of practice, questioning by assessors, testimony from witnesses, written evidence and the presentations of artefacts (Bryant and Bryant, 2015). Attainment of the Diploma is usually a requirement of Confirmation as a police officer (Police Regulations, 2003).

Student officers are required to complete a series of Police Action Checklist activities, supervised by a competent assessor (usually a police officer, and personal tutor called a Police Development Officer) before they are considered able to reach Independent Patrol status. During the Independent Patrol phase, student officers also have to complete a Student Officer Learning and Development Portfolio, a document that charts the student officer’s progress toward professional competence. A Learning Diary, a form of self-assessed reflection on learning, forms part of this portfolio that is underpinned by respect for diversity, safety and ethical standards in police work. There are also periodic Learning Development Reviews that are documents that result from formal meetings with training staff about individual progress.

Underpinning the national curriculum are the National Occupational Standards (see Table 7) and employment related qualifications for the police. These are constructed and maintained by the employer-led organisation, Skills for Justice (Skills for Justice, 2016). These are intended to allow employers to understand what ‘good’
occupational performance is constituted by (Skills for Justice, 2016). There are 10 National Occupational Standards that specify the knowledge, skills and understanding needed to perform police occupational roles. (Skills for Justice, 2016). The emphasis is on whether the student officer knows how to carry out a task, “the end product” (Bryant and Bryant, 2015, p.127).

Table 7. National Occupational Standards. A constable must be able to:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NOS Number</th>
<th>NOS:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>001</td>
<td>Provide initial support to victims and witnesses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>002</td>
<td>Gather and submit information to support law enforcement objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>003</td>
<td>Provide an initial response to incidents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>004</td>
<td>Arrest, detain or report individuals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>005</td>
<td>Conduct priority and volume investigations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>006</td>
<td>Interview victims and witnesses in relation to priority and volume investigations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>007</td>
<td>Interview suspects in relation to priority and volume investigations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>008</td>
<td>Searching people in a policing context</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>009</td>
<td>Search vehicles, premises and open spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>010</td>
<td>Manage conflict in a policing context</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: NPIA, 2007)

In turn these activities are intended to be carried out demonstrating a number of Personal Qualities (see Table 8) all of which are applicable to the constable level (Skills for Justice, 2016), and constitute the role profile of a constable.
Table 8. Personal qualities of a constable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personal qualities</th>
<th>Public Service</th>
<th>Leadership</th>
<th>Professionalism</th>
<th>Decision making</th>
<th>Working with others</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Practitioner level: Constable and Police Staff</td>
<td>Serving the public</td>
<td>Openness to change</td>
<td>Service delivery</td>
<td>Professionalism</td>
<td>Decision making</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Adapted from Skills for Justice, 2016)

Police forces were encouraged to set up Police Development Units to support student officers. These are organisational entities that should be given space and resources to operate effectively within forces.

Initial training in Ashton Police

Student officers were to be prepared for working in a shift-based, ‘24/7, response policing capacity, in most cases from one of the main police stations in Ashton Police. The whole programme (see Table 9 below) was overseen by the Quality Assurance Manager, a police sergeant, who worked from the force Headquarters within the Learning and Development Department. It was her role to make adaptations to the course according to the outcomes of internal and external evaluations. She worked with the Head of Learning and Development across the force to ensure that the programme met force and national requirements.
Ashton Police had created three Police Development Units to support student officers. After the Induction phase, the whole cohort in this study was divided into three groups of between seven and eight student officers, who were then posted to one of three Units, located at each of the three Divisional headquarters police stations. The rationale for this was based mainly on the existing residence of the student officers. All of these Units were sited inside operational police stations and acted as centres for the delivery and management of all phases excluding the Independent Patrol phase, starting at Week 32, which was managed from the respective 24/7 police ‘Reliefs’. All Units contained a dedicated classroom where a police constable trainer conducted the majority of the activities during the Learning Modules phase. Each Unit was managed by a police sergeant who also acted as line-manager for student officers until the completion of the Consolidation phase at Week 32.
Table 9: The Initial Police Learning and Development Programme in Ashton Police 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase/Programme</th>
<th>Management</th>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Training staff</th>
<th>Assessment</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>National Phase</th>
<th>Comparator phase (Probationer Training Programme)</th>
<th>Type of training</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Headquarters</td>
<td>Pre-operational</td>
<td>Introduction to force organisation and to principles of 'customer service'. Attestation (Swearing of police oath and receipt of police powers)</td>
<td>2 weeks</td>
<td>Police staff and police trainer</td>
<td>Putting People First (F). Management of Police Information (S).</td>
<td>Force Headquarters (classroom)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Force Induction</td>
<td>Formal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pre-operational</td>
<td>Carry out placement in the community in which Student officer will be working</td>
<td>1 week</td>
<td>Police trainer</td>
<td>Attachment to community group and/or Neighbourhood Policing Team (F). Individual presentation (F).</td>
<td>Police Development Unit and at location of placement</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Formal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pre-operational</td>
<td>Training in and practice of personal safety, restraint and use of force techniques</td>
<td>2 weeks</td>
<td>Officer Safety Training Unit trainers</td>
<td>Assessment of the practice of techniques, of underlying principles and law (S).</td>
<td>Officer Safety Training Unit</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Training school.</td>
<td>Formal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pre-operational</td>
<td>Supervised police patrol. Completion of Police Action Checklist activities</td>
<td>11 weeks</td>
<td>Police Development Officer</td>
<td>Police Action Checklist activities (S).</td>
<td>Police Development Unit and Relief Office</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Tutor Constable attachment.</td>
<td>Field</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pre-operational</td>
<td>Independent police patrol. Gather evidence for Student officer Learning and Assessment Portfolio</td>
<td>72 weeks</td>
<td>Relief managers.</td>
<td>Electronic Student officer Learning and Assessment Portfolio (S).</td>
<td>Relief Office</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Probation</td>
<td>Informal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Consoliation</th>
<th>Operational (tutored)</th>
<th>Operational (Independent)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Police Development Unit</td>
<td>Police Development Unit</td>
<td>Relief</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase/Programme</th>
<th>Consolidation</th>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Training staff</th>
<th>Assessment</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>National Phase</th>
<th>Comparator phase (Probationer Training Programme)</th>
<th>Type of training</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Police Development Unit</td>
<td>Pre-operational</td>
<td>Introduction to force organisation and to principles of 'customer service'. Attestation (Swearing of police oath and receipt of police powers)</td>
<td>Operational (tutored)</td>
<td>Officer Safety Training Unit trainers</td>
<td>Putting People First (F). Management of Police Information (S).</td>
<td>Force Headquarters (classroom)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Force Induction</td>
<td>Formal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Police Development Unit</td>
<td>Pre-operational</td>
<td>Carry out placement in the community in which Student officer will be working</td>
<td>1 week</td>
<td>Police trainer</td>
<td>Attachment to community group and/or Neighbourhood Policing Team (F). Individual presentation (F).</td>
<td>Police Development Unit and at location of placement</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Formal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Police Development Unit</td>
<td>Pre-operational</td>
<td>Learning police related law, powers and procedures. Taking in part in simulated practice of theoretical learning.</td>
<td>14 weeks</td>
<td>Police trainer</td>
<td>Knowledge checks (S). Performance in role-plays (F).</td>
<td>Police Development Unit (classroom)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Training school.</td>
<td>Formal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Police Development Unit</td>
<td>Pre-operational</td>
<td>Training in and practice of personal safety, restraint and use of force techniques</td>
<td>2 weeks</td>
<td>Officer Safety Training Unit trainers</td>
<td>Assessment of the practice of techniques, of underlying principles and law (S).</td>
<td>Officer Safety Training Unit</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Training school.</td>
<td>Formal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Police Development Unit</td>
<td>Pre-operational</td>
<td>Supervised police patrol. Completion of Police Action Checklist activities</td>
<td>11 weeks</td>
<td>Police Development Officer</td>
<td>Police Action Checklist activities (S).</td>
<td>Police Development Unit and Relief Office</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Tutor Constable attachment.</td>
<td>Field</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Police Development Unit</td>
<td>Pre-operational</td>
<td>Independent police patrol. Gather evidence for Student officer Learning and Assessment Portfolio</td>
<td>72 weeks</td>
<td>Relief managers.</td>
<td>Electronic Student officer Learning and Assessment Portfolio (S).</td>
<td>Relief Office</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Probation</td>
<td>Informal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A new role had been created to carry out field training during the Consolidation phase, the Police Development Officer, of which there were 18 that were selected to take up their roles. Ashton Police said that,

“The creation of the PDO role represented a radical step forward in the training of new officers in Ashton.” (Ashton Police, 2006).

Trainers had all attended a standard police, national level, two week, residential programme called ‘Train the Trainers’. However, the personal teaching qualifications of the trainers varied. One Trainer had taken a further post-graduate level teaching qualification, to advance his teaching skills.

Whilst the structure of the programme in Ashton Police appeared to conform to that of the national one, it was not identical. The force’s documentation states that, “IPLDP is organised into 4 phases…In some forces these phases may be blended together or broken down into smaller parts (Ashton Police, 2007). In Ashton Police, Phase 3 of the national programme (NPIA, 2007) was separated into two distinct phases constituting “class based learning” (Learning Modules phase) and “supervised work based learning” (Consolidation phase). Each phase of the training programme (see Table 3.7) contained different features. Induction constituted the student officer’s introduction to the police organisation and to the occupation of police officer. During this period (2 weeks), a member of police staff was responsible for ‘delivering’ the customer-service programme ‘Putting People First’. Other members of the force organisation contributed to elements of the Induction
programme too. During the Community Engagement phase (1 week) student officers undertook a placement in a community organisation and training in crime and disorder reduction. Phase 3, Learning Modules, was a 12 week programme of underpinning police related learning of criminal law, police powers and procedure, based mainly in the classroom. During this phase a police officer trainer was responsible for the teaching and learning, largely of police law and procedure. This phase was bisected by a 9 day programme of officer safety training and first aid training delivered at the Officer Safety Training Unit, located separately. It was, though, included in the syllabus of the Learning Modules phase. Phase four was an 11 week programme of where the Police Development Officer and the student officer worked from the Police Development Unit but also with officers on 24/7, response police shifts, called Reliefs.
Figure 2: Ashton Police Initial Police Learning and Development Programme. Proportional duration of phases

(Source: Adapted from Ashton Police, 2010).

During the Independent Patrol phase (72 weeks) the student officer worked as part of a Relief team and compiled a document called the Student Officer Learning and Assessment Portfolio, elements of which were evidenced from police work undertaken during this phase. Upon satisfactory completion of the Portfolio, the student officer had completed the training requirements of the programme. However, they remained bound by the employment status of the ‘probationer’ constable until Confirmed in office (Police Regulations, 2003).
The Portfolio served the dual purpose of providing evidence for the recently mandated national minimum qualification, the Diploma in Policing, and providing evidence that the student officer had completed the Initial Police Learning and Development Programme itself. All recruits in Ashton Police were required to be registered as undertaking National Vocational Qualifications assessment (Ashton Police, 2007). The Diploma in Policing was awarded by a national qualifications awarding body and served as a transferable, nationally recognizable educational qualification at Level 3 in the National Qualifications Framework and was the vocational equivalent of ‘A’ Levels.

Assessment during the training programme varied according to the phase being undertaken (see Table 10). During the Learning Modules phase there were regular exams to test knowledge (Knowledge Checks) and role-plays to assess the application of classroom learning in simulated police encounters. In one Police Development Unit during this stage, there were regular tests, by rote, of memory of definitions of police law, procedures and powers. Student officers were required to write Learning Diary entries and undertake Learning Development Student Reviews over the duration of the programme.
Table 10. IPLDP Assessment process in Ashton Police

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>When?</th>
<th>How?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Police Actions Checklists</td>
<td>Phases 1-3 (of national programme structure)</td>
<td>Police Action Checklists completion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Occupational Standards</td>
<td>Phase 4 (of national programme structure)</td>
<td>Work-based assessment. Student officer Learning and Assessment Portfolio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities</td>
<td>Throughout programme</td>
<td>Learning Development Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behaviours</td>
<td>Throughout programme</td>
<td>Within all of the above</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: Ashton Police, 2007)

The force had developed a Student Charter (see Appendix, 8) which set out the student officer’s responsibilities and those of the force.

During the Independent Patrol phase, periodic Learning and Development Student Reviews took place at week 60 and week 90. Entries for these reviews were made weekly initially but monthly for the majority of the programme. Police Development Officers and other supervisors also contributed separate entries that were used as comparators to those of the student officer’s. The force also employed assessors and verifiers for the programme to assure standardisation across the various assessment activities.

The completion of the Student officer Learning and Assessment Portfolio constituted evidence for the award of the Diploma in Policing and was a requirement of the training programme and of the probationary period. Unsatisfactory progress or failure
to complete it could be used as a reason to invoke Regulation 13 of the Police Regulations (Police Regulations 2003) where student officers (called Probationer officers in the regulations) can be required to resign if their performance is considered inadequate. In addition and subject to senior officer approval, usually at week 104 and subject to ‘satisfactory’ progress, the student officer was Confirmed in post and was no longer bound by the employment status of the ‘probationer’ constable.

Ashton Police workforce and new joiners

Ashton Police is one of the smallest forces in England and Wales and its territory is largely rural. There are two small cities 30 miles from one another and many small and large villages. In 2010 it employed 1,471 officer (Sigurdsson and Dani, 2010). In 2000, 2.6% of police officers were from a Black and Minority Ethnic background. This declined to 2.1% in 2015. Ashton Police recognised it had difficulties recruiting from the Black and Minority Ethnic communities and had established the Integrated Equality Scheme in 2007 to address that. It had adopted a locally determined target of 4.65% but this had not been achieved by 2015. Indeed, it had declined to 2.1% in 2015 from 2.6% in 2010. In 2000, 13% of police officers in Ashton Police were women but in 2015 that had risen to 28.5% (See Table 11). In 2010, 27% of Special Constables and 37% of Police Community Support Officers were women. In 2010, 4.8% of Special Constables and 10% of Police Community Support Officers were from a Black and Minority Ethnic background, both higher than the comparable
proportions of police officers from that background. This compares with 8.6% of the population in the force area from a Black and Minority Ethnic background. The two major cities in the force area had non-white populations of 14.3% and 21.5% respectively. The area also had a sizeable gypsy and traveller community of approximately 6,000 people and a growing proportion of the community from white eastern European ethnic backgrounds.

Table 11. Ashton Police recruitment 2000-2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender %</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former special constables</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: Adapted from Sisson et al, 2000; Bibbi et al, 2005; Sigurdsson and Dhani, 2010; Home Office, 2015)

The importance of background

McNamara (1967) argued that because police work is characterised by uncertainty, initial training should prepare police officers to be autonomous, self-directing and “appropriately motivated”. In Chapter 1, I discussed the way in which recruit background characteristics may more or less prepare them for police work (McNamara, 1967; Van Maanen, 1975; Fielding, 1988; Chan et al, 2003). These
characteristics concern such things as age, gender, socioeconomic position, occupational background, ethnicity, education, motivation and personality. Whilst it would be a mistake to see the relationship between background and initial training in simple causal terms, these things, in combination, can affect the recruit’s ability to progress through initial training and subsequently, to work as a police officer. As McNamara (1967) suggests, they can affect the recruit’s ability to interact with members of the community, negotiate their relationship to the police organisation, respond to challenges to the legality of their actions and accept the contested status of the police occupation (McNamara, 1967). Where recruit cohorts are homogeneous, these problems can coalesce and become more widely problematic for the relationship between the police and communities. In considering the background of recruits, it is also important to remember that, as Chan (2003, p.62) notes, “Organisational socialisation does not begin at the recruit’s entry to the police force”. It is, to some degree, influenced by the ‘anticipatory socialisation’ that attunes the ‘would be’ recruit to the police occupation. The background characteristics of recruits, can advance and retard the acquisition of police culture in subsequent stages of socialisation, largely during initial training (Bennett, 1984; Fielding, 1988). Furthermore, background characteristics indicate the choices made by the organisation about the kinds of applicants they want to employ, who subsequently form the recruit cohort (Raganella and White, 2004). This allows research to comment on the relationship between those choices and the process and product of initial training programmes.
Who are the student officers? Portents of what was to come

Understanding the background of recruits can help to explain a range of developments during initial training. In what follows I explore the background characteristics of the student officers in my research. This is a complex matter and in order to address it, I examine the key findings from my fieldwork that concern the characteristics of student officers in the Whole Cohort Group and the personal biographies of those in the Research Participants Group (see Chapter 2 for a discussion of the constitution of these groups).

Of the Whole Cohort Group in my study, most were under 27, male, white and educated to Level 3 in the National Qualifications Framework (‘A’ Level equivalent). As Table 12 indicates, the average age of the whole cohort was 26.85 but one student officer was considerably older than the rest (a female, former Police Community Support Officer). Excluding that officer brings the average age down to 25. However, 9 of the 20 student officers were under 22 at recruitment and 15 were under 30. The average age of the Participants Group (see Table 13) was a little higher at 27.5 and 7 of the 11 were under 30.
Table 12. Whole cohort statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cohort number</th>
<th>Age. (Average)</th>
<th>Gender: (Male/female)</th>
<th>Ethnicity. (White British/other)</th>
<th>Educational qualification. (Level 3/Above Level 3)</th>
<th>Occupational background. (Prior Police Experience/No prior police experience)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>26.85</td>
<td>12/8</td>
<td>19/1</td>
<td>17/3</td>
<td>13/7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Three student officers had higher education qualifications, one of whom had a Foundation Degree (SO.2) (equivalent to the second year of a Bachelor’s degree), another had a Bachelor’s degree (SO.3) and the third, a Master’s degree (SO.12). In the Participants Group (see Table 13), 73% had a highest qualification at Level 3, 8 of the total 11 student officers. All those with higher education qualifications were in the Participants Group as well. Table 13 shows that of the Whole Cohort Group in this study, there were no non-white ethnic minority officers, although, one student officer was a white citizen of a European country and another was a white-British citizen but born elsewhere. Table 13 also indicates that there were no ethnic minority student officers amongst the Participants Group. All student officers, in the Participants Group, lived locally and many had spent most, if not all of their lives living locally. A particularly striking feature of the student officers in my study was the prevalence of prior police occupational experience, much of which was in Ashton Police itself. Table 13 also indicates that most of the Participants Group had already
worked as Special Constables, Police Community Support Officers or members of police staff. 9 of the 11 in the Participants Group had worked in a policing capacity in Ashton Police itself. 5 of the 11 student officers in the Participants Group had been Special Constables.

Table 13. Research Participants Group individual characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Researcher assigned number (anonymised)</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Highest Educational Qualification</th>
<th>Prior police experience Yes/No</th>
<th>Living locally Yes/No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 (R)</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 (R)</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As soon as the June 2010 cohort began their training, I conducted interviews with student officers in the Participants Group (see Appendix 3) for individual student officer biographies) which focussed on their personal biographies and motivations for joining the police. It should be remembered that these took place after the start of the programme and I came to be very aware of Reiner’s (1978, p.158) reminder that, “Retrospectively recalled reasons, even if offered in all sincerity, are influenced to an unknowable extent by redefinitions developed during the experience of work itself…[and that] the reasons people articulate for their ‘choice’ of occupation are not a complete or adequate account of why they actually entered it…”

‘Special constables are only...part of NPT’

Some student officers had become well-tuned to the internal occupational hierarchy, having already worked in the police environment. Joining as a regular officer appeared as a promotion and a ‘step up’ for some. Student officer 10 had experienced this phenomena very ‘close to home’. He joined the force’s Special Constabulary, where he met his wife and they subsequently applied to join the police as ‘regulars’ at the same time. She was accepted but he was rejected. He said, “It knocked my confidence…Ok, I’m doing it for free as a Special Constable but they don’t want to pay me to do it. Why not? I could never get it out of my mind…I was at

---

3 At the time of the research Neighbourhood Policing Teams were a separate organisational entity from ‘reactive policing’. Their remit was to tackle a wide range of long-term policing issues, including crime-related ones but also wider community related issues such as the fear of crime, police visibility and police/community relationships.
the point, ready to hand back my warrant card…” (SO.10). Despite this, his parents and wife encouraged him to continue and despite his reluctance he got back into the ‘Specials’ work, which he did for the ensuing 15 years. At that point he re-applied to join as a ‘regular’ again and was very conscious that should he be unsuccessful he would have seen himself as a complete failure. He was waiting with ‘baited breath’ to hear if he was successful and once accepted, resigned as a Special Constable immediately, in order not to jeopardise his training place should he receive a police complaint.

Student officer 3 was also well-tuned to the internal occupational hierarchy and had achieved his goal of ‘promotion’ out of the ranks of Police Community Support Officers, whom he thought were “hated” by ‘regulars’, as he put it.

Student officer 7 had become a little bored and disillusioned with the lack of power associated with the role of Police Community Support Officer and when encouraged to apply to join as a regular by a colleague realised the opportunity to “do more” (as she put it) as a police officer and applied to Ashton Police. She wanted to do more particularly for those suffering from domestic violence. In her view, this required the acquisition of police powers of arrest and investigation.

Student officer 12 had made it her business, as a Special Constable, to seek out the ‘higher status’ work of ‘reactive’ policing, when she had shoe-horned herself onto a
‘reactive’ Relief, much to the annoyance of her Special Constabulary Inspector. She said,

“I wanted to go and play police officers and so...by basically misbehaving myself, that’s how I did it...and I loved it. It was the best thing I’d done and I suddenly found what I thought I’d find when I was 18 or 19 and would just turn up...So, they opened up recruitment and I went “right!” and I applied.”

The examples above demonstrate the variation in the way that student officers with prior police experience understood the police role and their motivation for becoming a police officer that might be regarded as more or less desirable. Pepper (2014) found that the Special Constabulary, whilst having experienced a process of professionalization recently, has a history of low status and poor recognition within the police occupational environment and that latterly, many Special Constables joined only so that they might improve their chances of success in application to be ‘regular’ police officers. This does not demonstrate what the police service and individual forces might consider ‘ideal’ motivation to join the police. The commitment to the Peelian principle of maintaining tranquillity appeared less prominent than the crime-control and status motivations. The low internal status of non-police officer occupations within the police workforce is noted by Gaston and Alexander (2002), Berry (1998) and by Johnston (2006). Cosgrove (2016) found that some Police Community Support Officers had quickly prioritised a conventional crime-control concept of policing that mirrored aspects of existing police culture. Furthermore, many PCSOs had been involved in reactive police work because of so-called mission-creep and the performance requirements of police forces (Cosgrove, 2014).
Some were ‘wanna be’ police officers and exhibited some of the features of police culture that place crime control on a higher level than community-orientated approaches to police work. It should also be noted that such a crime control orientation is prevalent in wider culture and underpins official definitions of the role of the police.

‘You went to uni…and now that doesn’t matter’:

Some student officers were very aware that particular educational qualifications were not needed to join the police. Student officer 6, a former Special Constable, went on to university after getting better than expected A Level results but left shortly after. He had not really enjoyed education until that point and felt no strong motivation to study for a Bachelor’s degree but conversely felt very motivated to join the police. He joined the Special Constabulary after leaving university, with the intention of applying to join the police as a ‘regular’ as soon as possible. He was quite sensitive to and defensive about the value of higher education and occupational success. He asserted that, once the idea of a career in the police had formed, it seemed superfluous to study further, despite the protestations of his mother. He commented that,

“I decided to go to University. Did English Literature there but I didn’t like it at all. I left within two months. Just didn’t really have much desire to do it really. It seemed just like, to me it was just wasting three years…because I was, from a very early age eager to get into the police force” (SO.6).
His sensitivity to the perceived snobbery associated with higher education was evident as he developed a critical view of what he saw as the accepted route into a ‘good’ job.

“...it was seen as the kind of thing you had to do. You went to ‘A’ levels and you went to uni and you got your degree coz that’s how you got a decent job and now that doesn’t matter...I think it’s maybe changed now because of the recession but it was seen as the kind of thing you had to do” (SO.6).

He felt vindicated in his view, citing some friends who had graduated but could not find jobs at that level. Indeed, he thought he had been labouring under a false impression that the police would look more favourably upon him as a graduate and was hoping to graduate and go on to an accelerated promotion scheme in the police. However, he had come to believe, during his time as a Special Constable that the police did not give particular priority to higher education and that he could achieve success despite and perhaps even because he did not have a higher education qualification. He said that,

“...I didn’t know much about the police, I thought that if I went to uni and got a degree they’re gonna look at me and go, “oh! In you come” kind of thing. But that was not how it works.....I thought that if they see me with a degree they’ll want to put me on some sort of ‘fast-track’ programme. But at that stage I’d had no real input by the police. So, I didn’t really know that much about it” (SO.6).

Student officer 3, had completed a law degree, after working as a Police Community Support Officer, hoping that it might confer some advantage on him but whilst also aware that it was not a pre-condition of entry and may not benefit him in the way he
hoped. He was very aware that a meteoric rise up the ranks or diversification into ‘high status’ police work may not come about but in case it did, he wanted to possess some educational ‘ammunition’ to better achieve his goals.

For student officer 1, a young student officer without direct police occupational experience, there was a good deal of family experience of higher education but he had not wanted to go to university after completing ‘A’ levels at a local sixth form college. There was a strong competitive culture of educational and occupational aspiration in the city in which he lived and in this college, in particular. In the city there was a clear divide where the perceived ‘clever’ pupils were selected for one college, that had a reputation as a ‘hot house’ for elite university entrance, and the ‘less clever’ were taken by the other college. Expectations in the former college of eventual occupational success in the ‘higher professions’ ran high. Whilst he applied to and was selected for the former college he did not have a good experience. He thought there was a pressurised and ‘snobbish’ approach to the educational and occupational development of its students. He knew that the police, as an occupational choice, would certainly have taken second-place in the view of those at his former college, particularly compared to higher professional occupations such as medicine and law. He said,

“I didn’t get along with them very well... I didn’t get along with their mentality so I didn’t come out with great marks from there. I didn’t go to Uni, as I wasn’t sure what I wanted to do...At that point I was still reeling a bit from [my college experience]. I wasn’t quite sure what I was going to do” (SO.1).
He worked in ‘stop-gap’ jobs, in service related work and after a year decided to apply to the local police, so that he could remain living and working in the local area. He had talked to a friend’s father who was in the police about how officers were treated and asked him if it was it a ‘good’ career, the answers to which had reassured him of its stability and good status. Student officer 1 was also keen that he was entering an occupation that would provide promotion and professional development opportunities and that it would be well organised and proactive in encouraging that amongst its officers. He was a quietly spoken and focussed person, not given to demonstrativeness, and had a well-developed sense of what he wanted from his career in the police.

The existence of a culture in the police that is sceptical or sometimes hostile to academic education is well-known (Niederhoffer, 1967; Ericson, 1982; Harris, 1973; Canter, 2004; Punch, 2007, Neyroud, 2011). Brewer and Magee (1991) identified an ‘anti-intellectualism in the Royal Ulster Constabulary (now the Police Service of Northern Ireland). Harris (1973 p. 16-17), in the USA, notes the comment of a recruit who said that, “police work was the best place to be if you don’t have a college degree”. For those that do join with university qualifications and with expectations that they will be of some benefit to their career aspirations, the consequences of this not being the case can be pernicious. Gau (2013) in the USA, found that officers with a ‘four year degree’ were less satisfied in their job and resentful of their comparative
lowly position. Paoline et al (2015), also in the USA, asks what the purpose of having such qualifications is, if they are not formally required.

The misgivings that exist amongst police officers generally and in this study, about the value of education in police work, are features of a strong pragmatic culture that, as Reiner (2000, p. 101) points out, “…has made them reluctant to contemplate innovation, experimentation, or research. However, Reiner (2000) is also cautiously optimistic that the recent growth in “practice oriented research” and political changes that require research to inform changes in police practice will have a positive impact. Improving the links between higher education and policing has been advocated at a high level in British policing as has requiring that recruits have better educational qualifications on entry (Neyroud, 2011). Watson and Robinson (2003, p.) argue that, “As the population as a whole becomes more educated, the service must be seen to be an organisation comprising intelligent and talented individuals if it is to command respect”. Nevertheless, there remains a perception, in some quarters, that educational qualifications are not important in policing (Watson and Robinson, 2003; Tong and Wood, 2009), a perception reflected in the views of some student officers in this study.

‘...an application form is like a golden ticket for the chocolate factory...’

Some student officers in this cohort felt that the slow-moving and sometimes pedantic bureaucracy of the force, the large number of competitor applicants and the
stop/start approach to training taken by the force at this time, served to make them feel ‘on the edge of their seats’ until the offer of a training place came through. They became very keen to take up the earliest opportunity to join. This served to further reinforce the perception that the applicant was subordinate to the police organisation and some of them appeared to have joined by sheer force of will and longevity in the recruitment process.

Student officer 12 expressed feeling overly controlled by the force’s requirements, which developed into a suspicion of the motives of the force’s Human Resources department. Her application went perfectly until she was offered a training place that conflicted with a carefully planned and extensive travel holiday. She had thought that she would be moved onto the next available place but said that, “You’ve probably had other people tell you how dreadful their experiences of getting in through occupational health and HR was and mine was pretty shocking” (SO.12).

This centred on a disputed medical condition and she suspected that the force saw an opportunity to get an older candidate out, in favour of a younger one. She was extremely suspicious of their motives that was further exacerbated when the force tried to move her start date further and further back. She said that she became absolutely furious with Human Resources and that her case had been referred to more senior staff but that after what seemed a “massive trauma”, she eventually got a start date for the training programme. In part, because of this, she had come to
understand police officers as of a higher status than police staff. She expressed her opinion of this process well.

“Everybody on my intake that I’ve talked to has got an HR or Occupational Health horror story and it’s shocking because people who want to join the police force are very driven people because you have to be. You know, because you go through so much. I mean, just getting your hands on an application form is like a golden ticket for the chocolate factory isn’t it?... they had been telling (another applicant) all about my trials and tribulations to get in, which is shocking. You know, “oh, there’s this woman who’s trying to get in but if she doesn’t get in you can have her place.” That’s awful. I mean, absolutely dreadful but I was lucky in that I’d been a Special and I knew that the HR department was not reflective of the job. You know, they were civilian police staff and I wasn’t applying to be civilian police staff. I was applying to be a police officer and I wasn’t gonna give up so I didn’t and I got in but……” (SO.12).

There is evidence here, of substantial cynicism about the role of police staff, police management and the bureaucracy of the organisation. This accords with Fielding (1988b) who found the idea that police management was ‘out of touch’ with other ranks developed after a year but that recruits that had experience of similar occupations to police work developed a less idealistic understanding of the police organisation more quickly than other recruits.

Student officer 3, a graduate, indicated that he had joined at the time he had because it suited Ashton Police rather than himself. In fact, it had rankled with him that he had not been able to maintain an important personal relationship because he felt he had to choose between the police training place and the relationship. The process of application and being offered a training place reinforced a feeling of subordination to the police bureaucracy, before joining.
Somewhat ominously, Alain and Gregoire (2008) found that the competition for places may convince recruits that because they are successful getting in that they will be successful in employment. As that study points out, 75% of posts in police organisations in Quebec were at a lower level and most recruits would remain there throughout their careers.

‘It was helping people’

Some student officers said that they joined Ashton Police, at least in part, to ‘help’ others. However, student officers 4 and 11, both young and female and without prior police experience were already a little hesitant in expressing this motivation. They said that they were thought by some of their peers who had a policing background to be ‘idealistic’ and that this was seen as a negative not a positive trait. They were clearly a little embarrassed and immediately mocked or checked themselves when expressing such motivations for joining.

Student officer 4 said,

“It’s the massive cliché…something I’d always thought I wanted to do…I felt that being part of the police, it was helping people…doing something for the community. I always, even up until we joined…If I saw a police person I’d be… really interested, really respectful and kind of really appreciative of what they do and the knowledge they have, even though I didn’t know too much about it…Different aspects, I guess. The excitement of the role but also the more tragic side of the role…There’s also the human side to it as well and you could be going round to someone’s house and telling them that whoever has just died and that sort of thing”. (SO.4).
In a similar way student officer 11 said that she was impressed, from a young age, by the female role-model of the police officer (someone in uniform who was kind, caring and friendly) but mocked her own desire as a young child to be a ‘police lady’ (as she put it), who was there to ‘help others’, but never thought she had the confidence to do it. The nature and validity of the motivation to ‘help’ appeared to be tinged with hesitancy from the outset of the programme.

Student officers 4 and 11 were very aware that they were new to the police organisation and that there were those in the student officer cohort (with prior experience of the police occupational environment) who derided the sentiments they expressed. They knew also that they may be expected to accommodate another way of seeing the role of being a police officer which, in the view of some their peers, was to ‘hinder’ (a word often used) not to ‘help’. There was no mistaking the pressure these two student officers felt under, to ‘wise up’ and accept the idea that, in the view of some student officers, their naïve ideals could not be realised. The age, gender and occupational background of student officers 4 and 11 appeared to conspire to make it a taxing beginning to their police careers.

Not all student officers were quite so embarrassed, apologetic or compromised by their desire to ‘help’ and provide a service to others. Older officers spoke more confidently about the importance of the ‘helping’ dimension of police work. Student officer 10 was aware that, having worked in the retail sector of the economy for a long time after leaving school, he had become attuned to the need to try to ensure
customers were happy and said that he had developed good oral communication skills and a willingness to ‘help’. He was comfortable with the concept and did not see it as incompatible with other aspects of police work.

Student officer 7, who was considerably older than all the other student officers in the cohort, argued that the motivation to provide a ‘good service’ to local communities as a Police Community Support Officer remained with her when she applied to be a police officer. Becoming a police officer allowed her the opportunity to move into a specialist Domestic Violence Unit that she could not otherwise do and she was committed to making a valuable contribution to improve the service police give to domestic violence victims. This student officer also brought with her some elements of distinct service orientated occupational values derived from her work as a Police Community Support Officer.

A number of points of interest arise in considering the way in which the concept of ‘help’ in police work was expressed by student officers in my research. Firstly, whilst the ‘helping’ motivation is a commonly cited one (Foley et al, 2008), what is of note is the way in which the concepts of ‘helping’ and ‘hindering’ were juxtaposed in the minds of some student officers in my research. There has long existed, a tension surrounding the concept that the police ‘help’ others and provide a ‘service’ to them (Stevens and Becker, 1994). Using force against others, is often seen to be in opposition to the service dimension. However, it is entirely possible to regard force as “all part of the service” (Stevens and Becker, 1994; Reiner, 2000). What is
problematic for the police, argues Bittner (2005), is that they regularly ridicule their service function, despite spending most of their time doing it. Punch (1979) referred to the police as the ‘secret social service’ an epithet not liked by police officers themselves. The attempt to embed ideas of 'customer service' in policing which has traditionally referred to those to whom it ‘delivered’ its services as ‘scrotes’ and ‘scumbags’ is problematic for that reason (Clarke et al, 2007 p.56; Westmarland, 2010). It is not easy to recognise and accommodate to the dilemma for police officers that they are, “as likely to be put upon for being too nice as for being too harsh” (Hughes, 1961, p.8).

Secondly, whilst it may be thought that the longer the recruit progresses through training the more that cynicism comes to dominate idealism, it is important not to assume that the latter would develop over time (Chan et al, 2003). Not all forms of police culture and not all student officers in the cohort could be necessarily defined by cynicism. White et al (2010) argued that the influence of the police culture may not be as strong as assumed, that female officers continued to report higher satisfaction with their work than male officers and that original altruistic motivations remained strong after some time in to the police career amongst both male and female officers.

Thirdly, there may also have been a gendered aspect to the expression of the desire to ‘help’ others. Whilst it is a commonly cited reason for joining the police by recruits, Lester (1983) found that female recruits were more likely to cite the ‘service’
dimension as a motivation to join the police than male recruits. Raganella and White (2004) found that female recruits rated the ‘opportunity to help people’ more highly than did male recruits (although both groups rated that highly). It may also have been the case that the reticence and lack of confidence of young, female student officers without prior police experience was particularly prominent in a cohort of student officers, so many of whom (female and male) had prior police experience and had already, partially adopted some aspects of a sexist (Heidensohn, 1999) and cynical (Niederhoffer, 1967) police culture.

‘It’s the presence you have’

Some younger student officers expressed a motivation to have a job with good status. However, they were also very sensitive to the contested importance of the police occupation. Whilst in their own understanding the role had a high status, they were aware that elsewhere this was a contested arena, in which, they would have to ‘fight their corner’. Some student officers were already looking down on what they considered occupations that had what they thought less status. For example, in describing his reasons for wanting to join the police, student officer 6, a young male officer with police experience, said,

“I don’t know…the presence that you have. So, if someone says, ‘What do you do for a living?’…’Oh, I’m a police officer’, it’s a bit you know [impressive], or ‘I work at Tesco’s’… the other jobs I did all seemed a bit meaningless… I was always thinking about the police”.
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Student officer 8, also young and with prior police experience, said, “…I’d rather have a career where I could actually progress in life rather than sit on my bum doing nothing like a lot of my old friends from school did”. For student officers 8 and 6, the police occupation seemed to be a way of keeping their heads above the ‘writhing mass of humanity’ that worked in supermarkets or sat on sofas all day. They certainly thought they were better than the underclass but did not consider themselves middle-class either, as was evident when they reflected on their educational experiences.

Weinberger (1995, p.12-13) argues that the police are in an, “ambiguous and constrained position…[and have developed] a sense of alienation from the wider society…” Fielding (1988 p.61) notes the insistence that police work was not thought similar to skilled manual work, despite the likelihood that this was the class background of many recruits. Furthermore, Hughes (1958) argues that police work can be seen as a form of ‘dirty work’ and that, whilst it has to be done in a democratic and economically developed society, it should not always be openly acknowledged. One common reaction to this, on behalf of police officers, as Waddington (1999) points out, has been to resist the stigmatising impact of their work, partly through the development of occupational cultural traits that raise its status in the minds of police officers. McNamara (1967) in the USA found that police recruits regarded the police occupation as highly prestigious but also thought it was not so well regarded by the public. Chan (2003 p.70-71) found that recruits in an
Australian police force, despite significant police corruption problems, rated the police occupation highly in comparison to others and that recruits tended to focus on the “noble and courageous” portrayals of the police. For McNamara (1967, p.199) the perception of low public prestige can pose a problem, if “an individual patrolman…feels he cannot rely on a high degree of public respect in carrying out his duties” (McNamara, 1967, p.199).

‘I want your moral certitude’

Some student officers said that they joined the police because they possessed the ‘right kind’ of values that others did not. These were often thought to have been developed in their family circumstances. Student officer 6 and 8, both young and with police occupational experience, had developed a strong sense of a perceived difference between their own values and the values of those that they would be policing. This manifested itself as a polarised view of ‘good’ and ‘bad’ personal values. Student officer 6 in particular had developed something of the Batman character about him. He saw himself as the protector of ‘good’ people, especially the old and the ‘legitimately’ vulnerable. He said,

“…even at school, like if we ever got picked on or if anyone, I always stuck up for people…you always used to get kids who were picked on…I wasn’t someone who’d just step in but I would always sympathise. I thought that ain’t right. Even if they were idiots, it’s just not right. I think it’s got to do with the way I was brought up as well…You want people to rely on you…”
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Student officer 6 had spent periods of time, as a child, being cared for by his grandparents and felt that their values that centred upon respect for others, smartness in appearance, orderliness and especially respect for older people had been formed in interaction with them. He also felt that both he and his brother (who had become a military medic at the same times as he joined the police), had similar values of protecting the vulnerable, because of this upbringing.

By contrast, but to the same end, student officer 12 thought that she had developed greater moral certainty by observing a particular police officer she had worked with, as a Special Constable. She did not get that from her own family upbringing and she also expressed the idea that her parents had been important in her career choice but in order to gain some stability that had not been there in her own family life. She rather plaintively said that,

“My mother was a bad role model. My father was a bad role model. When I saw this [regular] officer, I thought, I want that…your moral certitude” (8).

For student officer 8, the generic value system represented by religion, that formed a large feature of his extended family’s life, was part of the source of his values. He said,

“I think it helped to bring me up a bit better than what some other people have been brought up with cos I’ve always had that religious side…You’d go every Sunday whether or not your friends are around.. If they invited me out… I would say] ‘Unfortunately, I can’t come out. I’ve got to go to church’. So, that was a bit of discipline installed in me til I was 16…Be good to your neighbour. Treat people like you want to be treated” (SO.8).
It appeared that some student officers had already morally set themselves up on the side of the police, as opposed to the ‘other side’, a feature of police occupational culture that reflects a perceived difference between police officers and others. Salaman (1975) suggested that because of the isolation of the police from wider society, officers tend to emphasise the higher status of their own values vis-à-vis those of others.

‘Got told to...get some ‘life experience’

Student officers 2 and 8, both young officers, said they had joined the police at that time because they had met the ‘life experience’ criteria that Ashton Police had stipulated for them. However, what constituted ‘life experience’ was not clearly articulated by the force and not clearly understood by some student officers in the cohort. Student officers 2 and 8 had spent some time in an occupational void before they were successful in their application to the police. Indeed, student officer 2 did not want to take the opportunity to complete a third year of university study to attain Bachelors level because it might jeopardise his opportunity to take up a training place. He worked in a low skilled job and thought of that time as something just to keep him amused.

It appeared that Ashton police were recruiting young student officers who had been biding their time before they could apply who did not value or make best use of that period. Harris (1973) in the USA, found that recruits in his study had to bide their
time to get in because the police organisation did not employ officers under 21 years of age. He describes them as ‘kicking their heels’ before they would be considered for employment by the police organisation. Paoline et al (2015) ask what the point of university education is in the police if it is not needed as a precondition of entry or promotion. Ashton Police appeared to give the impression that their recruitment and training practices superseded the education of its applicants.

‘...a decent career...with a pension...’

The motivation to join for the security of the ‘job’ also manifested itself, although not frequently or particularly prominently. Student officer 6 expressed this strongly and thought it had been nurtured in his family context, where grandparents were a prominent motivation to join. He expressed a desire to join the police for a job that was secure and had good long-term pension benefits and that this had been particularly encouraged by his grandfather. He said that,

“My family has always pushed me to aim for a decent career or one with a pension anyway...My Grandad’s always been that leading role. He’s always put me in the forefront of looking at how to spend, how to like save your money. How to get a house. How to do all that sort of stuff. He’s always been the one, like the financial side of it” (SO.6).

Foley et al (2008, p. 7) in the USA, argue that whilst it may be that the current generation as a whole expects a lower level of job security, those who do value security are particularly drawn to more stable occupations. Different national contexts may enhance or retard these kinds of motivations. Research by Moon and
Hwang (2004) and Wu et al (2010) demonstrate the importance of security of employment and pay in South Korea and China respectively. These motivations strengthened in police recruits from lower socioeconomic background.

**Conclusion**

In this chapter, I have demonstrated that, amongst this cohort of police recruits there existed a complex array of background characteristics that should not be disaggregated from one another in understanding the development they subsequently made. There was a good deal of homogeneity in the Whole Cohort Group and their particular characteristics appeared to be important in their subsequent development. It was very noticeable that police culture was already highly advanced by prior occupational experience and long periods of anticipatory socialisation, much of it working for Ashton Police. The scepticism of the value of education, the separation of service and force in police work, the hierarchical ordering of operational and non-operational aspects of the organisation, the raising of the status of the police over other local and societal groups, were all potentially problematic. There was little of the optimism and altruism characteristic of police recruits and demonstrated by prior research (Van Maanen, 1973; Fielding, 1988; Chan, 2003).

However, there was some complexity and variation too. For some student officers, the service and force dimensions of police work were not separate and they
understood the importance of the value of their integration. Others were expecting a professional organisation that facilitated high quality occupational development, for which their backgrounds, they believed, prepared them well. Their background characteristics can be regarded as more or less ideal at this point but added to this must be the training programme itself (McNamara, 1967; Van Maanen, 1975). Joining the police appeared to be a solution to the problem of what job would satisfy and interest them the most. A lot was invested in it.

In the ensuing chapters, I look more closely at the initial training programme itself. Whist the background variables identified in this chapter were influential, the wider social conditions and the vicissitudes of the Initial Police Learning and Development Programme, as it was constructed and delivered in Ashton Police, also played their parts.
Chapter 4: Getting off ‘on the wrong foot’. The Induction phase

Introduction

The student officers in my study started the Initial Police Learning and Development Programme in June 2010. Ashton Police used the Induction period to introduce student officers to its organisation and to the principles of the training programme. It was a very short phase, the content of which revolved around customer and citizen focussed principles in police work and other organisational and occupational bureaucracy. It included the force wide programme, Putting People First, a ‘citizen’ and ‘customer-service’ focussed programme for all new staff and force-wide policy introduced by the Chief Constable in 2008. An HMIC (2009) inspection noted that, “This project has the high-level objective of delivering a meaningful and sustainable increase in customer satisfaction and confidence levels through a long-term change programme”. The majority of the remaining parts of the syllabus of Induction concerned, what Fielding (1988, p.51) calls, “basic administration, conditions of service and operating procedures” (See Appendix 9). The Induction phase took place at Ashton Police Headquarters, was taught by a range of police staff (not police officers) and police officer trainers, involved a range of teaching, learning and assessment practices and was conducted in a formal way in the classrooms available. The whole cohort of student officers in my study were together for this phase and it should be remembered from the previous chapter that they
demonstrated particular motivations for joining the police connected with their own personal backgrounds. Furthermore, they had not, at this point, come directly within the management remit of the Police Development Unit, rather Headquarters training staff had more control of this phase.

In this chapter, I argue that, in some key respects, the programme can be seen to have got off ‘on the wrong foot’. Some student officers had already developed strongly held negative views about those they perceived to be associated with the management and delivery of Induction. The informal police culture was very evident from the outset of the programme. At the same time, Ashton Police had an inflexible agenda of its own concerning the way in which it introduced student officers to its organisation. Moreover, the way in which Ashton Police presented this phase and the way in which it was experienced were not commensurate with one another.

Before exploring the detail of how and why this took place, it is necessary to examine some of the wider features and key problems of formal initial police training, which the Induction phase was a part of.

**Formal initial training**

As I outlined in Chapter 1, initial training has developed in such a way that formal training is separated from both field training and informal training in a rigid and sequential structure (Emsley, 1991; Weinberger, 1995). In the Ashton Police
programme the Induction phase, the Learning Modules phase, and the officer safety training programme, whilst all of different character, were pre-operational, largely classroom-based (see Table 3.7) and together constituted the programme’s formal initial training (Fielding, 1988, p.70). The Induction phase was the first of that kind of initial training.

Over time and in the language of initial training programmes, formal training has been referred to using a variety of terms. For much of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries it was simply called ‘training’ (Rawlings, 2002; Weinberger, 1995). In the 1980s, Lord Scarman (1983, p.127) called it the ‘initial course’ and at other times it has been called ‘basic training or even just the ‘classroom phase”. In the USA and Australia, it is often called Academy training (Harris, 1973; Marion, 1998; Chan et al, 2003). What follows is a brief discussion of some of the key features and problems associated with formal training, which apply in different ways to the Induction and Learning Modules phases and to the officer safety training programme.

In its traditional form (Stanislas, 2012), this kind of training has a number of distinctive features and remains a model that has considerable support (Vodde, 2009). Its duration is short, its culture is quasi-military, its venues are separate, its syllabus focuses on police law, powers and procedure, it is a ‘training’ not an ‘education’ programme and its pedagogy is didactic, where learning often takes place by rote in classroom settings (Niederhoffer, 1967; Marion, 1998; Chappell and
Kanza-Laduce, 2010; Conti, 2010; Stanislas, 2012). The purpose of formal initial training in this traditional model is to provide the recruit with legal and procedural knowledge to carry out police work ‘correctly’ and to develop the recruit’s comportment as a symbol of authority and propriety in the community (Critchley, 1967).

However, traditional formal initial training has been the subject of a good deal of criticism. Marion (1998) argues that officers completing it seem poorly prepared for the practice of ‘real’ police work. Lord Scarman (1983) thought it tended to foster a view that all training ceases after its completion (Scarman, 1983; HMIC, 2002; Wood and Tong, 2009) when it had just started. Harris (1973) found that the informal curriculum communicates messages that foster a defensive occupational culture and does not produce ‘a new breed of cop’. Conti (2010, p.6) argues that it results in the grinding down of “idealism, motivation and commitment” and fosters increasing conservatism (Christie, 1996). Some also argue that it conveys informal messages concerning the low status of women, ethnic minorities and other vulnerable groups in society (Holdaway and Barron, 1997; Prokos and Padavic, 2002; Conti, 2010; Foster, 2005). In part, the training staff can be seen to be at fault for this. As older, experienced officers, it is they who communicate the hidden curriculum to recruits that formal training is of no use, the real learning takes place ‘on the street’ (Niederhoffer, 1967). The social homogeneity of recruits and training staff is thought important in contributing to the mono-cultural, exclusive environment (Van Maanaen,
Finally, the physical separation of formal training and field training is also thought to be problematic in distancing recruits from local communities and in creating unnecessary ‘anticipatory anxiety’ about the practice of police work.

This may, though, be a misreading of what takes place in traditional formal training. Occupational culture may be more variable than thought because this kind of training does not result in inevitable compliance (Fielding, 1988; Chan et al, 2003). Fielding (1988, p.58) notes,

“Police training involves brief and highly condensed periods of …classroom instruction, drill and physical training…[which] can be regarded as agencies of formal socialisation…[but] the “stage model’ of occupational socialisation should not be interpreted as a rigid one. The heuristic value of models of occupational career should not lead to the assumption of linearity. Occupational socialisation is a process of identity transformation and the stages do not have an inexorable dynamic” (Fielding, 1988, p.71).

Some argue that formal training liberalises recruits but that conservative and authoritarian tendencies existed in officers before formal training (Colman and Gorman, 1984) and are further developed once in the operational environment. Brown and Willis (1985) argue that the evident conservatism and authoritarianism found after formal training is a result of exposure to police work not exposure to formal training (Brown and Willis, 1985) Others argue that traditional formal training has largely disappeared (Crank, 1997) or undergone significant revisions over time to ameliorate its past tendencies (Peacock, 2010; Chan et al, 2003; Stanislas, 2013).
At HQ, just went and switched off

Of the Induction programme, Student officer 6 said, “…don’t remember hardly anything from HQ…you just went and sort of switched off…Put together a bit haphazard…those doing it did their best” (SO.6)…[They] Could’ve kept it to the minimum. House rules, uniform and in to the classroom…Could have reduced it to 1 week…[We spent] some time doing nothing” (SO.6). For him, ‘Headquarters’ and the elements of the initial training programme that took place there were conflated. This was more the ‘Headquarters’ phase than the Induction phase. It might be noted that student officer 6 was already in a ‘classroom’ but he was clearly trying to get to another one he thought more valuable.

Mawby (2008) notes that force Headquarters is commonly known by ‘operational’ police officers, as the ‘dream factory’. Fielding (1988b) demonstrates that the view of Headquarters as “out of touch with the ranks” would usually develop after approximately a year. However, the development of these kinds of views can be advanced by particular kinds of occupational experience, especially police or police related experience (Fielding, 1986). Student officer 6, represented the views of some student officers who came into the programme thinking that Headquarters was synonymous with the management of the training programme which, itself, occupied a low status. As problems developed over the course of the programme, some student officers traced them back to what they considered to be their origin - force Headquarters and the Department for Learning and Development.
At this stage in the programme, it appeared that student officer 6 had constructed a hierarchy of police classrooms and what took place in them, at the bottom of which, sat the Induction phase classroom. Whilst some research indicates that the early entry to organisations is problematic because of idealistic expectations (Louis, 1980), during the Induction phase, the reverse seemed to be in effect. Cynicism and scepticism, recycled from within Ashton Police, was present from the outset.

‘Not how it happens on the street’

There was a further problem that student officer 6 had with the Induction phase. He regarded the trainer as not ‘operationally’ competent or knowledgeable and his respect for him diminished because of that. Student officer 6 had a well-developed veneration of operational officers and some disdain for anything associated with ‘headquarters’. This was exemplified when he said that,

“…the things they were saying were not how it happens out on the streets. They would say this is gonna happen. Well no, it’s not gonna happen. Well, in an ideal world it might happen but it doesn’t [in reality]. He (the police staff trainer) said, ‘well you know as a police officer you’ll never, ever get to put a door in. You’ll always have to get a specially trained firearms officer and Traffic will come and do it for you.’ Well, no that doesn’t happen because we have Method of Entry Team trained officers anyway…and you sit back and go well from a person who hadn’t been involved with the police before, getting told something which [is not true]…” (SO.6).

As these comments demonstrate, police staff are not those who are likely to endear themselves to recruits looking for a role model in trainers which accords with an action orientated, law enforcement image (Niederhoffer, 1967; Harris, 1973;
Police occupational culture has been shown to venerate those that are engaged in, what are considered to be, the ‘important’ police function of crime control (Skolnick, 1966; Bittner, 2006). Student officer 6, seemed to have little time for those not engaged in these ‘high status’ activities, a view that was pre-existent and accelerated by his prior experience as a Special Constable.

‘Didn’t listen to others’

The formal intention of the Induction programme was to create a learning environment that supported the needs of learners, in part, through a varied range of pedagogical practices (Bryant and Bryant, 2014) appropriate for self-directed, adult-centred learning. In order to effect this, an assessment was made, at the beginning of the phase, of student officer’s learning styles following the approach taken by Kolb (1984) that stresses the importance of adapting teaching, learning and assessment practices to the preferences (visual, auditory or kinaesthetic) of the learner and in valuing experience as a source of learning. In this way each student officer became aware of their apparent learning style or styles. Stress was also placed on the role of student officers as adult learners, following the work of Knowles (1990), who argued that life experience should form an integral part of learning. The nature of the learning environment was intended to be ‘open’, flexible, supportive, and individualised where student officers should feel able to express themselves, even about controversial topics. This approach to initial training was expressed by the
Quality Assurance Manager for the programme, a police sergeant, when she said that it was designed,

“…to make sure everyone is engaged and interested. [We] use [a] variety of techniques. [So] that they learn the relevant learning to go out on the streets... [We focus on] Learning styles, Lesson planning. Presentations. Ice-breakers. Techniques that involve getting away from front-loading...Don’t lecture...[It is the] student officer’s responsibility to manage own learning. More relaxed atmosphere... more own learning, own research, consolidation, blended learning, hit more people’s learning needs...Our job is to support them as much as we can to make them the best officer that they can be and we will put all our efforts into doing that. But, still it’s their responsibility to go away and do the work”.

To some extent the pedagogical practices that were employed during Induction demonstrated some variation. The PowerPoint presentation was commonly used to display and articulate important information, which frequently generated further less formal discussion. Student officers were often asked to form groups or pairs to discuss a question, the results of which were often displayed on charts or whiteboards. Some group work resulted in group presentations, usually consisting of PowerPoint slides (see Appendix 15 for an example) created by student officers derived from their own research and there was evidence of some learning using computer based programmes for the Management of Police Information and training in diversity issues.

However, teaching and learning largely took place as a single group rather than individually and the group progressed together working through common learning points. Very little self-directed, individual or group work took place. An attempt, at the
beginning of the programme, to formulate the rules of the classroom collaboratively, merely demonstrated that they had been pre-determined by training staff and Ashton Police already. Whilst the topics for group work (see Appendix 9) were eminently suitable for inclusion at almost any point in the programme, student officers had very little supervision, clear advice or resources to carry out research and they regularly used unreliable sources online. Student officer 12, a female post-graduate officer, remarked that,

“Some writing, reading, group discussion tasks, group presentations…This was the worst. Too busy trying to do it in time that didn’t pay attention to what you had written. Read it out. That was it. Didn’t listen to others’ because PowerPoints weren’t good or couldn’t read it well” (SO.12).

These comments indicate that the teaching and learning practices were not always experienced as ‘adult centred’ or self-directed but rather hurried and sometimes perfunctory. White (2006) argues that whilst initial police training has paid lip service to adult-centredness, the approach has been to lead student officers rather than be led by them. He argues that, “The rhetoric is that of adult learning, but the actuality is a traditional model of teaching” (White, ibid, p.396). This was the case with much of the pedagogical practices during the Induction phase.

‘We have to correct attitudes...’

The cultural environment during Induction was intended to be formal and student officers were required to wear ‘business’ dress. All were allowed to use given names
when addressing members of the training staff that were police constables or police staff but used ‘Sergeant’ when referring to the Quality Assurance Manager for the Programme or Sir/Ma’am, for more senior officers. Student officers did not wear police uniform until the end of this phase. As student officer 2 put it,

“You’re there for two weeks, you’re taking the course...putting people first element which is a constabulary focussed drive at the moment. You’re there, you’re not in uniform, you’re in [business dress]...it still feels like an interview, like an introduction to the company, like a weekend retreat type thing, you know. Meeting everybody, getting used to everything” (SO.2).

However, behind the apparently informal atmosphere, there existed a concerted effort to control student officers. In particular, there was a marked contrast between the aspiration to allow student officers the opportunity to express their views and a need to control what they said. This became evident when discussing topics that were sensitive or contentious and acted to reduce the effectiveness of this phase of initial training. The formal message was that it was acceptable for student officers to say what they thought, even if it was prejudicial or controversial in some way. There existed, amongst training staff, a somewhat contradictory view that hidden negative attitudes cannot be addressed but that it is the function of training staff to discover them and that it is necessary for them to ‘correct’ those attitudes using teaching and learning strategies at their disposal.

One trainer said,
“…personal experience will create different opinions; that creates good
debate…Some may have prejudice toward travelling community… We’ve now
moved away from the culture of saying that prejudices are wrong and [are
now] saying that actually most people will have a prejudice to somebody, to
some group in society… “ (T.1).

It was also stressed that the actions and attitudes of student officers would be
closely observed to ensure they corresponded with what was ‘acceptable’. The same
trainer said,

“We instil diversity immediately so that they know that expressing derogatory
opinions will not be tolerated….Everything they do for 2 years is monitored, if
we have any concerns in that area it will be dealt with properly…You’re never
gonna proscribe for someone who’s very clever and manages to hide their
attitude and behaviour…We would be careful to look for traits but can never
remove from the equation someone who hides it. But that happens in any
walk of life, wherever it might be. With RPs (role-plays) and discussion
groups, one would hope that that is reduced to a bare minimum…We have to
correct some practices. We have to correct attitudes they may have picked up
from existing officers…We had a student officer on the previous intake who,
because of where he was born and brought up, had certain beliefs about
certain things. He’s a fantastic officer now but we had to bring those concerns
[out]” (T.1).

For student officers, self-expression is particularly problematic given their fragile
employment status (Police Regulations, 2003; Bryant and Bryant, 2015) and lowly
position in the police rank structure. McNamara (1967, p.246) recognised the
institutional resistance to openness and its consequences, in the training of recruits
in New York.

“It is apparent that the academy does not immunise the recruits against the
sort of changes that academy personnel would find undesirable. …this is
probably a consequence of the academy’s failure to provide properly
controlled counterarguments endorsing the opposite view from the desired
one…this failure seems to be caused by …a fear that the discussion of beliefs or practices at variance with the position of the administration will be taken by all relevant persons as endorsement of these beliefs or practices. Whether or not this fear was justified, it seemed to have the opposite effect from that intended, in as much as the recruits later move closer to positions seen as inappropriate by the administration of the department.…"

Expressing opinions and attitudes has been particularly problematic for police officers (CRE, 2005; Rowe, 2013). As sensitivity to the ‘offensive’ and derogatory nature of a good deal of police ‘canteen culture’ (Fielding, 1994; Waddington, 1999) has grown, so the scrutiny of what police officers say has also increased (Foster et al, 2009). Attempts to address police attitudes to ethnicity demonstrate this difficulty. The inner-city disorders during the 1980s were thought, in part, to be connected to the authoritarian, conservative and racist attitudes of some police officers (Scarman, 1983; Colman and Gorman, 1982). The introduction of training that followed, especially for new recruits, to improve officer race awareness and attitudes toward those from ethnic minority communities was at times poor and achieved little improvement in practice (Southgate, 1982; Fielding, 1999; Rowe, 2012). Racist attitudes were again identified as problematic by the Macpherson inquiry (Macpherson, 1998) into the murder of Stephen Lawrence, which found that changing officer attitudes was difficult to achieve, in part, because the classroom training environment was hostile to the process (Rowe, 2007). A number of authors argue that this kind of training has been ‘bolted on’ and insufficiently integrated into professional development (CRE, 2005; White, 2006; Rowe, 2013). The approach developed more latterly represents an attempt to move away from the avoidance of
expressing discriminatory views to the creation of more positive and explicitly antiracist strategies (Rowe, 2013, p.159). Foster et al (2009) found that the use of racist language by police officers had diminished since the Macpherson reforms but also found that so-called 'stealth racism', where officers guard their attitudes carefully to avoid detection but continue to hold discriminatory views. In 2003, despite attempts to alter recruit’s attitudes to ethnicity, the BBC documentary *The Secret Policeman*, (2003) found racism very much alive (but concealed) amongst some recruits at a District Police Training Centre.

McNamara (1967) argued that the New York Police adopted a training programme that developed personnel over whom the organisation could exert control more efficiently rather than developing self-directed and autonomous officers. Addressing what police recruits think is problematic, in this context, because, according to White (2006), “In the police context, there is an assumed right to change the recruits’ behaviour in specific ways. The employment transaction buys off the employee’s rights to choose how she or he should be treated” (White, 2006, p.393). For White (ibid, p.393) this is, in part, because initial police training clings on to the erroneous idea, according that all that takes place there is vocational. “In short, training differs from education by attempting to modify behaviour in specific, measurable ways for which people will be appropriately rewarded” (White, 2006, p.392). The consequence is that recruits come to resent their manipulation by the organisation and develop values and attitudes that can undermine initial training. Whilst it is difficult, it is
nevertheless important that the initial training process allows recruits the opportunity to explore sensitive topics, to express their views and to be exposed to the views of others. As Fielding (1988, p.68) notes,

“It is desirable that there is diversity of opinion, not because the majority trend is necessarily undesirable, but because such diversity could be drawn on quite explicitly in training to provoke learning which would better prepare probationers for the flexibility they will need to display in routine police work”.

In what follows, I have focussed on two topics addressed during the Induction phase that demonstrate the way in which this issue was manifest in Ashton Police. The first concerns the application of ‘customer service’ and ‘citizen focus’ principles to police work and the second, concerns diversity and recruitment. The way in which both of these things were addressed during the Induction period demonstrated a fundamental problem whereby the organisation found it difficult to engage student officers in frank exchanges of views. The difference between the rhetoric and the reality of aspects of the initial training programme came into stark relief very early on in the programme.

For the cohort in my study it was stressed that the student officer was entering an organisation where all those who received its service, without exception, were entitled to the same ‘excellent’ level of service. The Putting People First programme had high hopes in Ashton Police. As their promotional material indicated, “The new way of doing things…will begin to infiltrate everything that officers and staff do” (Ashton Police, 2009). However, in interviews and during classroom discussion,
Student officers often presented different views of the validity of this message and it became evident that it was a contested one. In particular, some student officers with police experience had already developed an attitude that resented the customer service and citizen focus message and those who delivered it.

Student officer 6, a young male officer who had been a Special Constable, was trenchant in his criticism of this message. He said,

“I thought it was rubbish. I thought some of it was quite, almost insulting people’s intelligence really, just stuff they were coming out with. I mean, they were saying you’ve got to be nice to people, you’ve got to be polite. Obviously, we are drilled in with…Putting People First which is fine. I think it needs to be done but it’s little stuff. Like just ‘pink and fluffy’” (SO.6).

Some student officers, with occupational experience in Ashton Police, occasionally put forward their interpretation of the meaning of the phrase ‘Putting People First’, which they thought only made sense when applied to operational policing contexts. The phrase they often used was, “I’ll put others first…until I come first”, or “people’ means me…I’m a person and I come first”. This demonstrates the existence of a view that some people the police encounter are more or less deserving of ‘excellent service’ and of ‘coming first’.

The topic of the impact of customer service principles and community policing would have been an interesting one to have pursued. Both have seen a profound change in policing, demonstrated by the introduction of performance targets and league tables that expose the police to far greater scrutiny than has hitherto been the case (Senior
et al, 2007). The impact of this has been hotly contested. In that respect, Clarke et al (2007) found that police officers were the least disposed amongst other public service workers to welcoming challenge to their authority and referred to some of those to whom they ‘gave a service’ as ‘scumbags’, certainly not ‘consumers’, ‘customers’ or ‘citizens’. Shearing (1981) found that police officers distinguish between those they ‘do things for’ and those they ‘do things to’. Loftus (2007) notes the derogatory language used to refer to those living in deprived communities, particularly the white ‘underclass’. Clarke et al (ibid) also note that police managers appeared to be ‘on message’ regarding customer service but cynicism and resistance existed at the lower ranks, as it did amongst some of the student officers in this cohort in Ashton Police.

Nevertheless, a more supportive view of the customer and citizen focussed message did exist amongst some student officers. It was valued by student officer 4, a young female student officer with no police occupational experience. She thought it important to be able to use various ways of communicating with those she would encounter as a police officer but that she traced the cynical view of the ‘customer service’ model to those who had prior police experience. She picked up the source of these negative views perspicaciously and said,

“'I know there were some people who’d come from a policing background who couldn’t understand why we were doing...some of the subjects like...how to talk to people and different ways of saying things. You know, comments were, ‘why are we doing this’ ... 'we know how to talk to people.' I disagree with
that. I think there will be some people that didn’t and it was just useful anyway for people to have another way…” (SO.4).

A more supportive perspective did not just reside in those without police experience. Student officer 3 who, as a former Police Community Support Officer had come to value the art of conversation, in police work, as a means of addressing conflict, argued that,

“...the best thing I got out of it was it made me start thinking the way I should be thinking as a police officer… to look at things in a much more open way and not to make snap judgements over things. I think that was important because I like to think of myself as a very, very understanding person. I’m not prejudiced in any way, try not to discriminate in any way (not consciously anyway) and I’ve always been very proud of that but even I realise just how easy it is to slip up, say the wrong thing and how as a police officer and a focal point of the community you need to be exemplary in your behavioural standard” (SO.3).

There are two points of interest here. The first is that student officer 3 was developing a respect for diversity he had come to value in his former capacity. Cosgrove (2010) demonstrates that whilst there is a culture amongst this type of police worker of ‘wanna be coppers’ who adopt the dominant crime-fighting approach of police culture, some adopt the ‘professional’ community orientated aspects of that role. The second is that the operational impact of ‘good encounters’ and ‘poor encounters’ with the police and the importance of developing effective communication skills could have been explored. Bradford et al, (2009) demonstrate that positively received contact with the police and high public visibility of patrol can bolster police legitimacy. Lord Scarman made a similar point in the 1980s when he said that, “The recruit must learn that obtaining community support is not mere
community relations window dressing to be handled by a few specialists, but an essential element of the operational efficiency of the police in fighting crime and keeping the peace” (Scarman, 1983, p.23).

Another part of the Putting People First programme, covered the area of anti-discrimination legislation in police recruitment. It was thought that student officers needed to understand this legislation and how it was applied to the selection of recruits by Ashton Police. This proved to be a particularly contentious topic, as the vignette below demonstrates.

The discussion that never existed.

During a classroom question and answer session about recruitment to Ashton Police’s workforce, the hypothetical example was presented of a choice between two applicants with identical characteristics, other than the ability of one of them to speak a second language. This was a skill the student officers were told that the force ‘needed’. The trainer had presented this example, in order for student officers to see clearly how the force can select those it needs, legitimately, without compromising the standards required or contravening discrimination legislation. It was therefore, expected that student officers were simply being instructed as to how the force went about this process. However, the trainer asked the group which officer they would select. Some student officers picked up immediately that they were being asked to select the applicant with the language skill. The discussion developed, it became evident that some believed that the force was implementing a policy of appointing, as police officers, those with socially ascribed attributes it needed, rather than those with personal attributes that had been achieved. Those that put this view forward, argued that they possessed achieved attributes, which they felt they had worked hard for. Student officer 10, a former Special Constable and police staff employee in Ashton Police, said that he was genuinely concerned that Ashton Police and the service as a whole might lose the opportunity to appoint good people because of what he described as, ‘positive discrimination’. He was told, curtly, by the trainer that ‘positive discrimination’ did not exist in the police service; that ‘positive action’ did exist but that was a different matter. The student officer looked crest fallen and the point of distinction was not discussed further. Nor, indeed, was the range of views amongst the whole cohort solicited.

Instead, at that point in the discussion, the only ethnic minority student officer in the cohort, a white European male officer (just such a person with a ‘desired’ language skill, as had been...
hypothesised about earlier in the discussion) said that he was treated in a discriminatory way as a Police Community Support Officer because he possessed those language skills. He said he had been assigned to what he was told were 'Polish duties'. He argued that his skill was speaking English not Polish. He further added that he was happy to help 'deserving' Polish speakers but not the [dross and the drinkers]. The latter comments were of just the kind that other student officers knew very well not to make and I noticed a look of some incredulity amongst them, as these words were spoken. Because of this, it may have appeared that this particular student officer had been selected for just such 'erroneous' reasons as some had suspected could be taking place in Ashton Police.

What did transpire was firstly, that a member of the police organisation felt he had experienced discrimination in a previous role and secondly, that employing people from under-represented groups in the policed population does not mean that they will represent the organisation in the flattering way that the trainer was working hard to 'instil'. However, these things were not explored further, the discussion was curtailed and ended with the homily that, ‘Student officers all have prejudices and that they would emerge in due course’.

When, one wondered? In any case, the ‘nest of vipers’ that constituted student officer's views about this kind of contentious issue was not addressed further.

The discussion described above was conducted for the purpose of apparently challenging the officer’s stereotypes or involving them in the process of learning but in this context student officers were very wary of making their views and attitudes known. On the one hand, this discussion worked if it altered the attitudes of the audience but on the other, because the audience did not know or want to divulge what attitudes already existed, they could not be altered. By the end of it, no-one was prepared to say what they really meant or thought and what was formally intended to be an ‘open learning environment’ appeared very carefully, although a little precariously, controlled. What came across very powerfully was the unintended, even covert, message, ‘Be careful what you say and to whom you say it. It can get you into trouble’.

As with the issue of customer and citizen focus, diversity, recruitment and the experience of ethnic minority police employees could have been discussed further.

The practices employed by police forces in selecting recruits and the underlying principles on which they are based are very important issues in policing. Trikha (2012) notes that positive discrimination has not been a strategy that has been used in the police forces of England and Wales but has been used in the USA and in Northern Ireland with some success. The widely held misperceptions of ‘positive action’ or ‘affirmative action’ are important to explore. Thornton (2003) in the
Australian context, dispels the myth that affirmative action may lead to employing poor quality recruits and that it is not connected with recruitment quotas of particular groups in the population. It is indeed, a persistent issue and calls for ‘positive discrimination are still being made and contested (Police Foundation, 2016; Weinfass, 2016; House of Commons, 2016). Furthermore, the experiences of ethnic minority officers in the police might also have been important to have explored. Holdaway and Barron (1997) provide a detailed understanding of the experience of racism and its connection with the high rates of resignation from the police, in part, caused by discriminatory treatment.

What seemed to be taking place in Ashton Police was that a policy introduced from above had run up against its interpretation from below during the very earliest phase in the programme. It is a common feature of police organisations that those ‘at the top’ present the organisation in a positive light but those at the bottom behave in a much more pernicious way (Westley, 1970; Skolnick, 1966; Chatterton, 1979; Ericson, 1982), valuing more their informal and largely hidden practices that take place, ‘on the street’ (Brown, 1981). The organisation appears to say one thing whilst its officers do another (White, 2006). Because of its hierarchical nature and tendency to manage by personality (Bayley, 2001), attempts at reform are imposed from above with the consequence that resistance from those lower down the rank structure stifles meaningful change (Brown, 1981; Weisburd, 1989; Birzer, 2003). In this way, formal initial training is seen as ‘mere window dressing’. The organisation
may opine that it is ‘necessary’ and of ‘good quality’ but training staff and operational officers behave as if it is not (Niederhoffer, 1967; Van Maanen, 1975). This characterisation could well describe the dilemma faced by student officers during the Induction phase.

‘You have your Attestation...get your warrant card...and that’s where it hits you’

One of the formal purposes of the Induction phase was to attest student officers in the Office of Constable. Student officers collected their police uniform so that it could be worn at the Attestation Ceremony. There they took the police oath in a ceremony attended by family, friends, a number of other police officers, the Assistant Chief Constable and the Chair of the Police Authority. The ceremony was formal before which, there was a half-hearted attempt by Sergeant 1, the Quality Assurance Manager for the programme, to get one or two officers to smarten themselves up a bit, but that seemed to ‘fall on deaf ears’. A pleasant afternoon was had by many, especially during the informal tea and cake for all present. The ceremony was clearly emotionally important for some of the family members, particularly as the student officers stood up one by one to take their oath. It was at this point they received their police Warrant Card and, more importantly, their police powers. The oath of attestation is contained in the Figure 2 below.
The attestation oath

Declaration:

Sec.29 and Schedule 4, POLICE ACT 1996, as amended by Section 83 POLICE REFORM ACT 2002

I………………………. (name) ………………………

of Ashton Police do solemnly and sincerely declare and affirm that I will well and truly serve the Queen in the office of constable with fairness, integrity, diligence and impartiality, upholding fundamental human rights and according equal respect to all people; and that I will, to the best of my power, cause the peace to be kept and preserved and prevent all offences against people and property; and that while I continue to hold the said office I will to the best of my skill and knowledge discharge all the duties thereof faithfully according to the law.

Declared at … [Force headquarters], this 24th..day .. June..2010

Student officer 2, a young male officer with a 2 year university degree, articulated a sense of anticipation well when he said that,

“you have your attestation and that's, for a lot of people, where it hits you. You have your attestation...then you come on division'. You get your warrant card. It’s at that point that you think here we go, this is it. Until that point it still feels like an interview, like an introduction to the company, like a weekend retreat type thing, you know...It’s from your attestation ceremony that you can wear your uniform” (SO.2).

As pleasant as this occasion seemed, the apprehension that student officer 2 was feeling relates to a fundamental question he was asking himself: What have I been
trained for that merits being given a uniform and police powers? To be, apparently, asked to become something for which one has not been trained is daunting enough but to be asked to be a police officer without training is particularly worrying, for all concerned. Student officer 2’s use of the term ‘Division’, exemplified this issue and indicates that he believed he had progressed to operational policing. Whereas, he had, in fact, been posted to his Police Development Unit, whose purpose it was to manage his exposure to the vicissitudes of the operational environment. Both the student officer’s and Ashton Police’s hands were tied, though. It was the case then and remains the case now, that police forces are obliged to follow Section 29 of the Police Act, 1996 that requires all constables be attested and so, given police officer powers, on appointment.

It could be seen as inappropriate to confer police powers on student officers before they have completed initial training that would allow them to competently carry out police work. Wood et al (2013, p.390) argue that Attestation, “…occurs before an officer could possibly understand fully what it means to be a sworn officer in any meaningful sense…Attestation needs to be something that is achieved at the end of a process, rather than at the point of employment.” The Home Office’s own guidance (Home Office, 2010, p.10) recognises this as a problem and the report *Training Matters* (HMIC, 2002) argued for a delay in the timing of attestation. Alain and Grégoire (2008, p.) note that, in Quebec, Canada, recruits are only ‘sworn in’ and receive police powers once they have completed their degree, a 15 week in-house
police training programme and have secured a position in one of the police organisations. Because recruits receive full police powers upon appointment it is difficult to ensure that training continues. There can be too great a pressure, to use the recruit as an operational resource, in part, because they are not supernumerary. It is indeed, seen by some as part of what they regard as the problem of ‘abstraction from duty’, which has long been the burden of the police training manager (Langmead Jones, 1999). This contrasts with an occupation such as nursing where, in order to protect student nurses from the demands of the work environment, those in training have supernumerary status (Shepherd and Uren 2014). Recommendations have been made to introduce this in initial police training on a number of occasions from senior officers, academics and from parliament but to no avail, as yet (Peacock, 2010).

Early attestation has led to a fundamental confusion in the status of police recruits in England and Wales. It is not clear whether they are ‘training’ as ‘student officers’, which could preclude them from becoming part of the normal resources of operational policing until such time as ‘training’ is complete (a costly practice), or in employment as a ‘probationer’ police officer. The latter, as the oath above indicates, requires policing “skills and knowledge” to “discharge all duties” lawfully and effectively, something student officers, de facto, are not able to do.
Conclusion

I discussed some issues affecting traditional formal training at the beginning of this Chapter, some of which were in evidence during this phase, although in subtle forms. Despite its presentation, the pedagogy during the Induction phase was largely didactic and its culture controlling, its duration (too short), position (first) in the programme and location, at Ashton Police Headquarters, all contributed to minimising its intended impact. The homogeneity of the recruit cohort occupational background meant that aspects of police culture were already present and served to both support and undermine some of the formal intentions of the Induction programme. Some student officers were more supportive of the intended outcomes of Induction, in part, because they had no police experience and so, had idealistic expectations or because their prior police experience had fostered support for a liberal understanding of the police role.

It was also evident that the programme was not experienced as it was officially presented. The pedagogy appeared less flexible and student-centred than advertised and training staff wanted to engage student officers on complex and contentious policing issues but then felt the need to stifle expression. The ‘put-downs’ that student officers received deterred them from pursuing things further but it clearly did not prevent them from holding their views. Whilst it was important for student officers to explore sensitive issues there was no appropriate outlet to do so. Student officers were very aware that they could ‘drop themselves in it’ by making
contentious remarks. However, discussing these views, whilst it may have been
difficult to do, was clearly vital to the success or otherwise of the most important
messages of the Induction programme. It came across strongly that what the
organisation intended and what transpired during Induction were not synonymous.

It is difficult but not impossible to imagine how this phase might have been altered
without fundamental changes elsewhere in Ashton Police and indeed at the level of
the police service more widely. That would have required a reorientation of the
syllabus, which was heavily focussed on bureaucratic tasks, Headquarters driven
organisational initiatives and the constraints of the national programme. It would also
have required alterations in the teaching and learning strategies and the removal of
the Attestation ceremony, which itself, seemed to generate an unnecessary
expectation about what the student officer should be able to do. But, there did exist,
some scope for Ashton Police to have devised a different kind of Induction
programme and to have allowed student officers more ownership of it from the start.
Although, whether that would have secured greater support for the formal purpose of
this phase was in doubt, in part, because of the student officers’ backgrounds.

In the following chapter, I focus on the longer classroom based, formal initial training
period and how it continued to display some of the central concerns identified in this
chapter, especially the disparity between the formal intentions and real outcomes of
initial training.
Chapter 5: Stuck in the classroom. The Learning Modules phase

Introduction

The whole cohort of 20 student officers were sub-divided into three groups and posted to one of 3 Police Development Units in different police stations in Ashton Police’s territorial area. At 14 weeks, although longer than the Induction phase, the Learning Modules phase was still a relatively short one by comparison with Independent Patrol. In each Unit, it was conducted in a single classroom for 12 weeks but with a two week break for the Officer Safety Programme to take place (which I address in Chapter 6). Each classroom was located within a group of rooms and offices used by its respective Police Development Unit. The syllabus of the Learning Modules phase was almost exclusively focussed on police related law, powers and procedures. The classrooms themselves were structured around a teacher centred model where, at the ‘front’ of the classroom was a whiteboard and a projector screen used largely, although not exclusively, for teacher-led PowerPoint presentations. Pedagogical practices were varied, largely teacher-led and learning by rote was used in one of the Units. A disciplinary environment was evident and student officers were expected to adhere to specific rules of conduct but this was more quasi-militaristic in one Police Development Unit than in others.

As I discussed in Chapter 1, it was the formal elements of initial training that had been transferred from the Central Training Schools to the police forces following the
2006 reforms (HMIC, 2002; NPIA, 2007). In the Ashton Police initial training programme, it was principally the Learning Modules phase that functioned as its replacement (although the Induction and officer safety training programme were also part of it) with the intention of bringing the recruit closer to the community that they would police and removing what was thought to be unnecessary militarism and an impression that initial training had finished at that point (HMIC, 2002).

In Chapter 4, I discussed a range of features of formal initial training, especially those contained in its traditional format (Stanislas, 2012). The location, duration, pedagogy and cultural patterns were all crucial issues over the course of the Learning Modules phase. In the development of organisational socialisation and police culture what took place during the Learning Modules phase constitutes part of its formal stage (Bennett, 1984) and connected with it were a range of training and cultural features. One of these was that, as Fielding (1988b) found, the informal culture has a strong influence during formal training. It is though important not to assume complete uniformity in the impact of socialisation in formal training (Fielding, 1986; Georgeon, 1996).

‘Just want to...learn the law and get out there’

Of the Learning Modules phase, student officer 8 said, “Knowledge? Just want to get in there, learn the law and get out there...” (SO.8). As a young man with prior experience in Ashton Police and a disdain for any form of classroom, he knew
exactly where he really wanted to be...‘out there’. His comments reflect both a long-standing fixation with the law, in formal initial training, with the perception that it comes first and that it is simply a prelude to later, operationally based training.

Student officer 6 had indicated in the Induction phase that he just wanted to get to the first phase that mattered, what he called, ‘getting into the classroom’. It mattered for two things acquiring police legal knowledge and as a precondition of access to the phases in the operational phases.

As I discussed in Chapter 1, formal initial training is often all located at the front of initial training programmes. Whilst the intention of this may be laudable (to prepare recruits for police work before they practice it) it has been criticised because it appears to unnecessarily demarcate formal training from training in the operational environment and so, to convey the message that it is not as important as that kind of training (Niederhoffer, 1967; Fielding, 1988). The Learning Modules phase suffered from this problem, as it progressed. Whilst not the first phase in the programme, it was considered by some student officers as the first one, ‘that mattered’.

However, in the national curriculum (NPIA, 2007) there is no phase called ‘Learning Modules’. This term was coined by Ashton Police themselves and probably derived from the use of the term ‘modules’ that refers collectively to all that is required to be learnt over the whole programme (Bryant and Bryant, 2015, p.4) . There is a phase, in the national curriculum, called Supervised Patrol but it appears to encompass both what Ashton Police called the Learning Modules phase and the Consolidation phase,
jointly. As the National Policing Improvement Agency stated, Supervised Patrol is constituted by, “Workplace practice supported by class based learning” (NPIA, 2007). The decision to create a phase called Learning Modules, separated from and positioned before the Consolidation phase appeared to have been one taken by Ashton Police at the time of the introduction of the new Programme. The result was that it contributed to an impression that formal training and other phases of initial training were not to be mixed and that the former must precede the latter, each one gaining status as the programme continued. This was an important though unacknowledged message and interacted with existing features of occupational and organisational culture to create difficulties during this phase. Bryant and Bryant (2015, p.140-141) note the variation, across police forces, of the way in which, what are called the Legislation, Policy and Guidelines modules, from the national syllabus, are located in the chronology of the whole programme. This is done to avoid the hierarchical arrangement of phases practised by Ashton Police. However, it is a common feature of formal initial training, as noted by McNamara (1967), that there exists a reluctance to let recruits near the operational environment. Fielding (1988, p.72) recommended that, “the structure of recruit training needs to interleave formal training and periods of field experience more intensively…” In Ashton Police, the positioning of the Learning Modules phase, in combination with other factors, mitigated against that possibility.
It was a deliberate intention to foster a perception amongst student officers that there was a lot to do but little time to do it in, in this phase. Student officers were expected to experience this feeling from the start of the Learning Modules phase. Student officer 10, an older male officer with a young family, found the Learning Modules phase difficult. He said that,

“… probably at about the third or fourth week in the Police Development Unit, when the legislation started to come in, when it was really heavy going…It’s having to get my brain back into the school days of, you’ve got to absorb this, take it all in and put it all into its own little slot so I can recall it.” (SO.10).

He had not had ‘good’ school success (see Appendix 3) for more detail of his personal biography) and it had taken him a long time to be recruited as a police officer, from the Special Constabulary. He was clearly under considerable stress to remember the information in this part of the programme but had internalised the importance of this approach to learning. He clearly wanted to create and access his own personal database of police information, at this point, largely concerning police related law and procedure. He expressed very well what it was that he came to value in this phase.

“I think the way they went about it was good but heavy. They crammed a lot of heavy big subjects…which was hard. It was a real struggle but I think it was probably the right thing to do, cos it lays a big fat base for you to build everything else on top of… “ (SO.10)
Whilst this was student officer 10’s perception of the phase in Unit 2, neither student officer 3 nor 12, both graduates with prior police experience, found the programme too onerous, in the Learning Modules phase in Unit 3. Student officer 12 said,

“…as far as my life is at the moment it’s more like a 9-5 job. When we started they said, ‘Oh you'll have to do loads of work outside the class.’ Actually I've found I've not had to do so much” (SO.12)

Student officer 3, found the pace of the phase to be highly controlled, even slowed down to allow all to move at the same pace, despite individual differences.

"I think that we are all learning at very different paces. I think we are but I think that the course is delivered in a very, very good way to deal with that and it means that people who are picking things up a little quicker do have to wait a little bit but that just gives you a chance to go over things again….The way it’s structured, you can’t really move ahead too quickly. The only thing you can do is ‘pre-reads’ and that’s just gonna help you. …we’re rattling through things at a real quick pace. What I find alarming is that you can cover a topic such as…powers of arrest, in a day…because for someone who has got a legal background such as I have and my education, you understand the implications of breaching someone’s rights...Take afternoons, which we all enjoyed very much, where you can go home early, where not much was done…could knock about 3 weeks off the course" (SO.3).

The implication in these comments is that student officers 12 and 3 were not learning to their potential in that particular classroom. They were capable of doing so much more but felt unable to do so and were not challenged by the pace or the quantity of the programme except to experience it slow and a little vacuous rather than fast and full.
The experiences above, raise some important issues about the pace of the Learning Modules phase. Graduates in the police service reach higher rank than non-graduates but are also more likely to resign early, in part because of thwarted aspirations and unchallenging work. The ostensible high pace and short duration served to create a perception that important matters had been skimmed over and even completely missed altogether. As Harris (1973) notes, “The recruit does have to learn a large quantity of information, but that is not an excuse to evade the need to have, emotionally and intellectually, in-depth discussions.

The duration of the Learning Modules phase by comparison to the later Independent Patrol phase, at 72 weeks, was diminutive. This corresponds with the duration of formal initial training for some time in British policing (Peacock, 2010) but, its relative brevity compared to the more informal elements, ‘on the job’, was a problematic feature noted in the 1980s by Fielding (1988a) and one that was in evidence in Ashton Police in 2010. Fielding (1988, p.72) argues that, “The brevity of the period when formal training can have peak impact on probationers, bears implications which police trainers should take to heart”. The suspicion has been that formal classroom training is short so that recruits can be given to the ‘old hands’ as soon as possible, thus satisfying the police organisation’s financial and staffing concerns and the occupational culture’s need to secure compliance from recruits quickly and show them ‘how things are done around here’ (Van Maanen, 1975). This is something that Harris (1973) noted in a US police academy where training appeared hurried at the
outset to foster, in the mind of the ‘recruit’ a sense of urgency but as the programme progressed considerable boredom set in and complaints about the irrelevance of the academy work became significant features of the programme. Research suggests that the earliest period of occupational socialisation is important and most amenable to formal training practices, which is important in implementing change in initial training (Fielding, 1988). Some student officers were unnecessarily struggling with having to rigidly learn too much undifferentiated information without effective help whilst others had seen through the ‘fast and full’ message immediately and appeared to be coasting.

‘The big offences...that everything else is built on’

Student officer 10 had understood well the nature of the syllabus content of this phase when he said, “Things like your powers of arrest, your powers of search. Like the big offences like theft, things that everything else is built on, things like that” (SO.10). The impression he described was that law was the foundation of all policing activities and so, it must dominate this phase.

It is important to note the national and organisational derivation of the syllabus content in the Induction programme and the specific impact it had during this phase. In particular, that it appeared removed from the evident views that student officers had developed about it. The syllabus content (see Appendix 10) of the Learning Modules phase was derived, in part, from the choice Ashton Police had made to
place a good deal of the ‘learning modules’ (Bryant and Bryant, 2015) from the national syllabus in that phase of their programme. In turn, the content of those modules was determined nationally. To a considerable degree this decision reflected powerful but not formally stated views of the central importance of law, powers and police procedure. As can be seen in Table 14, as a proportion of guided learning hours, this was unrelenting.

**Table 14. Guided learning hours. Learning Modules phase (not including Officer Safety Training)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total guided Learning hours</th>
<th>490</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Guided learning hours focussed on police law, powers and procedure (including role-plays)</td>
<td>480</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: Ashton Police, 2010)

The syllabus, consequently, had a narrow, constrained and hierarchical feel and was certainly not something that student officers had any control over. As Bryant and Bryant (2015, p.140) note, “Taken together there are 7,720 separate learning outcomes (4,807 mandatory and 2,913 optional) described with the three sets of modules” in the Initial Police Learning and Development Programme. There was, though, some discussion that took place about the proper content of the syllabus in
this phase amongst training staff. The manager of Unit 2 thought that most of what he referred to as the ‘training’ sessions, could have been taken out because they were too far removed from their eventual practice to be of any ‘training’ impact. To that end, the thought he syllabus of the Learning Modules phase could have contained other content. However, he expressed the view that this was usually not possible because others, working from Headquarters and through the Department of Learning and Development, quashed any discussions of alterations he suggested.

‘Felt like being in school...’

The teaching, learning and assessment practices evident during the Learning Modules phase proved to be particularly contentious and student officers varied in their experiences of them. Trainers usually conducted classroom sessions with the aid of projected visual slide presentations (see Appendix 15 for an example). There were a number of Knowledge Checks, which were written assessments of the student officer’s knowledge of police law and procedure. The pass mark for these was set at 50% but in Unit 2 it was set higher. It was common practice to employ role-play exercises to provide the opportunity to put into simulated practice, what had been learnt in the classroom. Training staff usually played some roles and the particular context of a role-play usually centred on suspected or committed criminal offences. In one Unit, regular tests of memory by rote were employed. So-called, ‘inputs’ were given by a range of police employees and intended to make student officers familiar with the wide range of work that the police undertake and that some
input would allow student officers to take up operational tasks either more easily or proficiently. All of these practices proved contentious, which I expand on below.

Visual PowerPoint slides were used in different ways by trainers, some of whom preferred to invite more or less discussion and questions. One of the Trainers had put a considerable amount of effort into the creation of PowerPoint presentations that constituted a bank of items for all trainers to draw upon and were seen as the infrastructure of face-to-face teaching and learning. The trainer in Unit 2 summed up his approach when he said, “We try to teach as much as possible. The more information the student goes out on the streets with the better it’ll be for them students” (T.3).

The pedantry of PowerPoint presentations concerning the law was too much, on occasions, for student officer 8, a young officer who had an already low opinion of classroom learning. During a classroom presentation and discussion on some of the finer points of where exactly a public order offence could or could not take place, he became irritated to have to learn so much of what he thought was irrelevant knowledge. He seemed to think it acceptable, as a police officer, to act first and think later. He became fed up (as was his wont on other occasions) and asked if he could, “nick ‘em first and then see what happens” (SO.8). The trainer replied that, “We don’t just make it up as we go along…That’s why you’re in the classroom for 12 weeks.” Student officer 8 then implied that he just wanted to be ‘let out’. Somewhat
alarmingly, the trainer sympathised with the Student officer’s frustrations and said, “Maybe in an ideal world…I don’t know…” (T. 3).

Student officer 3 was critical of the pedagogical approach taken in this phase. He said that, “[You could] Learn more talking to a group of 15 year olds about law than in the classroom staring at the projector. Learn the questions they will ask you on the street. If you can sit and hold the attention of a class of 15 year olds you’ll learn more than sitting in classrooms” (SO.3).

Student officer 12, a post-graduate, was disappointed with the teaching practices in this phase for another reason. She was irritated that she was not able to make her own notes and understandings of what took place in presentations. She expected to engage with it more but could not. It was all done for her. She was evidently irritated that she was not being challenged enough and said of classroom sessions and trainers,

“Typical session would include explanation of law followed by Q and A. Talk around the law and pull it apart…told to read notes for homework…He did all the work for you. Didn’t need to make notes. Could sit in the corner and not pay attention…I preferred to write things down” (SO.12).

Student officers focussed heavily on preparing for Knowledge Checks. The trajectory of the teaching and learning that took place focussed heavily on these assessments. Whilst presented to student officers as neutral tests of knowledge recall, they were rather, fraught affairs. Student officer 12 questioned the neutrality of the trainer who
had devised most of the questions for the test and was frustrated at the unintended consequence of that. Student officer 12 said,

“If you know the question and the answer, sub-consciously, when you’re teaching it then you’re gonna try and explain it a bit and that this sometimes backfired. In some Knowledge Checks questions may have appeared that weren’t covered well enough for some people in the class so there’d be a mini-riot…Had a question about borrowing a car in relation to TWOC⁴. Some officers got it wrong and argued that they hadn’t been taught the technical issue concerning the distance the vehicle had been driven that created the offence” (SO.12).

The ‘appropriateness’ of rote learning became something of a cause célèbre in training circles in Ashton Police. The police sergeant manager of Unit 2 required that the trainer and the student officers in that Unit approach some parts of the syllabus by rote repetition of legal definitions. He said,

“Let’s take definitions. I went to training school. I learnt them all. I still remember most of them today and I still work with them now and it’s what got me promoted the first time. It’s what helped me with the promotions exams. You ask anybody, definitions are the way forward. Definitions are what give you that confidence out there and I make student officers know 43, verbatim during their first 32 weeks. No other PDU does” (S.2).

Rote learning caused student officer 10 some considerable difficulty and frustration, which he seemed to be left alone to deal with. He said, “Memorising things: “It’s memorising things… I mean I understood what was being said to me but it was when

---

⁴ TWOC is the acronym used for the offence of Taking (a vehicle) Without the Owner’s Consent. This is a lesser offence than theft but occurs within the same legislation.
I was getting the definitions book out, looking at it, trying to memorise it…then totally forgetting it and I couldn’t put my finger on as to why” (SO.10).

Role-plays were often used by training staff as a test of the student officer’s ability to put into practice the knowledge they had learned in a controlled and simulated environment. ‘Satisfactory’ performance was necessary to progress to the Consolidation phase. For student officer 12, the lack of realism of role-plays restricted the opportunity to know what it was like to carry out real police work. Describing the whole experience of role-play she said,

“Ok. An example would be, in one of the role-plays you had to breathalyse someone. But in the role-play you know the person was a police officer…and the difference between that and a member of the public you want to breathalyse is immense. You're not stood in a nice safe yard in daylight with no one walking past. You’re stood at the side of the road with the cars whizzing past you…You’re remembering bits of what you’ve been told. Hold on to the machine so they can’t pull it off you. Hold it so they can’t see the number. But it’s completely different breathalysing a real member of the public…There are some things, I’m glad I did that role-play but it doesn’t prepare you for the reality of going out and doing the job” (SO.12).

Student officer 3 made a similar argument and felt that role-plays lacked realism and authenticity but added some advice about changes to the programme. He said,

“…there’s no way, if you’re doing [role-plays] ‘til they’re coming out of your arse that you’ll understand the job properly until you do it. So, why not have it that you sit in the back of a police car with two officers…” (SO.3).

They were seen by some student officers and training staff as a litmus test of their ability to remember the law, powers and procedure they had been taught. They
appeared to be presented as the student officer’s chance to ‘get it right’ or ‘get it wrong’ in a very public setting. Student officer 4, who was a little retiring at times and was new to the police, found role-plays particularly difficult, in this respect. Student officer 8 made an important point concerning the lack of connection between classroom learning and its application to role-plays.

“…Even with the role-plays, if you’d messed up big time, you’d know [if you] didn’t know the law. Like one of our first role-plays was one of false representation where someone was using a charity collection tin and I really messed up on that one cos we’d only just done fraud and fraud is such a big thing to pick up on…We all did really well on the knowledge checks but that didn’t really help cos you couldn’t see where you were failing and [succeeding]” (SO.8)

Student officer 1, a young male officer, had high hopes for the police as a good career (see Appendix 3, for a fuller biography) but was disappointed in the quality of some of the ‘inputs’ and remarked that,

“I think the only thing that’s really struck me is the quality of some of the teaching, when it’s not done by a trainer. Like we had a PNC\(^5\) input…and the input, frankly, was dismal…It’s obviously a very important subject and…basically she sat there and talked at us for two hours. No PowerPoint we could take notes from, there was no handouts or anything like that…the problem is if someone’s trying to steam through it all and just wants to talk, talk, talk it’s very difficult to take notes and get exact points down…PNC’s a very structured system the way things are done, if you don’t get it right then you get moaned at…. I personally found that a pity that someone who can’t teach is being allowed to do an input…If you teach someone something wrong to start with that’s what gets imprinted ” (SO.1).

\(^5\) The Police National Computer. A vital tool for all police officers to access criminal records and other secure police information.
Student officer 1 wanted to know how to carry out real police work with the Police National Computer system and felt that this training was too removed from it to have been useful. Ironically, he wanted another PowerPoint presentation to feel that he had something tangible to take away from the session. He was evidently paying attention during the many hours of those types of presentations.

Of inputs, student officer 12 made a telling point concerning what she thought would be better ways to go about ‘training’ in occupational tasks. She said,

“Things like the custody system and Crime File and things like that, your familiarity comes through using it all the time and by giving us an in-depth ‘how to use it’ lesson and us not using it for such a long time, you forget it because you haven’t used it…I was always surprised because that isn’t the way they teach things at medical school. You see it, you do it then you teach it. Whereas with us it was more like, ‘oh well, we’ll just do it and then we’re not gonna do anything with it. We’re not gonna check that you understand it properly” (SO.12).

Nevertheless, inputs also served to inspire student officer 12, especially where they concerned career choices and opportunities. She had pursued ‘reactive’ policing in favour of Neighbourhood policing (the former as more akin to her idea of ‘real’ policing) when she was a Special Constable said,

“If I was to rate what worked the best, it would be input from specialist officers every single time because a lot of them weren’t trainers. They hadn’t learnt the different methods…but what they did have was shed loads of knowledge and shed loads of enthusiasm…Traffic [knew a lot] about accidents. Good PowerPoint. Enthusiastic….Didn’t have specialist input for everything. Often did it in the larger group with all the divisions. Usually at HQ. Traffic good…You wouldn’t think you could be interested by lights on cars but you could” (SO.12).
Student officer 6, a young male officer, who had been unimpressed by the lack of immediate operational experience amongst training staff in the Induction phase, argued that inputs from those working in the ‘real’ police environment and that linked strongly to what he thought would be his own impending working practices worked best. He regarded an ‘input’ from the Police Standards Department as useful in order that he may be able to avoid investigation. It may be remembered that he had regarded the discussion in the Induction phase on this topic as condescending but coming from those he respected, he accepted the message, although arguably not for the most altruistic reasons and more for defensive self-protection.

Student officer 12, an older female officer with a post-graduate degree summed up the pedagogical approach when she said, “[It] felt like being in school with all the problems that being in school has. Rather than training to do, what is, in my opinion, a very, very responsible job”. (SO12). Student officer 12’s comments indicate her feeling that she was treated as a passive recipient of knowledge. However, passive she certainly was not, as some of her and her peer’s comments above, belie.

A number of important issues arise from these experience of teaching, learning and assessment during the Learning Modules phase. Firstly, because of the prodigious gulf between what took place in the classroom and police practice the former seemed to be of little use. Where the classroom and ‘the street’ appeared to converge was where student officer interest and learning was highest. In that respect, role-play, despite its shortcoming in Ashton Police, could have been a more
effective tool in the Learning Modules phase. Nestel and Tierney (2007) found that amongst medical students role-play was a helpful practice to foster communication skills associated with medical practice but that it could invoke strong negative responses, lack realism and fail to align well with other aspects of the curriculum. Solomon (2001) describes the effectiveness of professionally conducted radical theatre techniques in understanding and training police communication. Moore (1998) argues for the wider use of simulations in police training, which have been used for some time in police training for disaster management (I discuss a variation on this theme, ‘scenarios’ training, in the following chapter). Furthermore, inputs engaged student officers most when conducted by officers with current operational experience and enthusiasm.

Secondly, there was a very strong sense that student officers were insufficiently involved in the learning environment. The practices discussed have been thought poor preparation both for policing a complex, fluid society and for negotiating similarly complex police organisations (McNamara, 1967; Evans, 1974). White (2006) suggests initial training has failed to engage the active participation of new recruits. McCoy (2006) argues that whilst paying ‘lip service’ to progressive approaches to teaching and learning, the preferred approach has been to employ teacher rather than learner driven practices and encourages recruits to act and think only in linear and legalistic ways. In Chapter 1, I discussed the existence of rote learning almost from the outset of the New Police (Emsley, 1991; Rawlings, 2002;
Peacock, 2010). This does not, in itself demonstrate its invalidity but it has been problematic over time and remains so, because it fails to inculcate a questioning and critical understanding of important policing principles. As Fielding (1988, p.73) notes, “Training has for too long concentrated on rote learning at the expense of understanding. The great importance of legal input means that training the memory will always be a component of recruit training, but this need not be the model for imparting all that probationers need to know. Both mode and content need to change. The mode of the seminar should be preferred over the formal lecture wherever possible if probationers are to be kept on the right side of the ‘learning curve’.”

The rote learning of the law and heavy focus on Knowledge Checks is evidence of the continued existence of a formalised, rigid pedagogy common to practices that took place at the Regional Training Centres in the past (Allard, 1997; Peacock, 2010) where knowledge is arranged in a similar way. Presentations very much appeared like a contemporary version of the lecture, which McNamara (1967) identified as ineffective in preparation for the uncertainties of police work. Despite attempts at reform, Oliva and Compton (2010) argue that police training has tended toward rigid forms of teaching by rote and has been fixated on law (to the detriment of other features of policing). McCoy (2006) argues that the public values ‘good encounters’ above law enforcement and that ‘police education’ should focus more on that than on ritualistically reciting the law and endless play acting (Brogden, 1988). Fielding (1988, p. 72) argues that “Training is like school study, imparted by rote and assessed by tests” and so, the danger is that recruits transfer school anxiety and antipathy to the police classroom. Student officer 8 certainly thought in those terms
and student officer 12 had a well-argued critique of it. Marion (1998) argues that ‘knowledge learning’ (as opposed to skill learning and attitude learning) formed a large part of the syllabus of academy training, a feature well exemplified in Ashton Police’s practices. This connects with White’s (2006) critique of the approach taken to knowledge in initial police training which he argues tends to treat it as “encyclopaedic and capable of hierarchical arrangement”. This, White argues, is erroneous and suggests that learning should be treated as “determined by interaction with personal and social factors” (White, 2006, p.396). Andragogical (adult rather than child centred) approaches to education that stressed self-direction, the sharing of learning with others, connections with ‘real’ life that were problem-centred would, argues McCoy (2006), fit well with training police officers for community style policing and lead to a more ‘learner centred organisation’. This view is supported by Vodde (2009) who identifies its improved effectiveness compared to more traditional practices. However, this is not what has often been found to be practised. Peace (2005) found that after the introduction of the Initial Police Learning and Development Programme, apparently designed to reflect community focussed policing, the purported application of adult learning principles was not practised. Vander Kooi and Palmer (2014) found problem based learning more effective than traditional methods of the sort described above. Birzer (2003, p.30) argues that police organisations need to identify the most effective methods to accommodate changes required when he argues that,
“Moreover, it is important for authorities that are involved in training police to have specific knowledge on the most effective teaching-learning methods so that recruits learn and conceptualise new information and tasks more effectively.”

Thirdly, student officers had very different reactions to and understandings of the teaching and learning practices used that were not just idiosyncratic. Student officer 8 desperately wanted to get out on the street. One wondered exactly what he had learnt from the many hours of presentations that would support him in doing ‘good’ police work. However, he had developed an antipathy to classrooms long before entry to the police and student officer 6 developed a similar antipathy whilst simultaneously leaving university and becoming a Special Constable (or arguably, sometime earlier). This, coupled with the other features of the Learning Modules phase, caused this desperation to get out of the classroom and en route, to diminish what took place there. They both knew that, as Fielding (1988b) points out, greater rewards existed elsewhere in the police environment. Chan (2003) notes that demonstration Patrols are extensively used in some initial training programmes, in part, to close the gap between the classroom and ‘the street’ but also to cool down the sometimes febrile desperation that recruits have to do police work too soon (Chan et al, 2003). However, other student officers were more engaged in classroom learning and saw its operational value. As Fielding (1988, p.71) argues, “It is unreasonable to expect the influence of formal socialisation to be direct; individuals choose what they think valuable from the different approaches on offer.”
‘Three separate forces’

The re-location of formal training to force territories was intended to allow easier and more productive interaction between formal and field training and to bring student officers closer to the communities that they would be policing (NPIA, 2007). The Police Development Unit was the managerial entity created to facilitate this. However, the physical location of the Learning Modules phase proved problematic. Each classroom was situated in its respective Police Development Unit, which were, in turn, located in each of the 3 Basic Command Units police stations. In a largely rural force, these could be up to 30 miles from one another. In Police Development Unit 3, the rooms used were very close to and could be seen from the operational Relief offices. In Unit 1, the Relief and the Unit’s offices and classroom were connected by a common corridor. In Unit 3, there was a little more separation from operational policing but student officers mixed with operational officers in some parts of the buildings.

Whilst laudable, in intention, the siting of the 3 Police Development Units reinforced already existing intra-force cultural divisions. Student officer 1, a young male officer without prior police experience, noticed this early on and commented that there seemed to be, “3 separate forces”, not one united one and that it must have been, “allowed to develop”. This had the effect of creating allegiances to the force’s operational Divisions and fostering some inter-Unit rivalries that were visible very early in the programme, in part, because many had prior employment in Ashton.
Police. During the Learning Modules phase, there was a strong sense of physical proximity to real police work in all Units but also of distance from it. Rather than bringing student officers closer to the community, locating formal training in Ashton Police’s Divisional structure advanced cultural allegiance to those Divisions which in turn reinforced stereotypical ideas about the nature and status of policing there. However, the practice (that I will discuss more fully in chapter 7) where student officers continued to use the Unit’s office space whilst training in the Consolidation phase meant that there was some interaction between student officers in other phases and with operational officers too. More widely, there have been concerns about the level of support and resources that Police Development Units received and the variation amongst forces in how they operated that appeared to have some detrimental effects on the experience of training (Bryant and Bryant, 2015).

Locating the Learning Modules phase inside operational police stations immediately sensitised student officers to the security and separateness of the police occupation. Police stations convey particular messages to those that see and use them (Millie, 2012). To enter any part of them except the reception areas, requires passing through security barriers. The internal space in police stations is also sub-divided according to its use. Spaces for operational policing often require further security. Because of this, the learning environment of this phase, set within the confines of the police stations in Ashton Police, did not conform, de facto, to what was intended to be an ‘open’ learning environment. Indeed, it might be thought that using police
stations as hosts for ‘open’ learning environments is an oxymoron. Millie (2012) argues for a more open way of using police stations as part of reassurance strategies in policing, an approach currently not practised. Santos (2005), in examining the creation of women only police stations in Brazil, suggests a model of the use of police station space that is calmer, less restrictive and more welcoming than current use.

It might be thought that there would be a benefit to siting formal initial training at universities to avoid the immediate immersion into the police occupational environment. However, where police organisations have collaborated with universities for some parts of formal initial training, recruits have not always been able or allowed to use the physical space in the same way as other university students (Heslop, 2010). As Wimshurst and Ransley (2007, p.119) point out, police recruits studying at university can be “quarantined by their mainstream peers”.

The importance of the physical location of formal initial training, should not be exaggerated though. Chan (2003) demonstrates the changing nature of the police academy in New South Wales Police, Australia. A new venue, a dedicated site away from the operational environment and residential, was chosen and the programme, in many other respects, was altered considerably. The military feel of the former training school had been reduced but not eliminated and many historical problems remained (Chan, 1997, p.133). Indeed, the Central Training Schools, in England and Wales, underwent considerable reform over their history, particularly during the late
1980s and much of the 1990s when a more liberal culture and learning environment was encouraged (Kushner, 1994; Allard, 1997; Peacock, 2010). The venues remained the same but practices changed, to some extent. Indeed, Brown and Willis (1985) noted a temporary liberalising effect of the period spent at the Central Training Schools. The isolated location of the training schools, on former military sites did not seem to have a negative impact on attitudes.

‘It’s a discipline I will carry for the rest of my career’

The creation and enforcement of rules concerning behaviour and appearance has been important in initial police training, as was discussed in Chapter 1. It was during the Learning Modules phase that this was in evidence through the influence of the Police Development Unit manager. There was a degree of conflict amongst training staff and student officers, about behavioural expectations and in particular, the validity of the quasi-military emphasis evident in Unit 2. Others eschewed that, in favour of a more formal, bureaucratic model based on the use of procedural rules. This created different disciplinary environments in the Police Development Units.

The Sergeant who managed Unit 2 was male and in his late 30s. He was a pleasant, articulate, ‘clean cut’, smartly dressed, officer who ran the Unit as he remembered the Central Training Schools had been run. There were two features of his disciplinary approach. Firstly, he required that the classroom trainer taught and student officers learnt, some aspects of the syllabus by rote (see Appendix 13 for
some examples). This required student officers to recite the exact wording of some aspects of police law, powers and procedure and was done in addition to other requirements. Secondly, he required student officers to be inspected for uniform smartness and that officers ‘bull’ their boots, an old favourite from the past that takes time, patience and the ability to ‘switch off’ the mind whilst doing it, after which, the toe section of the boot should resemble polished glass. This created a more regimented atmosphere and had a particular impact on the experience of the training for student officers. Sergeant 2 described his approach in this way,

“I wouldn’t call it strictness. Clear expectations that you will come to work and earn your money. Both myself and the tax-payer expect you to earn your £24,000…I’m quite robust, I’m quite an intrusive manager, so not a lot gets past me…and I will challenge, appropriately, any student officer, PDO, trainer that gets out of line…[In the Unit, there are strict standards of ] dress. Creases. Polished shoes. Look the part. Other PDUs are different. [Here we have] Uniform inspections. No tram lines, hair off collar, shoes clean, ladies [must not] wear too much make-up, guys [must be] shaven” (S.2).

He was also proud of the resignation rate of student officers in that Unit, which was up to 15%, which he attributed to failures in those officers to cope with the regime in the Unit. He had effectively ‘weeded out’ some student officers he felt were not ‘good enough’. Student officer 10 had understood well what was required, as is indicated in the vignette below.

SO. 10. “Our uniform is slightly different to [BCU 1] and [BCU 3], as you’ve probably seen when you’ve been on the PDU. Our shirts have got to have one crease in the sleeve, on each sleeve, creases down the back of the shirt...The Sergeant likes the crease straight down the centre, right the way from the top of the shirt to the bottom of the shirt. Trousers to have a sharp crease in them. Be clean and tidy and the boots to be clean but the tips of the boots to be
‘bullied’ almost like a parade ‘bull’. So, we do that on a regular basis. We’ve had uniform inspections. We’ve had pocket notebook inspections…the discipline’s there. It’s a case of…You come in. You’d be there for 0830 in the morning and you’d be there until 4.30 in the afternoon…It doesn’t bother me at all. It’s a discipline that I will carry through for the rest of the career that I have. Not so much the ‘bull’ on the boots cos they’re not gonna last 5 minutes out on the street but making sure that I’m smart cos it’s all about first impression. If I look smart then somebody can approach me and think, “that officer’s got something about him.” So, the discipline will carry me through. When we’ve been with [Unit 1 and 3], they sort of laugh and say, “why are your boots really shiny, why have you got creases?” That’s because, that’s how our PDU manager wants it, that’s how he has interpreted the dress policy that the force has.”

That the military style of formal initial training existed in Police Development Unit 2, did not seem accidental. Division 2 had a reputation as a tough inner city area and for some student officers and staff, this required a ‘tougher’ kind of policing. Indeed, a contest existed, amongst student officers, over whose Unit approximated most to a tough, military style atmosphere. The benchmark for this argument had clearly already been set and its provenance was in Unit 2, who had the ‘first say.’ The debate centred on the question of whose Division was closest to an inner-city, high crime and ‘dangerous’ policing environment. By consequence, stereotypes abounded and student officers defended their own Division but always in proposing that it also had ‘dangerous’ policing problems too, just different ones to the others.

There was some variation in views about discipline amongst student officers. Student officer 12, from Police Development Unit 3, a female officer with a post-graduate degree, hankered after the militarism that she had heard (from regular officers, during her time as a Special Constable) was the case in the Central Training
School days. The closest she could get to it, was what she had heard existed at Police Development Unit 2 and she thought the Learning Modules phase was made to be “more of a test” than in her own Unit. Student officer 1, a young male officer at Unit 2, had something of that feeling as he had also considered a military career as well as a police one. Student officer 6, a young male officer, from Unit 2, got some of the militarism the he wanted and certainly more than he thought existed in the other Units, the ‘softness’ of which he was inclined to sneer at. He wanted more though and felt a little cheated that he was not able to get a much more military style experience. Student officer 3, a young male officer, who had a degree in a criminal justice subject, was forthright in his views that discipline of the kind seen in Unit 2 was unnecessary in the modern policing context.

It should not be assumed that the control of student officer behaviour was the preserve of Unit 2, though. Student officer 3, was wont to challenge, on occasion, what he thought were petty rules and became involved in a disciplinary problem with the force’s Police Standards Department over appearing to make fun, online, of student officers and the trainer at Unit 1. He was adamant that this was not his intention and the case went no further but he felt angry at the perceived ‘pettiness’ of this and that the force bureaucracy had become involved. He was concerned that this would have an impact on his career, almost before it had begun; a perception that was prescient, in his case.
These findings concerning discipline during the Learning Modules phase indicate the continued existence, in Ashton Police, of military style formal initial training and of a range of ways that student officers understood it. Discipline as Chan (2003, p.96) argues, has both an inward and an outward dimension. It determines relationships within police organisations (as demonstrated in the rank hierarchy) and is used to control others in police encounters. Crank’s (1998) argument that this stress training is less common, is confirmed but it certainly had not disappeared. Violanti (1993) found that high-stress training can lead to maladaptive responses in police recruits and that police organisations should use should be reviewed. This accords with Chan (2003) who found that military style discipline was much less prominent than had been the case but that many recruits were disappointed with that, as was student officer 12. However, Chan also found that recruits entered the police with varying expectations of discipline and did not all react to the discipline that did exist in the same way. The disciplinary regime is also prioritised by police organisations, training staff and recruits themselves (Fielding, 1988). The military model of discipline has also been a way of controlling the police through “hierarchical accountability and rule-bound behaviour” (Chan et al, 2003 p. 96). It was something that was expected to have been eliminated by the new programme but it remained prominent, if a little neutered, in Ashton Police.
Conclusion

The intended creation of an adult-centred, open and supportive learning environment sat uneasily against the reality of mechanical and hierarchical acquisition of police law, powers and procedure. The pedagogy was teacher-led and there was considerable evidence of ‘spoon feeding’ knowledge to be repeated in formalised ways. This reached its zenith with the rote learning of legal and procedural definitions in one of the Police Development Units. There existed a reluctance to allow student officers to experience field conditions despite such close proximity with them, which created unnecessary anxiety. The Police Development Units seemed to reinforce intra-force organisational schisms and loyalty to the Unit, the Division and to stereotypical understandings of police work.

The Induction phase had fostered a feeling that it was of little importance. Something similar could be said of the Learning Modules phase, although this took some time to develop and did so in different ways for student officers with different characteristics. Indeed, student officers certainly understood the *double entendre* of the phrase often used by others and themselves that they were ‘in the classroom’. Although for different reasons, some student officers felt, ‘stuck in the classroom’, which denoted both their whereabouts and their lowly status.

The duration, the position in the programme, the pedagogical practices and the cultural environment of the Learning Modules phase, appeared to give rise to a
familiar feeling found in formal initial training that the 'real' learning takes place 'on the street' (Niederhoffer, 1967; Van Maanen, 1973; Brown, 1981).
Chapter 6: Rough and tumble. The Officer Safety Training programme

Introduction

All student officers were required to undertake officer safety training at the dedicated Officer Safety Training Unit and the programme was assessed by both written and practical elements. Two members of the officer safety training team were responsible for the 9 day programme including student officer assessments that were carried out toward the end of the programme. Whilst the officer safety programme bisected the Learning Modules phase, it was also, ostensibly, a part of that phase too (see Table 3.7) and constituted an element of formal initial training. However, it had a distinct syllabus, took place in a very different location and made claims for operational status that marked it out as distinct. Because of these things, I decided to examine it in its own right.

What emerged from observations of the officer safety training programme was that, because of its positioning in the programme and minimal integration with the Learning Modules phase, it was much less effective and ‘useful’ in practice than in the minds of trainers and of some student officers. I argue, in this chapter, that the formal purpose of the phase, to train student officers in safety techniques, took second place to its informal purpose of conveying to student officers the message that policing should be seen as an action-orientated, physical, ‘rough and tumble’, ‘man’s game’ with important consequences for the development of police culture.
Officer safety training appeared to have much greater symbolic importance than importance for safety training itself.

The ‘Velcro effect’

It is important to note the developments in officer safety training in the police forces of England and Wales that gave rise to the current iteration of it in the training programme itself. In the 1990s, because of concerns about assaults on police officers, regular training in ‘best practices’ with regard to personal protection and the use of force came into existence. There were two drivers of these changes. The first, was the increasing recognition that police officers must be treated in the same way as other employees with regard to health and safety legislation. As a consequence, police forces are legally obliged to provide evidence that they are making necessary provisions for the protection of police officers and that officers are trained in safe practices with regard to their own use of force. The second was that concerns about assaults on police officers led to a more centralised approach to equipping and training police officers for the use of force. This was also a legacy of the changes to public order police training during the 1980s, where paramilitary style equipment and training became commonplace. As a result, as Buttle, (2007, p. 164) points out, “Currently, police officers undergo officer safety training at a level and regularity unknown to their predecessors”.
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The lobby to make changes to equipment and training was successful and as a consequence the traditional truncheon was replaced with a baton worn externally (rather than concealed, as had been the practice hitherto). These could be used offensively, defensively and for restraints and resembled those used in police organisations in the USA (Buttle, 2007 and 2003). Stab vests, rigid linked handcuffs and finally, incapacitant spray were issued to all officers.

However, some significant concerns were expressed about these developments and some doubted the capacity of forces to adequately train officers in the effective use of new equipment (Geller and Toch, 1996). The veracity of the evidence concerning some of the new equipment was also questioned, particularly the incapacitant spray (Buttle, 2003) that some thought likely to increase the likelihood of its use. This is the so-called, ‘velcro effect’, named after the sound made when the retaining strap is undone that is thought then to lead to the compulsion to use it. Her Majesty’s Inspectorate of Constabulary (2007) report Safety Matters recommended a series of measures that needed to be taken. The time given to safety training should be standardised, training should be more frequent rather than ‘one-off’, it should be better evaluated, considered more important in the organisation, should utilise training scenarios rather than instructional practices and Police Standards Departments and safety training staff should be better connected with one another.

These developments have led to a specific national syllabus for officer safety training (see Appendix 10) which is focused on the knowledge and skills necessary for the
approved use of police safety equipment and the wider use of force in police
counters. It is also based on some aspects of cognitive and behavioural
psychology particularly tactical communication in conflictual police encounters.

‘Don’t deny it, justify it’

Trainers often appealed to both a legal and wider moral responsibility when using
force. One trainer encouraged student officers to think,

“...If you use force...be prepared to justify that because we can’t go around
hitting people for no reason. We've got to justify that use of force... We are
governed by the Human Rights Act...If not, are we not lowering ourselves to
like a thug...We’re not above the law, so whatever we do it’s gotta be within
the law and justifiable”.

The often heard refrain was ‘Don’t deny it, justify it.’ Trainers would ask student
officers, rhetorically, “Were you in the lawful execution of your duty?” This was
considered to be of the utmost importance in establishing the circumstances where
force could be used. Without it, it was indicated, there can be no justification for the
use of force. This was often swiftly followed by a focus on the law relating to the use
of force that officers were required to learn, often verbatim. One trainer said, “If you
can’t recite it, you’ll be pilloried [in court]” (T.3). Another trainer highlighted the
purpose and value of this approach. “Can you see how this is a good model for
writing your statement”? (T.4). Furthermore, it was argued that student officers
needed to know these things in this way to avoid Professional Standards Department
investigations and police complaints. These were presented to the student officers as sources of concern and a threat to their career.

The encouragement to ‘justify’ the use of force largely derived from a desire to defend the student officer from prosecution and represented a defensive form of professionalism (Harris, 1973). Whilst it is necessary for police officers to use force lawfully, ethical questions (White, 2006) that precede legality were not as prominent as the perceived need to avoid prosecution or defend a complaint. As McNamara (1967) argues this can lead to the perception that the law is unchanging and unbending which may encourage officers to seek illegal or quasi-legal solutions to the uncertainties the police face. A better focus, argues McNamara (ibid) should be maintained on the spirit rather than the letter of the law.

‘…give them the techniques’

Officer safety trainers believed their role was to, “try and…make people think about the situations they’ve been in, think about their own safety…give them the techniques” (T.3). The curriculum of safety training for student officers was a national one and as such contained common principles across police forces in England and Wales. At the time the National Policing Improvement Agency (now College of Policing) had ownership of the Personal Safety Manual (NPIA, 2009). These principles were based in the United Nations Code of Conduct for Law Enforcement Officials, which requires that all use of force should be exceptional and proportionate.
(United Nations, 2016). The safety training curriculum also stressed the importance of lawful behaviour, especially the requirements of the Human Rights Act 1998. In that respect, the curriculum also reminds officers that they may have to defend their use of force in a court of law. Consequently, only techniques approved in the Personal Safety Manual were permitted to be taught (NPIA, 2009). Student officers were required to demonstrate competence in relation to the national occupational standard, Managing Conflict. It was also emphasised in the formal curriculum and by Trainers that the learning of all skills could be achieved by their subdivision into component parts that were: Demonstration; supervised completion; verified completion and independent completion. This was thought to allow all officers to become proficient and formed the basis of the pedagogical approach.

In the middle of nowhere

As I discussed in Chapter 1, the physical environment is an important component of the development of police culture in initial training. The geographical and topographical location of the Officer Safety Training Unit, away from the classroom environment, at a separate facility used for this type of training and large scale public order training for officers across a number of police forces, was a significant aspect of the atmosphere of the programme. The Unit was sited in a relatively isolated and rural part of the force's area on a quite recently vacated former military site, was also important in forming the experience and atmosphere of this element of the training. This was demonstrated by the nature of the buildings which, although relatively
modern, had not been subject to recent renovation and so, had a shabby and ‘rough and ready’ feel. In part, this had been caused by the actions of those involved in the many training exercises that took place in and around the premises, where projectiles and petrol bombs were frequently used to provide reality to the training. Furthermore, the principal training room used for many aspects of the safety training programme had the feel and look of a boxing or martial arts gym. It was indeed, called ‘the dojo’ and doubled-up as the venue for Ashton Police’s martial arts club. One could be forgiven for thinking that this was a place where people came to learn how to fight.

‘I can’t remember any of it’

This programme bisected the Learning Modules phase (see Table 4.2). Trainers argued that changes at Ashton Police meant that the Officer Safety Training programme had to be isolated from the Learning Modules phase and delivered in a single block of time. One of the trainers said that,

“What we find is that by the time they come to us because they’ve already had 12 weeks and they’ve done role-plays within those 12 weeks…we’re saying, “well, you’ve got to think of your distance, you’ve got to have your hands up and we’ve said it would be nice, even if it’s for one day, what we covered yesterday, if we could give them that right at the start of their 12 weeks…”.”

This sentiment was supported by one student officer who commented that,
“It was very quick paced. All the content was good but it was rushed into the days we did it. Some people have left there not feeling as confident as some other people and that’s just cos they didn’t have enough time to practice”.

Trainers lamented what they thought had been the diminution of the quality of Officer Safety Training for student officers, from its earlier manifestations with better Staff Student Ratios, specialist scenarios and longer training periods. As a result of these things, a significant feature of this element of training was the existence of an antipathy toward Headquarters expressed by training staff. One trainer thought that Officer Safety Training had borne the brunt of spending changes since the early 2000s across the force.

“In the end it got to, we’ve gone from platinum standard to tin plate standard now. We’ll do the best that we can... At times I feel we do fail the odd officer. I think we don’t have the time to spend with you. If I had another two days I know I could get you there but I know...the timetable says we’ve gotta move on” (T.5)

This was thought to lead to difficulties in the way in which officers applied some of the techniques trained at Officer Safety Training. Trainers felt that the force was not making training sufficiently close to operational practice or frequent enough to prevent a fading of skills by the time they are required in situ. Indeed, one student officer commented that,

“...can’t remember it. Seems like ages ago. Remember thinking I wish we’d done it a bit later on because we did 6 weeks in classroom, then Officer Safety Training, then another 6 weeks. Remember leaving classroom phase and thinking, I can’t remember any of it. Could have done with a refresher. Maybe one day?” (Focus Group: BCU1)
This training would not be used by student officers for some time after it had taken place by which time ‘skills fade’ and permanent changes in behaviour would not have been ensured. Regular training and re-training is necessary as is the independent monitoring of the effectiveness of prevention strategies (Mayhew, 2001 p. 5; HMIC, 2007). This was indeed a problem identified by the Macpherson inquiry, which identified a lack of current first aid training in contributing to deficiencies in the police response to the murder of Stephen Lawrence (Macpherson, 1999). In this sense and in the context of the whole initial training programme, it could not adhere to one of its own principles that regular practice and use, as close as possible to operational practice, is essential. Furthermore, the behavioural principles, such as Bataris’ Box, on which the training was founded are of uncertain intellectual origin and do not have clear evidence of their efficacy (Chandler and Munday, 2011; Wingrave, 2011). They reflect a deterministic understanding of the relationship between the actions of police officers and the actions of others and remove consideration of the wider context of police encounters that can direct the course of behaviour in a particular trajectory, which is not entirely within the control of those present (Buttle 2005).

‘This is an operational unit’

The officer safety programme was presented as being much closer to real operational policing than anything they had done hitherto and that it was visible in its separateness from Headquarters. This represented, for some student officers, their
first taste of police culture and practices of operational police officers, at some distance from the supervisory control they had known hitherto.

Trainers at the Unit had extensive operational experience and had come into the role with a strong operational orientation and commitment to officer safety across the force. They were important symbolic figures in the training of student officers and their distinct apparel was noticeable. In particular, the boots worn by trainers were higher on the calf of the leg and trousers were shorter because of that. They did not wear tunics, as did student officers and the colour of the whole uniform was black, not police dark blue. If they did wear caps, they were baseball style, not flat as were those of student officer’s. This gave the appearance of a quasi-military look and not that of the English ‘bobby’.

It was observed by one trainer that,

“they’re buzzing and we’ve had comments come back from the trainers that, “I can’t teach them anything”, because they’re so high from what they’ve just done because for 10 weeks they’ve been sat in a classroom, maybe the odd role-play. They come here and it’s hands-on and it is throwing each other around. It is spraying each other. It is shouting at each other and that tends to give them a buzz…” (T.3)

There was a clear attempt to elevate the status of officer safety training above other elements of formal training. Its geographical isolation, ‘rough and ready’ built environment and strong focus on police equipment and its heightened masculinity, all contributed to that. This undermined the ‘official view’ of initial training that all its
component parts had parity of esteem and were equally useful to student officers. Chan (2003, p.137-141) demonstrates that recruits valued most, “what they perceived as operationally relevant material” and found that they ranked officer safety and survival skills highest amongst all aspects of training at the Academy
The Unit was considered, by trainers, to be an environment where standards of political correctness differed from other areas of the student officer’s experience. It was an environment that was thought to stand in contradistinction to other environments in the force where people may be concerned about offending others. When asked if it was a ‘politically correct’ environment, one trainer said,

“(A little sigh). It depends what you mean by politically correct. We will challenge inappropriate behaviour or comments about race, creed or colour. We will challenge that because that’s not on but if you want to stand and take the piss out of each other because…we haven’t got to the point where we realise that everybody is whiter than white and nobody’s gonna swear at you and nobody’s gonna shout at you because that’s the real world” (T.4).

Black humour was often employed to lighten the mood. One of the trainers joked that a senior officer asked a firearms officer why he had, “shot someone 68 times”. To which, the reply was, “Cos that’s all the ammunition we had with us.”

This language and humour evidently served to provide a more ‘realistic’ working environment and one where student officers also developed important bonds with one another. However, it also served to ridicule a human rights perspective of the police use of force, which was the ‘butt of the joke’, at times and the need to be sensitive to language when using force was diminished in importance. Whilst humour can serve to help police officers cope with difficult and stressful matters it can also serve to undermine important ethical principles (Charman, 2013; Rowe and Regehr, 2009).

The officer safety training team was a small one, all of whom were very comfortable in one another’s company. One trainer remarked that,
“…we’ve described it as the, ‘I’d die for my colleague’. Put it that way. For anyone in there. Jim, who is the lead public order officer, I’ve known him…he was 6 months behind when I joined…If he rang me at 3 o’clock in the morning and said, “I need help.” I’d be there and vice-a-versa” (T.4).

Whilst the outside world was presented as dangerous, so was the internal police world. Part of the purported operational occupational culture of the unit centred on the image and presentation of the Trainers and other staff working in the Unit. Both trainers worked as a ‘double act’ where one trainer played the lighter-hearted but slightly sinister trainer and the other a little more serious but physically intimidating trainer. Trainers were aware of the reputation of the Officer Safety Training programme amongst student officers and other officers and this was played upon to generate a level of trepidation. However, they felt that there existed an incorrect impression of what takes place on the Officers Safety Programme, which didn’t entirely scotch the myth. One trainer said that officers think,

“We’re gonna beat them til they’re black and blue. Humiliate them. We don’t because if you do that you break somebody’s will and it’s no good…‘We’re not big bad ogres…We’re teddy bears that could rip your head off but we are teddy bears…there isn’t a problem that we haven’t experienced…but you’ve got to tell us.”

‘If in doubt, give ‘em a clout’

Student officers were encouraged to take ‘the line of least resistance’, faced with fractious confrontations, that would involve putting up with some abusive behaviour without having a negative reaction. “It’s easier to slide on shit than on gravel”, was the often heard aphorism. However, whilst the formal curriculum stressed technique and restraint, the informal one stressed a warrior spirit. Training staff emphasised that officers should use whatever force they feel necessary, in whatever way is most
appropriate in the circumstance. This was translated via a number of other aphorisms commonly used to convey this message, such as, "If in doubt, give em a clout" and "There’s a reason why a person clenches a fist...For what?...to punch you with". Furthermore, the ability and willingness to strike first, if necessary, was thought to be important. Trainers often issued the advice, "No-one wants to go second in the punch in the face game...do not wait until a person does something to justify a response". If those circumstances occurred, it was thought necessary for student officers to develop the capacity to ‘stand and fight’, to use ‘good old fashioned fists. Trainers felt that their encouragement was designed to foster and bolster a warrior spirit. As one trainer said, "You never kill the warrior...It doesn’t matter how bad their role-play is you’ve to give 'em a win at the end. Otherwise you'll completely destroy it and then you’ve got to start from scratch and build 'em up again" (T.3).

‘...if I can finish your career’

It was common for trainers to use audio-visual materials copied from television programmes or taken from websites and used in the training environment to exemplify points of practice concerning officer safety. For example, immediately after the screening of an extract from a television serial about violence experienced by US police officers, student officers were made aware of what was called the ‘3% rule’. One Trainer remarked that, “…we work on the basis that 3% of the people we work with can cause serious violence...[and that some will think]...If I can really hurt you and finish your career…” The sentence was left deliberately unfinished to maximise the impact and to leave space for officers to reflect on the seriousness of the
implications of the comment. The sense that career ending injury was always around the corner was expressed by a trainer who said that,

“...I read the daily log. “Officer assaulted on duty”...I'm here so that you do get to do your 30 or 35 years’ service and get a pension at the end of it and enjoy your retirement” (T.3).

Emphasis was sometimes given to the perceived need to be extra vigilant policing alone and in a rural location, where instant backup did not exist, a feature of Ashton Police’s largely rural terrain. This was cited as the place where the officer is vulnerable to the ‘career ending’ attack in contra-distinction to the inner-city, public order context, where back-up is usually quickly available.

Whilst Chan (2003 p.140) found that recruits…valued above all, those aspects of the training that they identified with danger management”, student officers received an impressionistic and possibly erroneous understanding of the danger of police work and the likelihood and nature of assault in Ashton Police. Some of the materials used as exemplars were from different policing jurisdictions and contexts and so may have inappropriately and inaccurately generated fear amongst some student officers. Little was known about or communicated to student officers concerning use of force and assault on police officers in Ashton police itself. In that respect, Table 15 indicates that in 2009-10 most assaults on police officers across the force area resulted in ‘no injury’. 5 officers were seriously assaulted, a proportion of approximately 0.5% of all police officers in Ashton Police. A quantitative approach to understanding police officer injury is advocated by Andrew et al (2009) who argue that this might allow police forces to minimise injury both in training and in operations by providing valuable knowledge on how effectively practices and techniques work. The principle
source of injury of police officer is musculoskeletal and is caused by extreme activity engaged in from a state of inactivity. Where officers are usually injured when using force is in post-arrest struggles rather than pre-arrest attacks (Andrew et al, 2009). The police are often keen to support a more realistic statistical understanding of the likelihood of being a victim of crime, as a way of allaying fear, an argument that can equally well be applied to the police as victims of attack. Mayhew (2001) argues that safety training should reduce and defuse any unwarranted fears and should emphasise that training alone is insufficient. To some extent, social scientific research has debunked the myth that police work predominantly consists of dangerous activity and has demonstrated that much of what the police do is not dangerous (Banton, 1964; Bayley and Bittner, 1984; Bittner, 2005; Cumming, Cumming and Edell, 1965), although it is unpredictable.

Table 15. Ashton Police - Assaults on police officers on duty in England and Wales in 2009-10

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fatal</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serious</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No injury</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: Adapted from Her Majesty’s Government, 2016)

In that respect, there was a somewhat inevitable fixation on the equipment used for some techniques taught in the syllabus. Buttle (2003; 2005; 2007) argues that the apparent obsession with recently introduced police equipment could be having pernicious consequences when he writes that, their, “ability to deter may also indicate that a more proactive and thus aggressive style of routine policing is
currently being employed on the streets; a style far removed from that of the traditional image associated with the British police” (Buttle, 2005, p.141).

‘...with my size...I can deal with it’

Student officers placed themselves and were placed by trainers in a size based hierarchy in relation to the use of force at this point in the training. A number of the student officers were stocky and/or tall and muscular which conferred on them the perceived advantage in the hierarchy of size. The physical size of trainers emphasised the point that size was important to be able to perform these techniques more or less successfully. One of the trainers was a very hefty, male officer and considered his own size as useful in the way described above. He said that,

“In my 20 odd years’ service, I’ve drawn my baton twice and I’ve never hit anybody with it and I’ve never used PAVA or CS. Because I’ve always felt that situations I’ve been into, my size or...I can deal with it. But, you have officers out there who perhaps twice a week get the PAVA out but that’s their own interpretation of the situation. The situations that they may feel threatened in, to go for your PAVA, I might not and that’s down to the individual”.

The implication is that smaller officers are restricted in the techniques they can use and the sub-text was that those who use this equipment are not as competent and those who can prevent conflict by force of size along. Trainers emphasised this point.

“We’re not prescriptive enough to say, ‘You’ve got to use this restraint or this pressure point or this take-down.’ Because it never happens like that because for me, my size, that might work. For somebody that’s 5 foot six, six stone wet through, that technique will not work”.

In the ‘hierarchy of size’, female student officers were assumed to be at an immediate disadvantage and could appear to trainers to be the architect of their own
downfall. At one point during a training session student officer 11 plaintively said, “I can't arrest men”, a comment that did not endear her to the training staff and seemed to confirm them in their opinions that female officers were inferior when involved in the kinds of situations they thought they were training student officers for.

Some student officers had gained a reputation as the kind of officers that may enjoy a fight. One student officer who had indicated (earlier in the initial training programme) his willingness to get ‘hands-on’ was recognised by other student officers as a ‘loose cannon’. Student officer 2 remarked that, “the recruitment process has failed with that one”.

However, student officer 3, a male officer and graduate in law, did express some reticence about the approach to safety training taken at the unit. He remarked that he did not enjoy violence or using force and that whilst he joined the police to prevent or bring to justice people who committed violence, its use by police officers should be carefully controlled. This student officer stood in some contradistinction to others. The evident mischievous even slightly sinister pleasure in the use of force by some appeared very different to the serious ethics of others.

Trainers at the Unit did sometimes express the view that they were training officers to fight, at some points in the training, and to talk at other times. Despite messages to the contrary, this element of the training programme tended to convey the idea that individual officer physicality measured by strength, size and willingness to ‘fight’, was ultimately, perceived to be most important when it came to police conflict management and the ‘use of force’. Despite the martial arts image of the programme, trainers had not entirely accepted the principle that exists in some forms
of martial arts training that stresses the necessity of demureness to avoid conflict. Only where violence is entirely unavoidable, can it be justified and then only in defence (in all situations) not attack (Funakoshi, 1981). This would have required a considerable alteration in perception on behalf of trainers as well as much longer periods of continuous training, much more closely connected with ‘real’ experience.

Officer safety training appeared to perpetuate the image of the masculine, action-centred image of policing (Smith and Gray, 1985) where crime-fighting, involving the use of force, violence and masculine symbolism constitute some of its dominant characteristics (Prokos and Padavic, 2002). The officer safety programme exuded strong informal messages of the centrality of masculinity, where the ‘hard-charger’ rather than the ‘station queen’ is venerated (Herbert, 2001). Cordner and Cordner (2011) in the USA found, women police officers considered police academies as male dominated institutions. Some consideration might have been given to research evidence on gender and use of force. In this sense, there existed an unconsidered assumption that female student officers had less capacity to effectively engage in policing encounters where force is used. Charles (1982) found that it was possible for female officers to be trained to be able to perform wrestling, pulling and grappling skills as effectively as their male colleagues and that assessments of these capacities should be made immediately after academy training to obtain a better indicator of physical capacities. Interestingly, French and Waugh (1998) found no differences between male and female officers in relation to the performance of handling non-compliant offenders, regardless of specific training to do so. It may also be the case that female officers are less likely to exacerbate policing encounters because of their own behaviour and so, do not need to use force at all.
‘Would you work with them’?

From practice in the dojo, student officers were then required to put into practice some of the techniques during role-plays and during their assessments by trainers, at the end of the programme. At the beginning of the second week of the programme, officers underwent an assessed scenarios day that constituted the culmination of the training in some aspects of the programme and was considered by the trainers as one of the most important parts of safety training. Student officers were acutely aware that the scenarios would require them to use a range of skills and to select which ones were most appropriate, at some point in the scenarios. They were also aware that the actors and observers in the scenarios could be any member of the training staff from any of the Police Development Units. Trainer’s use of the term ‘scenario’ contained a normative view that they were much closer to real policing situations than ‘role-plays’ that student officers had performed in the classroom work. The ‘scenario’ was thought by Trainers to be something they could offer that the Police Development Unit could not.

Scenarios were always followed by ‘feedback’ from the observing staff which usually involved a series of points made about the performance of the student officers. This feedback was, at times, extensive and personalised and meant that each individual student officer had a good idea of what training staff thought about the quality of their performance in a particular scenario. Trainers emphasised that, “It’s not about belittling them. It’s about building up confidence” (T.4). In what follows I describe and analyse three examples of scenario exercises that took place during one of the scenarios assessment days.
Scenario 1:

This scenario took place in the area where a number of disused old vehicles were parked and the information received by student officers was through a radio channel used, on this day, for training purposes. The same scenario was run a number of times to give a number of student officers the opportunity to individually tackle the activity.

A report from a CCTV operator had been received that a man had been seen in the area looking into vehicles. A specific description had been received and some detail about what the person had been seen doing already gave objective grounds for ‘reasonable suspicion’ for making a stop and search. In all manifestations of the scenario the actor/suspect carried tools that constituted evidence for an offence of being equipped to commit a criminal offence. This scenario required the officer alone to control quite a large space around and beyond the vehicles and to deal with a situation that might quickly become violent because the student officer had, to some extent, surprised the suspect in the act of committing a criminal offence.

However, the actor/suspect took various positions and behaved differently depending on how they chose to act it out. One stood up when seen by the student officer and walked toward the officer and one walked away quite quickly upon seeing the student officer. The suspect created different justifications for what he had been doing that seemed plausible and in some cases student officers failed to find the tools carried on the person of the actor. In one case, a student officer accepted the story entirely, which seemed plausible, and let the person leave the scene.
During this scenario, whilst student officers were trying to complete it, training staff observing them made informal assessments of performance to one another, which centred on whether the person was “up to the job” or not. Somewhat uncomplimentary and candid remarks were heard occasionally. In one scenario where a female student officer was having difficulty asserting her will over one of the actors, one of the training staff remarked, “Someone’s got to work with her” and “I wouldn’t want to work with her.” Another Trainer remarked that, “Equally, with some officers, by the end of the week, you think, if I was crewed with you at the weekend, you wouldn’t get out of the car… I’d be more concerned with looking after you that I wouldn’t take care of myself”. Female student officers bore the brunt of this kind of comment, although not exclusively, which was sometimes accompanied by an exaggerated mocking of their voice, usually because it was thought to be quiet, ineffectual or a little ‘whiney’. There was also the occasional mocking of the body position, deportment and how the uniform was ‘carried’ by some student officers (student officers 4 and 11, young female officers with no police experience). Shoulders were sometimes slumped, eye-contact was lost, hands were placed on hips to indicate frustration, and exclamations were made to stop scenarios from continuing. All of these things demonstrated the student officer’s lack of confidence at times. This was something that they found embarrassing and affected their performance, particularly female officers. Comments were not made in their sight or hearing, except where it seemed to trainers to be appropriate to do so, usually as what trainers thought was a joke, at the student officer’s expense. However, some supportive comments were also in evidence, during this scenario. One of the observers (a Police Development Officer) took student officer 4, who had been experiencing difficulty with displaying confidence in scenarios, to one side to praise
her for being decisive in stopping a suspect from moving further. This appeared to have a very good effect on the officer’s demeanour at the time.

Scenario 2:

In another scenario, student officers received a call from the Control Room that they should attend a park near a local college, from which a report had been received concerning two people seen talking to students at the college and behaving ‘oddly’ and ‘suspiciously’. One of the actors was the Sergeant who managed Police Development Unit 2 (it should be borne in mind that he was the driving force behind the strict disciplinary approach of that Unit, discussed in Chapter 5). The two student officers, who attended were from Police Development Unit 3 (where it will be remembered, the disciplinary regime was more liberal).

The reactions of the actors varied but in all cases they made it difficult for the student officer to judge whether or not they should carry out a stop/search procedure. The problem for the student officer was that it was necessary to find out what had been taking place over and above the information they already had, which was probably not, in itself, sufficient for a stop/search. This was not an easy task, especially when they found the ‘suspects’ unresponsive. They needed to establish the exact nature of the situation and to build a better picture than the one they had from the Control Room and to have in their mind the possibility of not carrying out a search.

In the case of the two student officers in this description, the actor/sergeant from Police Development Unit 2) made it particularly difficult for them to get any response. He felt that the student officers had been intent on ‘building grounds’ to carry out a
stop and search regardless of the circumstances. He highlighted, the subtle but important difference between ‘suspicion’ and ‘belief’. At that point, one of the student officers ‘tutted’ to indicate her displeasure at what she perceived to be aggressive feedback and because of what seemed to her to be an esoteric and unnecessary complication of the law regarding stop and search. She was taken to one side, by the sergeant in question, where loud voices were heard and whereupon the student officer started to cry. She was told to, “Turn off the water works…” and asked, “What are you crying for?” The sergeant returned to make his point to all concerned that they needed to be able to recite the law verbatim, which would prevent them from making the mistake he thought had been made in this scenario. The tension between observers, actors and student officers was manifest for the rest of the day. A good legal and procedural point was made but the way in which it was made meant that the training point diminished in significance the longer that it was explained and the more that the argument itself deflected attention from it. It was evident that the differences of approach to training in earlier stages had a significant impact on the way this training scenario was played out.

Scenario 3:

This scenario was built around a real incident that occurred in the centre of the main city of one of the force Divisions. Student officers watched, all together in the dojo, a few minutes of CCTV footage obtained by the unit where a man brandished two knives at passers-by at a particular place in the city centre. The man continued walking, accompanied by a woman, at which point the footage was stopped. The
student officers were then required to leave the dojo and carry out a scenario based on the footage viewed.

They knew that the knives were being kept on the person of one of the suspects tucked in his trousers by his lower back. As the suspects, both male, approached them the scenario required that they should deal with the matter immediately. In one case, two student officers, one of whom was student officer 8, were trying to deal with this scenario. They had successfully isolated the two suspects and rightly wanted to make an arrest. However, whilst they were negotiating with the suspect, student officer 8 very suddenly decided to perform a ‘take-down’ technique he had learnt earlier in the week. He carried it out perfectly but as he was doing so, he was heard to say, “You’re going down buddy.” One of the police officer observers, the Sergeant from Police Development Unit 2 (the student officer’s own Unit), the same person who was so incensed about what he thought was the ‘poor practice’ of student officers from other Units, took this student officer to one side and admonished him severely. He commented to me that he did not think student officer 8 was old enough to police effectively. One of the other trainers remarked that the incident confirmed his suspicions about this student officer. He said, “He’ll go off and sulk now…he’s done that earlier in the course.” It seemed an obvious irony that this student officer was from the Unit presided over by the sergeant, infamous for his disciplinarian ways that should, according to his own rationale, have led to exemplary student officer behaviour. I did have the chance to reflect on this when I interviewed student officer 8, which indicates that he had not understood well the feedback he had received. He said,
“I remember getting in trouble for it. [Sergeant] just gave me a rollicking for it.” [He said I had made] inappropriate comments really. As I said, even on a Saturday night, even as you’re fighting people. You don’t know what’s coming out of your mouth, it’s literally you don’t think before you do your actions…especially when you’ve never been put in that situation before…I’d rather protect myself than worry about what’s coming out of my mouth…If that gets me in trouble, that gets me in trouble but…I’d rather not be dead. I’d rather still be alive…It’s one of those things….Yeah, I’ve definitely learnt from it, to shut up and don’t say anything…definitely, learnt to keep my mouth shut and just spray him and hope for the best…

After the student officers had had their opportunity to attempt to resolve this scenario they were then able to view the whole of the CCTV footage of the incident that they had seen part of before the scenario itself. In the ‘real’ incident the officers made contact with the suspect a short while later, further into the central area of the city. They (one male and one female officer) parked their police vehicle in front of the suspect, alighted quickly but calmly and the male officer instructed the suspect to stop. The officer walked toward the suspect in a partially crouched position with his spray in his hand but behind his back. He kept a good distance between himself and the suspect (approx. 3 to 4 metres) and instructed him to turn to face the building and to put his hands where they could be seen. The suspect’s friend, who was quiet and compliant was kept at some distance from the suspect. The male officer searched the person, in the first instance, where he thought the knives might be and found them immediately and handcuffed him straight away.

It was noticeable that the real scenario did not resemble the fictional one in important respects. In the real scenario the officers approached the suspects from a vehicle already displaying blue lights, which they had positioned to slow down the movement of the suspects and to partially protect themselves. In the real scenario, one of the suspects was female which did appear to calm the male suspect a little.
The use of scenarios to develop policing skills achieved a degree of reality that role-plays appeared not to have been able to do, made possible by the availability of appropriate buildings and outside space. Trainers were able to develop student officer’s confidence in a short period of time and it appeared that aspects of this model could have been more widely used in the training programme. However, some student officers appeared to see them as ineffective, an attitude they had brought with them from role-plays in other parts of the training programme.

The practice of using scenarios to replicate ‘real’ policing situations has been common in policing (Shinder, 2001) but they should be as ‘authentic’ as possible to achieve the best outcomes (Moore, 1988; Shinder, 2001; Sjoberg, 2013). This is a view supported by Her Majesty’s Inspectorate of Constabulary (HMIC, 2007) which argued that more benefit is to be gained from officer safety training when it includes the use of scenario based training, as opposed to a programme consisting merely of static drills. That scenarios can provide high levels of fidelity and have proved efficacious in other areas of vocational education is highlighted by Sjoberg (2013) but that even well-planned and seemingly realistic scenarios can become ‘passive learning experiences’ for those involved. Alain and Grégoire (2008) note the use of professional actors for training using simulated policing situations, which facilitates a high degree of realism and a broader range of emotional response. Furthermore, the focus on tactical communication may narrow the attention of student officers and disconnect common police communication practices from those specific to conflict. Taylor (1983) argues that training in social and communication skills should have a better status but also take place much closer to operational practice.
Conclusion

The officer safety training programme demonstrated a number of important issues with regard to this kind of training. The formal intention of the training was compromised by strong informal gendered messages from the existing police culture and by its location, some chronological distance from field training, in the structure of the initial training programme. Its geographical location and the Unit's position in Ashton Police's organisational structure emphasised a powerful message that it was to be thought of as more important than other elements of formal training. The scenarios training appeared to have significant potential to provide a level of fidelity that role-plays had not done hitherto but they exhibited significant problems too, also concerning the gendered and disciplinary assumptions of training staff. Effective feedback to student officers about their performance was also hampered by the disciplinarian culture of some of the training staff.
Chapter 7: In at the deep end. The Consolidation phase

Introduction

In this chapter, I focus on the phase of the training programme called Consolidation. The intention of this phase was to embed the learning that took place in the previous phases by the completion of a period of ‘supervised practice’ (NPIA, 2007; Bryant and Bryant, 2015) in the operational environment with a Police Development Officer (a personal police tutor). It took place between weeks 21 and 32, a total of 11 weeks. The student officer carried out, utilising the knowledge and skills developed in previous phases, a series of police tasks, called Police Action Checklist items, under supervision, in the police work environment (see Table 16). This was called, in the national curriculum, ‘supervised patrol’.
Table 16. Police Action Checklist items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Police Action Checklist Item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Safety first</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Information management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Patrol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Search</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Investigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Disposal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Custody procedures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Finalise investigations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Road policing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Property</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These activities were observed and supervised by a Police Development Officer, trained to assess their performance. One of the purposes of the creation of the Police Development Units was to allow greater formal control of “supervised practice” (NPIA, 2007). In Ashton Police, Student officers remained under the line-management of the Police Development Unit sergeant, used similar and familiar accommodation but no longer had classroom sessions. Both student officer and Police Development Officer worked from the Police Development Unit and from the Relief base room (see Chapter 3).
The performance of the tasks was intended to represent a national minimum standard for continuation to the Independence phase and were to be carried out without, “direct supervision, safely and lawfully...whilst demonstrating behaviour appropriate to the role” (Ashton Police/NPIA, 2007 p.1). All had to be completed in full in order to progress to Independent Patrol status.

“Essentially, the PACs are intended as a statement by the PDO that the student officer can perform those assessed tasks in a confident manner and to a standard appropriate to their current development. It is acknowledged that more development is required but that the SO can perform that task without a high risk of failure and in a safe and controlled manner. It is a matter for the professional judgement of the supervising PDO as to when this point is reached” (Ashton Police, 2007).

The formal intention, as sergeant 1 argued, was that student officers were, “not going to any job...Police Development Officers can filter them according to the needs of student officers. Police Action Checklists make sure they’re protected and supported and it can be controlled” (S.1).

Field training: Key issues

As with the previous phases, the training that took place in the Consolidation phase has been referred to using different terms, such as the ‘tutored phase’, the ‘tutor constable attachment’, the ‘street duties course’ and others. In the Initial Police Learning and Development Programme, it is known as ‘supervised patrol’. In this chapter I will use a generic term to refer to this kind of training, field training, which does reflect terminology used in initial training in other countries. In terms of the organisational socialisation process, what took place in this phase constituted aspects of its informal stage (Bennett, 1984) although a level of formality existed in
the programme, particularly concerning the completion of tasks and their associated bureaucracy. What follows is a discussion of some of the important issues concerning field training and the cultural development therein.

Periods of field training constitute an element of initial training in most police organisations (Sun, 2003) and research has demonstrated its importance (Van Maanen, 1973; Yunker, 1977; Southgate, 1988; Fielding, 1988; HMIC, 1999; Chan et al, 2003; Sun: 2003; Chappell, 2007; Campbell, 2009). It was noted in Chapter 1, that field training in the past was perfunctory and very short (Emsley, 1991; Weinberger, 1995). It struggled to gain recognition but did extend its duration and formality somewhat. However, there have been a number of problems with field training as practiced. Peacock (2010, p.36) notes, “there is a tendency, from more experienced officers, to expect recruits completing the initial part of the training programme to know everything about policing and forget that the training spans two years”. This is facilitated by their possession of full police powers and absence of supernumerary status, which contrasts with an occupation such as nursing where, in order to protect student nurses from the demands of the work environment, those in training have supernumerary status (Shepherd and Uren 2014). Recommendations have been made to introduce this in initial police training on a number of occasions from senior officers, academics and from parliament but to no effect (Peacock, 2010). The reformed initial training programme of the late 1980s and early 1990s (Peacock, 2010 led to the integration of periods of formal, classroom based training with field training (Module 4 of that programme). This was to facilitate reflection on learning experiences gained in the field (Peacock, 2010).
In the 1980s, Lord Scarman criticised the paucity and dearth of training with a ‘tutor’ constable (as field trainers were known then) after the ‘initial course’ (Scarman, 1983). In the late 1990s, Her Majesty’s Inspectorate of Constabulary (1999) identified that Tutor Constables espoused values and conducted practices that were different to those taught at Central Training School and that “new starters should go with the flow, it’s part of the police” (HMIC, 1999, 29). In the later report, *Training Matters* (HMIC, 2002) the Tutor Constable system was again found to be unreliable and lacking in organisational support. This has been experienced elsewhere. Alain and Grégoire (2008) found that, because of workforce changes in Canadian police organisations, there was a dearth of experienced officers to act as tutors to recruits. As Muir (1977) argues, the Chief then has a crucial role in ensuring good training and effective supervisors exist in the police ranks (Muir 1977, p.9). The increase in recruitment in the early 2000s had put considerable pressure on forces who found it difficult to provide sufficient Tutor Constables. As the report put it,

“This Inspection found many examples of tutor ‘burn out’ due to ‘back to back’ attachments and tutor shortages. As the majority of tutors and their probationers are considered an essential resource and, importantly, expected to be part of the on-duty shift each day, it has to be questioned whether probationers are given the full range of training. Operational demands should not be allowed to limit the training opportunities for probationers. This is a short-term expedient and could have serious consequences later. This situation is very disturbing” (HMIC, 2002, p.82).

Research demonstrates that police culture develops in particular ways in the context of this kind of training. Chappell (2007) argued that the field training process is critical in shaping neophyte officers’ attitudes. It is the time when they are most open to learning new philosophies that will influence their police work throughout their careers. Van Maanen (1975, p.226) notes that,
“...a one-on-one relationship such as the police apprenticeship situation leads generally to an intense, value oriented socialisation program in which the outcome is dependent upon the affective bonds typifying the dyad. Thus the newcomer must be more concerned with satisfying the expectations of the coach than with satisfying the expectations of the organisation – although such expectations are often congruent”.

As the discussion in Chapter 4 indicated, the hidden curriculum of formal training has served to convey the message that learning to be a police officer really starts after that has taken place (Niederhoffer, 1967). Van Maanen (1975) referred to this period (which begins on first exposure to the ‘real’ police environment, often during formal training) as ‘reality shock’, when the neophyte officer encounters the real working environment of policing ‘on the streets’. As Van Maanen (1975, p.222) points out, the "traditional feature of police work—patrolmen training patrolmen—insures continuity from class to class of police officers regardless of the content of the Academy instruction”. This is a difficult time for recruits as the hopes they entertained for their chosen, high status job seem to fade somewhat.

What the programme in Ashton Police called ‘supervised patrol’, specifically extended the formalisation of ‘field training’, and brought it further within the remit of the National Occupational Standards (Skills for Justice, 2016). It was instructive to learn how, in Ashton Police, this has effectively addressed some of the problematic training and cultural issues associated with field training, identified above

‘They had no PDOs left to give me’.

During the Consolidation Phase, there was evidence of inconsistent experiences in the way in which field training took place. Student officer 3, a former Police Community Support Officer, was assigned immediately to operational Relief work
during the Consolidation phase. He was told, that no Police Development Officer
was available, that he would have a Relief mentor instead and that training staff saw
him as a confident officer who could cope with Relief work. He said that,

“They had no PDOs left to give me. So, they just said, ‘…out of everyone, you
look like the person who’d be able to cope with being thrown in at the
deep…so we’re gonna put you straight on shift with an experienced officer. I
was happy with that.” Put me with a woman at first who refused to do it. Didn’t
want to be burdened with SO. Didn’t want responsibility. Fine.
Understandable. Put me with Jack. If I was comfortable with things he’d let me
do it. If not he’d work on it….I owe becoming a police officer to him.
[He]Taught me the job” (SO.3).

Student officer 3 came to adopt a view of his progress, that ‘no news is good news’
and felt that the Relief management immediately saw him as an operational
resource. He felt flattered and had developed a view that what skills he learnt had to
be learnt in the way it had taken place for him but also felt the need for more support.
Indeed, he came to the rather ironic view that, “I was better equipped to deal with
things purely because I’d been thrown in at the deep end and that’s all it was” (SO.
3). He considered that his workload was considerably more onerous than other
student officers in the cohort, a problem about which his Relief mentor had made
representation to line managers. He felt that he had double the number of jobs than
other student officers and had a ‘crime queue’6 as well as dealing with some Road
Traffic Collisions. As he put it,

“[I] Went on to reactive shift…. Had the highest test scores and was thought
the least likely to crack on shift…One thing I was bitter about was being
dumped by the PDU. I was not spoken to until the end of Consolidation…They
knew it could be difficult emotionally…”Training finished as soon as I set foot
into shift…It was experience that you needed. That was the thing. Training is
training. Experience is important. Training gives you the basis but you don’t

---

6 A ‘crime queue’ occurs when an officer is personally assigned responsibility for ensuring that a recorded crime
is progressed through the usual investigatory and bureaucratic police procedures.
learn how to do that job until you do it…The problem is that it’s such a dangerous job to be doing when you don’t know what you’re doing that you need that…” (SO.3).

Other student officers were given various roles to ease them more gently in to carrying out police work. Some went to small, rural stations and to Neighbourhood Policing Teams, whilst others remained ‘under the wing’ of Police Development Officers, closer to the Police Development Unit.

However, student officer 3 had developed an interesting view of how field training should be carried out.

“They did used to split the training but wouldn’t want to be back in classroom after having been out doing the job. “I just feel that so much more of the training needs to be on the job, so much more… Get rid of rabbit in headlights shit by doing it. If you’ve got a safety net there whilst you do it, “there’s no point in mincing about with a tutor Constable which, let’s face it, they don’t really want to do frontline police work anymore otherwise they wouldn’t be in that position, they’d be back in reactive. They’re (tutors) happy doing what they do. They’d be back in reactive. Minor jobs, paperwork. It doesn’t prepare you for the job” (SO.3).

Not all student officers appeared to have remained under supervision by their Police Development Officer for the 11 week period of the Consolidation stage. Student officer 8, a young student officer, who it will be remembered hated all other prior phases and who had worked as a member of police staff, was paired with a Police Development Officer for only 8 weeks, a fact that he was quite proud of. He said that, his Police Development Officer became, what he called, “a well-paid chauffeur, especially in the last couple of weeks. He’d often be just around the corner. He knew I could do the job after the first 4 weeks” (SO.8).
These experiences indicated a general problem that the Consolidation phase was subject to wider force organisational issues and seemed to be fragmenting as student officers progressed through it. The impact of the organisational re-structuring of Ashton Police was partly to blame for that, which itself was a product of austerity politics of the incoming Conservative/Liberal Democrat coalition government (Lister, 2012; Loveday, 2013; Burton, 2013). This resulted in the abolition of the Police Development Units and the re-deployment of police officers working in them. The impact of this seemed to be that the organisational solidity of the role of the Police Development Officer was compromised. One of the most important and necessary features of field training has been its proximity to immediate operational priorities. Whilst this is recognised to be vital to the authenticity of the training practices it has often resulted in the field trainer and recruit being used principally as an operational resource rather than a training resource (Home Office, 1983; Owen, 1999). In this sense training in the field has not always been a protected activity and has resulted in the inappropriate (usually too early) introduction of recruits to the operational environment. Peacock (2010) argues that a tension has long-existed between the Home Office, that tended to want to maximise numbers of operational officers and Chief Constables who tended to favour that recruits received a ‘full complement’ of training. Student officers in Ashton Police were not always protected from their own naivety, zealousness or good-will and some developed, at times, an understanding of field training as an impediment rather than a facilitator of their progress. This is not a recent phenomenon. The Scarman Inquiry had identified difficulties in providing a reliable system for teaching recruits in the operational environment. The field training period was extended from four to ten weeks, at this time, to allow more extensive and supportive, supervised operational training (Scarman, 1983). During the late
1980s and part of the 1990s, field training and classroom based training were interspersed with one another to facilitate better reflection on operational experience (Peacock, 2010). The argument was that exposure to the operational environment needed to be carefully controlled to avoid the formation of occupational practices and attitudes that were considered inappropriate for policing a diverse and multicultural society. For that to be possible, recruits were thought to need time to reflect on their field experiences before further exposure.

‘I wanted to go out more but...’

Ashton Police stated that, “PACS (Police Actions Checklist items) serve a very important role within IPLDP assessment and should not be regarded as a ‘tick-box’ administrative exercise” (Ashton Police, 2007). When the student officer had performed the Police Action Checklist tasks, to the satisfaction of the Police Development Officer, the former was ‘signed off’ to move on to the next phase, Independence.

However, for some student officers completion of the bureaucratic targets seemed to be an incentive to complete them as soon as possible. Others became resentful their Police Development Officer appeared to be over-concerned with completing paperwork to demonstrate competence, identified by the Police Action Checklist items. This extended to the bureaucracy associated with their training as it came to be seen as an impediment to progress not a facilitator of it. One student officer said,

“(PACS, LDSRs, PDO reviews of us). I found that...I want to be out there fighting crime and dealing with people...you’re sat in the office and your Police Development Officer is doing a review and you’re doing your PACS...”
They thought they would be ‘out’ more but instead felt disappointment that police work and the initial training programme generated so much ‘paperwork’ that they were not able to get ‘out more’.

For student officer 8, his understanding of ‘doing well’ centred, partly, on the completion of tasks at speed. He seemed to revel on high-speed repetitive work. He said,

“It was made clear that you need to be sprinting straight away on shift…Usually get 10-12 jobs, 6 per night…There are 24 on the shift but not everyone is always in…I’ve been told that I’d get the ‘most improved award’ if there was one” (SO.8).

Student officer 6, a young male officer had been desperate to ‘get out there’ and said, “I wanted to go out more. I felt frustrated. It was a bit slow but picked up toward the end. I told [the Police Development Unit manager] I wanted to go quicker”. In this sense, some of them thought of their time in this stage as divided between being ‘out there’ and its opposite, being ‘in the station’. They sometimes made mental calculations of this and attributed greater value to the proportion of time spent ‘out there’. Some identified ‘paperwork’ as a fetter on the ability to ‘get out there’. One student officer said that, “I do feel, though, that as a student officer, I want to be out on the streets as much as possible and there’s so much paperwork…” (Group interview: Police Development Unit 1).

Student officer 8 was very keen, during the Consolidation phase, to do his paperwork correctly and was quite meticulous with it, especially the ubiquitous and long-standing ‘301’, crime report form, which he indicated he always kept handy so that he could produce it when needed at a ‘job’. He was obsessed with doing it quickly, to get it ‘out of the way’.
However, student officer 3, a graduate in law, expressed a somewhat different approach to paperwork which centred more on its quality than ‘getting it out of the way’ and on his own personal standards. He had also received a congratulatory email from a Detective Sergeant, who thought he had written an “excellent statement” that was thorough and a good proportion of useable information”. He had, in fact, used an aide memoire and 10 point plan for statements, a technique taught in the Learning Modules stage of the programme. He recognised the pressure that came with paperwork though (he did not want to get a “bad reputation”) and recalled that another Detective Sergeant had told him that he remembered uniformed officer’s collar numbers.

Some student officers certainly developed an understanding of the consequences of being thought not to have completed their bureaucratic obligations correctly. During an observation, student officer 12 was summoned by a Detective Sergeant (DS) because she had forgotten to sign a statement that she’d taken for a murder inquiry. She readily swallowed her pride and hid her exasperation that she had not been supervised in undertaking such an important task. She signed the statement and said, “You do what you’re told when asked by a DS (Detective Sergeant).”

The bureaucratic burden of the initial training programme itself also came to bear heavily on student officers. They were expected to complete regular Learning and Development Student Reviews as part of the assessment process of the programme. Both these things constituted important parts of the bureaucracy of the initial training programme. For some student officers this seemed to be another
unnecessary imposition on their time. One student officer strongly resented completing the Learning Development Student Reviews (LDSR). He said,

“You repeat yourself. In the PACS you expand on things and then repeat them in the LDSR…Not useful for learning…They’re like Action Plans. It would be useful if you’re making the same mistakes but for a singular problem that’s already been corrected…Why do we need to write a review about it…It’s a pretty pointless exercise really because you’re already doing it on your PACS and then you’re writing about it to tell…no one who’s actually gonna read it anyway.” (Focus group: BCU, 1)

It was indeed described by student officer 6 as a, “Pile of rubbish.” He thought that they were almost being required to do something wrong so they could then write about it and seemed formulaic to him. He thought he was working quickly enough and in exasperation said, “You don’t need smoke blown up your arse,” (SO.6). Another student officer said,

“Haven’t got a problem with PACS but the number of LDSRs we’ve got to do…That’s ridiculous…Have to do 1 per week…Spend quite a lot time doing it. If you do your PACS daily and then your LDSRs…If you’ve got a couple of crimes you’re dealing with. As well as jobs that come in for your PACS, that’s too many” (Focus group: BCU, 1).

In contrast, student officer 3 took a more sanguine view of what was required for assessment. He argued that he virtually took control of all his own learning during this stage and that it was all completed outside of his normal Relief work, partly because he was enjoying doing ‘the jobs’ so much but also because it was so bureaucratically demanding. He completed 107 pieces of evidence for the Police Action Checklists (far more than was needed) He said, “I’m taking responsibility for my own learning. This has hardly been looked at by the PDU staff. I’ve got my work ethic from doing the job” (SO.3).
As a result of these issues, the Consolidation period represented training, largely for technical aspects of police work and for the fast pace of ‘job-to-job’ reactive policing. This technical focus was enhanced by the bureaucracy of both the assessment process and police work. For some student officers, there appeared little time to do anything else. Stradling and Harper (1988, p.202) note that “much of their early training burden is practice at paperwork”. Chappell (2007) demonstrates how most police agencies in the USA practice a model of field training (the San Jose Model) that is inappropriate to the direction of community policing. Field Training Officers, they argue, reflect the dominant hierarchical and bureaucratic perspective of the police organisation and were unable to evaluate recruit’s community orientated policing skills. Some have altered the entire curriculum to reflect problem-solving approach but others just tack courses on to existing system (Chappell, 2007, p.499). Sun (2003) also noted the highly structured and standardised nature of this programme and the continuity of a law enforcement tendency amongst Field Training Officers and other officers alike. Haar (2001) demonstrates the way in which support for community policing and problem-solving approaches to policing, inculcated during academy training, dissipated upon contact with police work and the police organisation, in the first instance, during field training.

These experiences also reflect the development of a long-standing feature of police occupational culture that devalues paperwork and station based activities and over-values making arrests, pursuing criminals and policing outside the station environment (Owen, 1999; Herbert, 2001; Bittner, 2005). Fielding (1988b) argues that this conflict struck at the heart of what recruits thought police work was about. Owen (1999, p.106) noted that this was not liked by recruits who thought that their,
“time would have been better spent on operational duties”. Chappell (2007) argues that that the tendency of field training officers to adhere to rules and to be obsessed with documenting behaviour interfered with independent critical thinking and the process of learning and Owen (1999) noted that ‘probationers’ picked up from tutors, scripted practices for dealing with ‘jobs’ quickly. Flanagan (2008) noted the over-bureaucratic nature of the assessment of recruit police officers which was thought to have increased since the introduction of the new Initial Police Development Programme. What might be a more fruitful approach, as Norris (1992, p.103) argues, is to “…define competent practice by reference to occupational rather than organisational criteria…there is a considerable disjunction between the rhetoric of training and the reality of police work. It might also be stressed that, as Foster 2005, p.201) points out, “paperwork…is…a crucial component of all policing. It provides part of the foundation for transparency and legitimacy of police practices…”

‘If it was shit, he’d tell you’

Some student officers developed ways of doing police work and of understanding its purpose that strongly connected with that of their Police Development Officer. Student officers were usually very complimentary about their pairing. One student officer said that,

“the students have been paired up with the Police Development Officer, personality wise, very, very well. People seem to have developed very, very quickly. Largely down to the Police Development Officer that they’ve been given” (Focus group. BCU, 1).

Partly because of this quickly developed affinity, there did seem to develop an uncanny resemblance between the Police Development Officer’s perceived
personality and policing style and that of some student officer’s. At times, it appeared as though doppelgangers of some Police Development Officers were being produced.

Student officer 8, for example, modelled himself on the approach to police work of his Police Development Officer that centred on doing the ‘jobs’ at speed, which, in turn generated a strong sense of comparative success for this student officer as he was meeting his Police Development Officer’s expectations. He also picked up why and the way in which his Police Development Officer prioritised activities. Student officer 8 said,

“He said to me, it’s not about the arrests. You’ll get the arrests naturally. It’s finding the intel to keep the Superintendents off your back. If they say, [student officer 6] has only made 2 arrests this month but he’s put 50 bits of intelligence on, so he is actually working…Someone’s definitely watching you all the time. The Inspector is watching you and if you start underperforming you’ll be kicked up the arse and told to get on and do stuff…He must be interacting with people to get the intel” (SO.8)

The scepticism he felt about the formal messages he had hitherto been exposed to during the programme was also reinforced by his Police Development Officer.

“PPF⁷ is good to an extent but it depends who you’ve got and how they’re being with you. If somebody is being nice…and even if they’re being horrible, you’ll try and put them first but if they’re being that bad, it’s like well hang on a minute I’m a person as well. I’ll put me first and I’m still putting somebody first. I’ll put me first and I’ll look after myself first before I’ll help you. If you’re gonna be like that with me and be nasty to me and shirty with me, I won’t try and help ya…They didn’t really discuss the idea that some people are difficult to put first…It just seemed like, you put everybody first and it’s only really now, speaking with your PDO, “yeah, you put everybody first, when you can.” In induction it just felt it couldn’t be challenged” (SO.8).

⁷ Putting People First was the programme encountered in the Induction phase, the force wide customer and community services programme for Ashton Police.
In Chapter 3, it was noted that student officer 6 was a little defensive about the status of the police amongst some communities and had been itching to get out on to the streets. In the Consolidation phase, he appeared to be developing a pugnacious approach to police work, in part, encouraged by his Police Development Officer. Student officer 6, looked up to his Police Development Officer and saw his own approach to police work developing out of that, aspects of which were a little alarming. He said,

“[My] PDO…swears a lot and is blunt. I got on well with him. If it was shit he’d tell you…I am seen as quite a fiery person and plain speaking. I won’t tolerate some things. Don’t want people screaming in my face….People change on shift because they’re not strong enough. Older officers are not as knowledgeable as me. Very few officers police according to the law. There is low level poor practice. It is important to police better for the sake of the law and for the professionalism of the police. This might provide comfort for the person searched.”

In a contrasting way, student officer 3 had developed a very different approach to policing. He argued that his Relief mentor (acting in place of a Police Development Officer) demonstrated exemplary skills and characteristics. It seemed particularly complementary in relation to their respective approaches to policing. The student officer said of his mentor,

“He’s incredible. Can’t speak highly enough of him. He has 6 years in the job…Professional at all times. Laid back. Not had a fight – touch wood. Treats criminals like victims. Always offers to back up…Shout up for jobs… Jack defined the kind of police officer I was gonna be because he’s got such a great way of talking to people as well. I really responded to that. He gave me the confidence to go, “it’s ok to talk to people.” Didn’t know much about the job so I talked to people whilst he did other things. Got confidence from that when people were grateful.” (SO.3).

This was exactly how this student officer came to understand the requirements of police work. It had been developing for some time. He had reservations about the
‘light touch’ of the police legal training he had experienced and saw the officer safety training as a bit ‘clockwork orange’ (as he put it) and now in the Consolidation phase felt that he had found his own way, but through the example of his mentor. Indeed, he noted how one of his female peers had expected him to become a stereotypical male police officer but was pleased to find a different outcome. He said, “…she was surprised I had become such a laid back officer. She had expected a typical bloke” (SO.3). It is tempting to wonder how policing styles might have developed had student officers 6 and 3 swapped over their pairing.

The desire to resolve conflict by talking and listening was very important for student officer 3 and focussed on a particular incident that he attended (accompanied by his Relief mentor) involving an assault by a person who was drunk and who had run off from the scene. They had gone to the area near a local pub and detained a person, made an arrest and had seemingly defused the tension and gained control. The student officer described the following change in the circumstances in this way.

“Just about to put the cuffs on when another officer comes around the corner with his baton out and on his shoulder 8 at which point it just kicked off! The person had become very compliant but this changed him” (3).

He described this moment as an ‘epiphany,’ where he came to realise the importance of equanimity and dialogue in policing but conversely its frequent absence in the behaviour of other officers.

---

8 This refers to the position that Student officers were taught to hold the baton in preparation for making a strike. It is intended to act as a signal that the officer is prepared to make an imminent strike and should be accompanied by an instruction for those so instructed to move away.
There has been a concern that field trainers have imparted informal, technically ‘incorrect’ practices and often pernicious values to recruits who are thought to be so ‘susceptible to attitude change” (Van Maanen, 1973, p.24) and that the field trainer is so powerful vis-à-vis the recruit. Owen (1999 p.112) noted that Tutor Constables ⁹ in the Metropolitan Police referred to it as ‘puppy walking’. As Fielding (1988, p.92) notes, “It is not at this stage that one would expect to encounter recruits with their own adaptations.” Fielding (1988b) and (Holdaway, 1983) also noted both the tendency for recruits to mimic field trainers but that, “recruits discern different approaches to practice.” Chan et al (2003, p.303) observed that, “…field training remained an apprenticeship arrangement where probationers learned by ‘watching, listening and mimicking...’ individual adaptations to field training experiences amongst recruits also existed as well as the ability to recognise ‘good’ and ‘bad’ policing. Brown (1983) found that “recruits tended to ‘mirror’ instructors’ conceptions of the role and “attitudes to police work were the product of a good deal of informal advice from police tutors who...firmed maintained they directly influenced attitudinal development” Sun (2003) argues that whilst the field training officer is pivotal in transmitting cultural patterns and on whose values and behaviour recruits model themselves, many do not display exemplary police practices. Furthermore, in the context of the example above, Chan (2003, p.12) argues that , “How often ‘good’ or ‘bad’ models are encountered will depend on the prevailing culture of the police organisation and on how training is organised. In this case, its organisation had

⁹ The Tutor Constable is a term used in previous initial training programmes and is the equivalent of the Police Development Officer in the Initial Police Learning and Programme.
capricious consequences that could and did display ‘good’ and ‘bad’ models of police practice.

‘I was frightened of showing my emotions’

Student officers went through some important emotional experiences during field training. This indicated that there was another layer that appeared to have been subsumed beneath the technical requirements of Checklist activities (NPIA, 2007).

Student officer 13 appeared to have frozen in the face of ‘real’ police work’. Repeated attempts to develop his self-confidence met with little success. They were well meaning but ineffective in the context of the programme that did not seem to have the resources to address the emotional difficulties he faced.

Other student officers had found dealing with death very difficult. Student officer 10 indicated that fellow officers helped him ‘deal with it’ (rather than his Police Development Officer) but that support with the emotional issues in training did not feature specifically in the programme. The deeper emotional aspect of this kind of field experience was not far from the surface for student officer 8, who often appears as a little cocksure elsewhere in this thesis. He said,

“I went to a post-mortem…Pathologist put me at ease…The various activities were broken down and de-mystified…I was frightened of showing my own emotions (being upset) and so not being professional. I switched off my own emotions to some extent…Children and death are too close to home…Could be emotional or physical…Fellow officers are supportive” (SO.8).

Henry (2004) notes that ‘rookies’ focussed almost entirely on the bureaucracy of death rather than its emotional impact. This was to allow a protective ‘psychic
numbing’ to take place that was considered, “quite functional because it protected the rookie from potentially overwhelming psychological threats…and to avoid permanent or severe traumatic reaction”. Nevertheless, if not addressed some of these experiences can re-emerge in relation to stress-related illness later in their careers (Burke, 1993; Burke, 2016).

There was little evidence of taking time for reflection, in part it could be argued, because much more time was taken up with bureaucratic and technical activities associated with the training programme,

‘I’m not ready yet’!

Despite the preparations made by student officers during the Consolidation stage, there existed some level of uncertainty and anxiety concerning the subsequent Independence phase. One student officer recognised this issue when she said, “My concern is that on shift I won’t have time for the high standards maintained in the Police Development Unit which is the ‘gold standard’” (SO.7). The sense of trepidation about ‘going Independent’ is summed up well in this quote from a student officer who said that,

“We are all losing our safety net. Doesn’t matter how confident you’re gonna be...I think our learning will start when we get out there on our own. As much as we’ve learnt so much with our Police Development Officers, they’ve got so much experience and they’ve given us so much, not just my Police Development Officer but every one of the Police Development Officers that you talk to, they’re always there to support ya. But in a couple of weeks when you go, that changes. But you are joining a team and you’re gonna become part of a unit, whereas we haven’t had that up here...For the last 10 weeks we’ve been on our own agenda basically. So, once we get out on shift…we can take responsibility for what we need to actually be doin” (Focus group: Unit 1)
One student officer remarked that, “The fear is making mistakes and taking responsibility for them. We haven’t got that person standing there for us” (Focus group. Unit 1).

Whilst some student officers had been desperate to ‘get out there’, by the end of the Consolidation stage, some were also concerned that they were not yet ready to progress to the Independent Patrol phase. The duration of the Consolidation stage seemed too short (it constituted 11% of the total initial training programme) and the rigidity of the programme and the organisational changes at the time enhanced that feeling. For some student officers it was further truncated by informal practices of Police Development Officers, which seemed perverse and indicated that, in practice, field training did not always take place over the entire duration of the Consolidation stage. Chan (2003, p.147) notes that field training in New South Wales lasted 49 weeks and included a range of experience of operational policing that included watching, doing and reflecting on police work.

For student officer 13, the transition to operational policing proved to be his undoing on the programme (see Chapter 8). He had progressed ‘satisfactorily’ through the Learning Modules phase although there were some notable ‘warning signs’ concerning his lack of a social connection with his peers. Whilst he was a pleasant person, he didn’t seem to quite ‘fit in’. If some student officers were desperate to get ‘out there’, this one was desperate to be kept away from ‘real’ policing. Once he had been paired with his Police Development Officer (a female officer known for her patience) he seemed to crumble under the weight of expectation. His ‘stage fright’ had a lasting effect as this quotation indicates He said, “… when I was out on the
ground with … my tutor, I found it very hard…because I was so subdued and quiet…” (SO.13). Fielding (1988a) found that some recruits did suffer from varying degrees of ‘stage fright’ and that field trainers needed to “give novices a feeling of agency and direct experience while protecting them from lasting errors” (Fielding, 1988, p104).

The anxiety of the transition from the Consolidation phase to the Independent Patrol phase was further exacerbated by the major re-organisation commenced by the force during the Consolidation phase. The Police Development Units had already started to be dismantled. Trainers had been moved to other duties or otherwise left the training environment. A rationalisation had taken place and the force eventually had one Police Development Unit and one trainer at force HQ. The Police Development Unit Sergeants left to take up other duties and were seen by some student officers as looking for other jobs and not being wholly focussed on the training activities.

As the Consolidation stage drew to a close student officers found out where they were posted and some expressed a desire to know more accurately where they were going, so that they could prepare themselves. Some said that they would have preferred to have remained where they had been working with their respective Police Development Officers, at least for the first part of the Independence phase. As it happened, some felt that it was difficult to have to get to know new areas and working practices so soon after Consolidation when they still felt very ‘green.’ Student officers remained in their divisional area but could be posted to a different station.
At the end of the Consolidation phase, despite what the organisation intended (to prepare student officers for Independent Patrol) there was a strong sense that they would be expected to do something they were not ready for.

Conclusion

The Consolidation phase in Ashton Police, built around the performance and observation of occupational tasks, served to make visible and formal, some of the activities of both the student officer and the Police Development Officer. This represents a change from some eras and provided a systematic programme of training development during what has been demonstrated to be a crucial time for the development of occupational values and practices and one that has often been hidden from oversight.

However, there were a number of problematic issues that emerged during the Consolidation stage that, at times, reflected continuities with field training in the past. The way in which student officers were exposed to the operational environment seemed, at times, to be inconsistent and meant that some student officers were effectively ‘thrown in at the deep-end’. Student officers reacted to police work environment in differing ways which was strongly connected with the relationships they had developed with their Police Development Officer. This placed a great deal of emphasis on a somewhat capricious process regarding which Police Development Officer was paired with which student officer. There was little time devoted to effective reflection on field experiences, except through the written review process that itself was seen by some student officers to be just another part of the endless bureaucracy of initial training. The period of time allowed for training in the police
field environment was too short for student officers to feel confident and secure in their capacity to police effectively upon progression to the Independent Patrol phase. In some cases, the short timeframe was truncated (because of wider organisational changes) and led to a perception that the Consolidation phase had ended early.

Moreover, there is a wider point to be made concerning the context of the introduction of the Initial Police Learning and Development Programme. During the history of initial training, in the police forces of England and Wales, a tendency has existed to bring its structure and direction back to ‘familiar’ ground’, a rigid sequential pattern of initial training, and attempts to bring formal and field training together have been particularly strongly resisted (Peacock, 2010, p.120). However, the national guidance specifically included, in the ‘supervised patrol’ phase, ‘class-based’ activities too (NPIA, 2007). It allows a force to conduct formal class based training alongside or intertwined with “work based learning under supervised patrol” (NPIA, 2009). Fielding (1988b) also advises that after the Initial Course, the Tutor Constable attachment need not be a block”. This advice is apposite with regard to the initial training practices in Ashton Police where there was an opportunity to have taken a more progressive approach to field training by integrating it more closely with formal training.

This had a significant impact on the development of police culture, where the ‘reality shock’ was significant for student officers. The attachment to the values and practices of their Police Development Officer was profound but very variable and in the cases of student officers 6 and 3, not well aligned. The bureaucratic burden for student officers and the organisational fragility of the phase produced another wave
of anxiety and ‘anticipatory socialisation’ associated with feeling that they were not really ready to move on to Independent Patrol status.
Chapter 8: On probation, not training. Independent Patrol

Introduction

Student officer 8 said that, “You learn a lot in the PDU but things are different when you get on to shift”. In this chapter I focus on the stage of the programme called Independent Patrol. When student officers had been ‘signed off’ as ‘independent’ at the end of the Consolidation phase, this allowed them to move on to the Independent Patrol phase where training became more informal (although aspects of formal training remained, particularly in the form of the frequently derided Student Officer Learning and Assessment Portfolio) and student officers were policing without immediate supervision. From the start of this phase, student officers lost the support of their Police Development Officer but were allocated a Relief mentor and were line-managed by their Relief supervisors (sergeants and inspectors). They had effectively left the control of the Police Development Unit, although their progress was monitored by it and by the Learning and Development department at force Headquarters. There were four Reliefs, operational at all times, based at police stations in the force area and operating on a shift system. Student officers moved a very short physical distance to start working on a Relief. They were busy stations and relatively modern buildings but in different locations. One had a picturesque ancient city centre location and the other was close to a busy dual carriageway, some way outside of a more suburbanised city. In response to calls to the police, student officers traversed the territory of the Division and sometimes the entire force territory, for particular activities.
In this chapter, using examples from my fieldwork findings, I argue, that student officer’s relationship to the initial training programme became so attenuated that their status as probationer officers overrode their status as student officers. The former is a status that more accurately reflects their legal employment situation and meant that in effect, they were largely no longer ‘training’ in a formal sense. This was a much longer phase than any of the other phases and despite having to compile a lengthy document of working practices, the Student Officer Learning and Assessment Portfolio, what training did take place was largely informal. The Portfolio was seen by student officers as largely a bureaucratic task, not a training activity. What follows is a brief discussion of some of the key issues of informal training that apply to the developments that took place over this phase.

Informal training: Key issues

It was noted in Chapter 1 that in the nineteenth and a large part of the twentieth centuries, officers were expected to be out patrolling on their own, after a perfunctory period of formal training and field training (Emsley, 1991). As Weinberger (1995) notes, “Having passed through their training period, recruits now faced the task of becoming ‘real’ policemen, over a two year probationary period in their first posting”. This did not constitute a formalised ‘training’ period at that time but considerable informal training did take place (Weinberger, 1995). It has been treated as a probationary work period rather than training per se, where the ‘probationer’ is assumed to have completed ‘training’ and entered a trial period where their police work is under scrutiny (Weinberger, 1995; Wood and Tong, 2009). As the Police Regulations (2003, p.8) state, “…during his period of probation in the force the
services of a constable may be dispensed with at any time if the chief officer considers that he is not fitted, mentally or physically, to perform the duties of his office, or that he is not likely to become an efficient or well conducted constable”.

It is during informal training that the value of the recruit to the organisation becomes evident. Research by Martin and Wilson (1965) demonstrated the rising cost and reduction in officer ‘working capacity’ that any increased duration of formal training has in the police and Peacock (2010, p.118) writes that, “Any opportunity to reduce the amount of time an officer is in training and thereby increase the amount of time on operational patrol will be seized upon by those who need to provide the front line service.” In the 1980s, Lord Scarman (1983, p.130) sought to emphasise that, what he called ‘probation’ as distinct from the ‘initial course’ and ‘street duties’ courses did constitute a training period, in part, because it had not been seen as such hitherto. He took the view that failure to recognise this could result in damaging encounters between police probationers (untrained officers, in Scarman’s view) and the public.

Research on organisational socialisation and police culture regards this period as an informal socialising influence (Bennett, 1984; Fielding, 1988) where recruit’s attitudes migrate toward acceptance of those of their work colleagues and they start to gain a more realistic and cynical understanding of police work (Van Maanen, 1975; Fielding, 1988). The learning that took place in formal and field training recedes and is replaced with practices learnt informally, ‘on the job’. The recruit experiences a metamorphosis by internalising the features of occupational culture of their more experienced role models (Van Maanen, 1973). This takes place through an ‘informal’ training process where recruits are shown ‘how things are done around here’. The
long-cherished idea that policing is learnt as a ‘craft’ (Bayley and Bittner, 1984; Willis and Mastrofski, 1998) implies that ‘formal’ training is unnecessary because learning to be a police officer can be facilitated informally, ‘on the job’. This is a practice that crucially, is much less open to wider scrutiny than formal or field training. As Chan (2003, p.8) argues, “The key issue in recruit training is whether formal training has any lasting influence on practice…”

Police culture has been portrayed as the cause of ‘training decay’ (Chan et al, 2003, p.10) where professionalism taught in formal training is undermined by what is learnt informally. This presentation of police culture, acquired during informal training, gives the impression of a final perspective that all recruits reach, whereas it may be more accurate to describe the variation that exists and a degree of “taking on the culture”, as Chan (2003, 202) calls it. This is, though, a period where officers have been found to be learning to do police work through an opaque set of practices of observing others and learning by experience (Bayley and Bittner, 1984). Despite attempts to formalise and incorporate the ‘better’ aspects of this murky world, Chan et al (2003, p.304) notes that, “…the bulk of recruit training was based on the notion that policing is a craft to be learned ‘on the job’” but one which required much greater formality to understand better its impact. Learning in this way may not be pernicious but little is known about it. It has been left to old hands to pass on the knowledge they say that only they can have. The problem, as Bayley and Bittner (1984, p.36) argue, is that “…this view of policing…suggests that policing is not amenable to rational analysis and, by extension, to formal learning.” One way of addressing these problems has been to promote professionalisation in policing, which would involve substantial changes to this kind of initial training. The resistance of the police to
professionalisation is related to its historical and cultural features, which eschew the value of education in police work (Green and Gates, 2014).

For Chan (2003, p.5) “…police professionalism should be seen as a multifaceted and dynamic concept” containing competing understandings of it. Whilst professionalisation is associated with establishing power and authority and does not always lead to better police work, it is important to find effective ways of teaching the ‘craft’ of police professionalism. In order to do this it is necessary, according to Chan, not to see police culture as negative or to see professionalism as its antidote. As Chan (2003, p.11-12) argues, “It is simpler to consider that within police organisations, recruits will encounter both ‘good’ and ‘bad’ practice models during formal instruction and in less formal occupational settings”. ‘Good’ informal training should involve combining academic learning with practice but maintaining parity of esteem for both (Peeters, 2010).

‘Find your own trouble’

The question of discretion became particularly visible during the Independent Patrol phase and initially student officers received little or no direction in relation to discretion, which was illustrated by a note I saw during my first observation of this phase, in one of the Police Development Unit base rooms, entitled ‘Independent Patrol Expectations’. The note suggested student officers should brief themselves (if there was no formal briefing) and then go about a variety of possible police tasks at their own discretion. Student officer 12 indicated that during the first week of the Independence phase they were, “told that our time is our own and to use it
well…[and to] find your own trouble” (SO.12). In what follows I describe a number of examples of the use of discretion by student officers evident during this phase.

Student officer 12’s interpretation of discretion was to find a lot of her, ‘own trouble’, which meant pursuing prosecutions that she thought other officers would not have concerned themselves with. She saw it as important to embrace the jobs considered ‘lowly’ by other officers; ‘Shit jobs’, as she called them, largely for the experience and practice of doing them. She had, therefore, started out, in this phase, “nicking everything that moved” (SO.12) but realised that some experienced officers arrived at policing decisions in a rather more flexible way. She said that,

“When I first started I’d give tickets £50-70 fine to everyone. Now I don’t do that…I was told that you’d never get out of the station if you did everyone for everything. So, I could stop them and give a ticket but I won’t. I could give ‘words of advice [but] “if I get the feeling their behaviour isn’t going to change I need to punish them”

This apparent permissiveness had the potential to cause significant problems as the chaotic scene, involving another Student Officer in the cohort and a Student Officer from a cohort a little further on in the programme, contained in the vignette below, illustrates.
Vignette:

Out of their depth

The events in question followed a period where there were no immediate ‘jobs’ to attend and student officer 4, a young female officer, and another, young male officer colleague, a little further ahead in the training programme, had been driving through the city at night without any apparent aim - “Going out to play” as it was called. At a certain point the colleague spotted a vehicle driving without lights and decided to stop it. He made this snap decision to make a ‘stop’ just a few minutes before the end of the shift - and so, the saga began.

Once the officer started speaking with the driver, the original offence, of driving without lights was quickly forgotten and the colleague was interested in the legality of the documents for the driver and the vehicle. The driver spoke and understood little English and had been driving on a foreign licence for more than 12 months. This constituted an offence but the question was, what offence? Firstly, the colleague wanted to seize the vehicle and issue a Fixed Penalty Notice for driving other than in accordance with the conditions of his licence at a probable cost of £90. Student officer 4 issued a Fixed Penalty Notice for this. In addition he would have to pay to retrieve the car. The passenger was not in a position to drive the car legally at which point the student officers thought he should receive a further Fixed Penalty Notice for having invalid insurance, the fine for which he could decide to pay immediately, at a cost of £200 or to go by summons to court. Student officer 4 issued this Fixed Penalty Notice too.

At that point, the student officers had a discussion with the driver about his job, his wife’s job and why he was in England. They discovered that he was working as a care worker in a home, the knowledge of which seemed to cause them to take some pity on him and to reassess the cost of the offences that they were reporting him for.

In order to seek some clarification of the nature of the offence the driver had committed and possibly to allow the student officers to resile from the direction they had been going in, the colleague spoke with a Traffic Sergeant at the station, over the radio. They were told that they may not have been correct in assuming he was committing both offences. Meanwhile, student officer 4 talked with a friend of the driver (who had been called to help him with the language issue and possibly to drive the car home) and decided to go to the driver’s home and conduct an interview and take the summons route. At which point, the police vehicle wouldn’t start. The colleague called road side assistance which took some time to arrive by which time the police vehicle started again! As time was moving well beyond the end of their shift, both student officers conducted the interview inside the police vehicle with the driver in the back seat and the student officers, leaning over, in the two front seats, to speak to him and his recently co-opted interpreter.

After establishing that the driver had committed certain offences, a caution was issued but the wording was not understood and had to be explained a number of times and in a number of different linguistic formations. When it was finally established (partially through the interpreter) that the caution had been understood the driver was reported for summons for the offences. This took up 2 hours of the shift, at the end of which all (including the researcher) were exhausted. Student officer 4 commented that, for the first time, she needed a large glass of wine at the end of the shift. Her colleague commented that some evenings he often drank as much as it took to get to knock him out. This was one of them.

This was clearly an offence that was eventually appropriately prosecuted. However, the manner in which it took place was haphazard and chaotic at best and became so because two student officers, partially trained in road traffic legislation decided on this course of action, without appropriate supervision.
Another example, with arguably more serious consequences, occurred when student officer 2 and one his peers (working together, without direct supervision) had made an arrest of a young person, for possession of Cannabis that had clearly caused some consternation amongst those on duty in the Police Development Unit. I overheard one student officer say, “How old? 14!” Another officer sarcastically said, “Ahhhhh…bless” and after seeing the small quantity for which the arrest had been made, another officer asked why the arrest had been made. The student officer justified his actions with a rather plaintive remark, “Yeah, but he’s got loads of previous though”. Both student officers received a ‘grilling’ for their actions from training staff but the consequences, for the arrested person, would have been considerable.

It was noted in Chapters 5 and 6 that student officers had experienced role-plays and scenarios training during earlier phases of the programme, as too artificial to feel confident about using stop and search effectively in ‘real’ policing situations. They were certainly not lacking in confidence during one Relief observation. Student officers 8 (a young male officers) and 10 (an older male officer) were patrolling together in the police van in the late evening, when student officer 10 spotted a young person from some distance away (150 metres) who was alone walking along the street wearing the hood of his ‘hoodie’ over his head. At that moment, the person was not known to them and did not resemble anyone known to them. Both student officers seemed to know instantly that they ‘should’ stop and search this person. They drove quickly over to him and told him to stop, which he did. Student officer 10 said that there had been burglaries and thefts in the area by persons wearing ‘hoodies’, fitting his description. He then told the person he was going to carry out a
search. The search took place and a very small number of Cannabis stalks were found, in response to which, the person said that he had smoked cannabis that evening. This seemed a rather routine activity for the young person about whom no personal details were recorded. At that point the student officer felt he had grounds for further action in relation to the suspected possession of illegal drugs, which he was about to go ahead with. However, an urgent call came in over the radio that they felt they needed to attend. Both student officers quickly got back to the vehicle to attend on ‘Blues and twos’\textsuperscript{10} but were ‘stood down’\textsuperscript{11} \textit{en route}. The young man searched had a lucky escape from possibly spending a number of hours at the police station.

Student Officers were well aware of the ‘correct’ way of carrying out this procedure but also well aware that their supervisors required them to do it differently and frequently. It seemed to be the case that some student officers did not think that discretion extended to stop and search at all. It was evident that a number of practices did not align with those taught during the Learning Modules phase. The grounds for the search were probably not lawful. Reports of burglaries in the area and of persons wearing ‘hoodies’ would not have been specific enough for this particular stop and search. The student officers did not tell the person that he was ‘detained for the purposes of a search’, who they were, what station they were from or what the legal basis was for the stop and search, as their formal training had specified.

\textsuperscript{10} ‘Blues and two’s’ is a term that refers to the flashing blue police lights and the multi-tone sirens currently used on vehicles intended for use in emergency police response activities.

\textsuperscript{11} To be ‘stood down’ means that the force control room indicated that their presence was no longer required.
For student officer 3, a male officer with a law degree, the issue of stop and search became especially problematic. During the Independent Patrol phase, his supervisors had concerns about the ‘low’ quantity of stop and searches that he was doing and told him to increase them in a way that he felt was ‘building grounds’ rather than having those grounds at the point of the stop and search. He thought his supervisors were asking him to rely on ignorance of the law on stop and search and the tendency for those stopped not to ask questions about the legal basis of the procedure. Student officer 3 felt trapped in a dilemma where he was being required to carry out a very powerful police activity in what he regarded as unlawful ways and without discretion. He described this dilemma in this way.

“[Police supervisors did not like] a young police officer questioning things in a healthy manner. [They thought I had made] a fundamental misunderstanding of the law, which frustrated me quite a bit. I don’t know everything…but I do have a very good legal background. I understand a lot of these things and I really paid attention at training school and I did really well on my tests…I do know what I’m talking about. So, when I said, ‘I’m not comfortable with this’, to be told, ‘oh, you just don’t understand the legislation. You need to go out with someone who does understand’, it is quite frustrating “ (SO.3).

This resulted in him feeling ostracised on that Relief and eventually leaving it feeling vulnerable to the practices of his supervisors that he had no control over. He thought they saw him as ‘soft’ on criminals and said that at one point during a review of his progress, he was told to, ‘find your inner bastard’. Somewhat ironically, he said that he felt closer to being a transgressor of the law as a student officer than at any other time in his life. He did, though, feel that some of the blame for this lay elsewhere, specifically the Divisional Superintendent whose need to meet performance targets drove this problem. What was evident was that training had ended and just doing what you were told had replaced it.
Even where discretion apparently ended there was room for student officers to exercise loosely supervised decisions. Student officer 12 said that, “What we don’t have discretion over is domestic violence.” Nevertheless, this officer recounted an incident in which she separated the parties involved in a domestically related assault but made no arrest. Sometime later she was admonished by a Relief Sergeant, who asked her what would have happened if the person had gone back to the house and “stabbed them all to death” and that, in that case, it would have made the force and the officer all look very bad (SO.12).

The thorny question of how to exercise discretion should, according to Stradling et al (1988, p.202), be a part of, “All aspects of training”. As Lustgarten (1988, p.11) argues, these, “sensitive, very specific human judgements”, constitute an important element of that training. It may be remembered that ‘stop and search’ had been problematic during the Learning Modules phase, which centred on the confusion some student officers felt about what constituted lawful practice. However, it did not have the overt training focus in the Independent Patrol phase. Student officers appeared to be doing what they felt was expected of them, even if it was unlawful. There was, though, apparently no capacity to have professional discussions about such an important practice. Recent changes to stop and search, implemented because it was found that many were illegally carried out, demonstrate the appropriateness of student officer 3’s position (HMIC, 2013). Because stop and search is a pre-arrest power, its practice has attracted considerable academic and policy related interest and a debate still exists concerning its role in precipitating public disorder (Guardian/LSE, 2011). Its connection with problems of police legitimacy and public order has been established (Scarman, 1983) as has the
importance of the police acting in a procedurally fair way, as viewed from the perspective of those being stopped and searched (Bates et al 2015). The distinction between ‘blue letter law’ (law adapted for police use) and ‘black letter law’ (law as written in statute) is a well-known phenomenon in policing (Reiner, 2000), one that student officers in Ashton Police should have been able to discuss professionally. Lustgarten (1988) argues that police officers have a range of choices open to them but often make the mistake in assuming they all involve the law, a view that is likely to lead to its application, often where it is not necessary. However, it is the case that police officers frequently exercise their discretion not to proceed with the legal process (Goldstein, 1960). Owen (1999) and Goldsmith (1990) found that the substantive criminal law offered little guidance to patrol officers. Discretionary decisions have more of a human dimension (Owen, 1999) but the speed at which they have to be made can lead to distortions in enforcement that have a cumulative, differential impact on particular social groups such as ethnic minorities, the young and those from low socioeconomic groups and can impact on the legitimacy of the police (Lustgarten, 1988). Bryant et al (2013, p.394) argue that the professionalisation of the police could lead to greater autonomy for police officers supported by a body of knowledge to support their actions, a reliance on epistemic authority rather than de facto authority.

It also appeared that student officers were, on occasions, working alone or, as a pair of student officers alone. Owen (1999) found this too and pointed out its connection with the confusion over the exact nature of the probationer status. Lord Scarman, admonished the Metropolitan Police for this practice, in the early 1980s. He argued that, “One ill-judged incident involving an inexperienced constable can wipe out all
the advantages one hopes to gain from introducing probationary constables more fully into the community they are to police” (Scarman, 1983, p.131). In Australia, Chan (2003, p.152) identified the practice of ‘rostering together’ of 2 recruits as against the rules but that it happened ‘quite often.’

There also existed considerable pressures on student officers to demonstrate they could do police work but little control over the actions of student officers, who appeared to invoke their own interpretations of what was important for them to do, what McNamarra (1967) calls ‘the lottery approach’. As Alain and Grégoire (2008) note, “if recruits are left more or less alone by the organisation that hires them, theoretical ideals may be transformed into ideas about police work that do not accord with what society expects of its police officers”. In this respect, norri (1992, p.104) notes that the,

“…new recruit has to learn to become a competent organisational member from the perspective of the occupational culture…. [So], we must define competent practice by reference to occupational criteria (not organisational ones)…..This would mean “training will also have to address the problem of dubious and illegal practice. This does not mean that it has to sanction it, but recognises that acknowledging the situation is the first step in doing something about it.”
‘A massive gap with the way some officers respond…’

It was very noticeable that differing approaches developed over the long Independent Patrol phase with little formal acknowledgement of it in the training programme. Questions about whether these different emphases were thought of as better or worse than one another, did not seem to be addressed. As will become evident shortly, the assessment of practice that took place did not appear able to capture these kinds of developments.

Student officers were aware that they were developing favoured strategies for performing police work, one of which prioritised talk as a means of resolving conflict. In interview, Student officer 12 said that, as a matter of principle, she was keen to defuse situations rather than use too much police resources. She had developed the view that she aspired to be an officer who can “sort things out” on her own with minimal help and that this constituted being a “good police officer.” Student officer 12 said that she had developed this approach when working with and observing another officer who preferred to talk a problem down but still be able to act decisively and use ‘correct procedure’ when making arrests and using force (SO.12). She felt that she had learnt that it was important for her to be aware of the different reactions that victims can have to crime too and to alter her approach accordingly. She recalled that she happened to have a paper tissue to hand that she gave to a victim of a burglary which she said had allowed her, “to preserve the dignity of the person” and to show “human solidarity”. She went on to say that, “I’d rather be an officer who people think is a bit boring but is a good officer….Keep your eyes open and your mouth shut…” (SO.12). This did not preclude other priorities in her policing style.
She took her response driving course much later than some of the other student officers and she was desperate to get the licence to drive on ‘blues and twos’. This was an essential element of why she had joined the police, as was indicated in Chapter 3, and not to be able to respond to help colleagues and citizens in need was very upsetting for her.

The following events describe an incident that student officer 12 attended to assist a colleague. It demonstrates some of the features of her emerging policing style.

At 0915 on a weekday morning student officer 12 attended a flat in response to a call to assist a colleague with a dispute between neighbours. There had been a dispute between the occupants of two flats whose front doors are opposite one another and share a common staircase, on the top floor of a 3 story block of flats. There was some shouting heard on arrival, aimed at a person who was descending the stairs. It was not immediately obvious who that person was. The officer already in attendance in one of the flats could be heard exasperatedly asking the person to stop shouting. She was rather close to losing her temper and at the same time looked like she had ‘seen it all before’.

The student officer went into the flat where her colleague was and decided to separate the two occupants. She spoke to one of the occupants in one room whilst her colleague spoke to the other in a different room. The occupant with whom the student officer was talking weaved a complex story concerning a snake that he alleged had been stolen and injured. (Where exactly was the snake, I was eager for her to ask!) The student officer listened intently and managed to get the person to slow down and to soften his voice, whereupon the atmosphere became far calmer. She made reassurances about investigating the snake allegation, expressed genuine concern for its welfare and listened to the story about the altercation with the neighbour. This took about 15-20 minutes and all seemed calm when student officer 12 left the colleague, originally in attendance, to ‘finish’ dealing with the job. The occupant with whom the original call had been made, appeared to have come back to his flat or had emerged from the flat after she had left and a further disturbance was in progress. This required that the student officers gain entry to the other flat, whose occupant allowed the officers in. The floor of this flat was strewn with many empty bottles of prescription methadone. The acrid smell of dry, stale cigarette smoke, body odour, alcohol and chemicals was powerful. After further convoluted conversation with the occupant of this flat, it was established that criminal offences may have been committed but that was not the route the officers wanted to explore any further. The snake, it seemed, was alive and well (exactly where, I again wondered). Somewhat surreally, whilst this was taking place, a contractor arrived to repair the letterbox of the first flat (damaged in the original altercation) and without uttering a word, carried on with his job amidst the bickering and shouting as if no one was there, after which he promptly left. The situation did calm down after both sets of occupants had been given ‘words of advice’ about their behaviour (a common phrase used when no offences have been progressed with) by both officers about disturbing others and potentially committing offences. Both officers anticipated further calls to the same premises which they finally vacated approximately 90 minutes after the original call.

Student officer 12 seemed to revel in the need to make some sense of the events of this dispute. She listened and talked intently to the occupants of the flats and was interested to identify what had taken place (from all points of view), whether any of it related to crime or not and what course of action to take. She was also able to consult frequently with her colleague and to appear neutral in the situation but to be sympathetic to whichever party she was talking with.
Student officer 3, argued that the best officers are “those who like to talk to people” (SO.3). He became very frustrated by his colleagues’ lack of skill in verbal communication and that, in part, that represented a failing in initial training.

Communication is a massive part of the job. If you look at training and that kind of thing. There seems to be a massive, massive gap with the way some officers respond to the public. Some officers (and I like to think I fit in this category) who are excellent at conversing with people, talking to them, verbalising what they’re doing, making them understand and be reassured, right to the other end of the spectrum. People who can’t talk to people and they are rubbish and that’s something that used to really frustrate me in the job… I found it frustrating that we worked in such different ways and to see how some police officers actually antagonise some people when they talk to them and then they wonder why people’s perception of the police is so bad.”

It could be argued that this was as much an issue of the quality of the ‘talk’ that took place, rather than ‘talk’ itself. Student officer 7 recounted one particular occasion where the approach of a colleague to a particular set of circumstances had what she felt was a deleterious effect on events.

“I can think of one situation. A girl, obviously got other issues in her life… [she had run] away from home. Dad had reported it… Tracked her down. My colleague just laid straight into her and that got her back up and I just think if we’d had time to speak to her in a different manner, we might have found out more of the reasons she’d run off from home and what her concerns were. Instead of sending her back to her Dad…” (7)

Some student officers stressed other aspects of police work as important. Student officer 8, a young male officer (who might be remembered for his “You’re going down buddy” comment during Officer Safety Training) valorised his part in a proper ‘fist-fight’ and was proud that he emerged from it with ‘honour’ (not backing down, throwing and landing some punches himself). He recounted an incident concerning
domestic violence that resulted in him ‘calling in’ a ‘state zero’.\textsuperscript{12} His colleague went to the rear of the premises and he went inside to speak to the occupants. The victim had been badly assaulted, having been bitten in the face, beaten and punched.

Whilst in the premises, a fight ensued and the student officer was punched by the victim’s male partner. When this happened his colleague, who had come in through the rear of the premises, immediately stepped forward and punched the assailant, which impressed student officer 8. The idea that it is necessary to just hit someone sometimes; be up for a ‘proper boxing type fight’ (no officer safety training techniques) was clearly important for this student officer. He recounted with pride that the Control Room told him later they could hear him swearing, saying to the man, “You fucking cunt!” (8). He may have had, in his mind, the advice contained in the aphorism often used by safety training officers – “If in doubt, give ‘em a clout”.

Student officer 8 summed up his approach to police work and the way he liked to be seen by his colleagues very clearly when he said that,

“There is something called “Good Work Listings…Got into briefing notes for notable behaviour. I went to a ‘Burglary in Progress’…Chased the lad who had an air pistol firearm…Was with two other officers…I was the one who gave chase as the younger and fitter officer. Caught another ‘Burglary in Progress’ at the end of Consolidation…Now have a reputation as officer who likes the ‘runners.’…I made 11 arrests during Consolidation. I was in a big scrap with 5 person affray. We arrested some and the others were nicked in the car park at this big fight. Like to turn over the runners…I’d rather be out catching those who have committed (real) proper crimes” (SO.8).

\textsuperscript{12} ‘State zero is part of the numerical system used by police forces to indicate the status of all their officers on a permanent all year-round basis. Zero indicates that the officer’s status means he/she is in need of urgent assistance.
Student officer 6, a young male officer, describes the motivation to appear efficient and to confront those thought to pose a threat to the police role. He described himself as,

“…the kind of copper that just wants to go to jobs…Superintendent looked at stats [that tell him how well I’m doing]…Get in their faces. Go to jobs, turn people over (legally)...Proactive work means doing [that]. We don’t get to do that anymore. Used to have Briefing and Tasking car [an unmarked vehicle]. Don’t have it anymore. Not enough people…” (SO.6).

Student officer 6 valued operational progress better than moving up the rank structure from the outset and I did hear that he secured a place on Tactical Firearms Training, seen by many as sideways promotion.

After field training, Van Maanen (ibid, p.224) finds that a metamorphosis takes place where recruits come to see themselves as “…constrained by a variety of audiences, including their own department. The independence the recruit felt would characterise the job soon becomes perceptually limited in too many ways” (Van Maanen, 1975, p224). McNamara (1967) found that, whilst starting with positive perceptions of the “semi-military model” of close supervision and the application of negative sanctions, after field training recruits had developed a more negative understanding of those things. However, more contemporary studies reveal that a more nuanced picture exists of how recruits take on cultural values and practices. Fielding (1988, p.58) makes the point that

“…over time novices achieve an individual balance between formal, informal and experiential agencies of socialisation. This implies that there is more variation in working attitudes among constables than is suggested by previous analyses”.
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Chan et al (2003, p.201) describe this process as “Taking on the Culture” and asks “How uniform was this metamorphosis? How complete was the transformation”?

Whilst confirming some of the changes noted by Van Maanen, research by Chan et al (2003, p.247) demonstrates that way in which the recruit adopted the “street cop culture” was by no means automatic or unconscious”. Recruits articulated a difference between ‘good’ and ‘bad’ police work, understood and resolved the difference between what was taught in formal training and what was taught in the field, came to value communications above technical skill and did not simply, ‘follow the line of least resistance’. Chan et al (ibid), conclude that what may have taken place during this period of occupational socialisation “involved a strategic use of camouflage so as to give the appearance of ‘fitting in’ Muir (1977) argued that all those who carry out police work cannot but be affected by the application of power, in some way. This is confirmed by Way and Patten (2013) who demonstrate how some officers develop negative views of those they police, especially those in disadvantaged positions whom they refer to as “dirtbags”. This is an observations made by Westely (1953) and other classic ethnographic studies of the police discussed in Chapter 1. In that sense, Muir considers that the ‘professional’ police officer is the one who best becomes the ‘streetcorner politician’. The ‘good’ police officer is one that can achieve, “a tragic sense and a moral calm under the threatening circumstances of patrol work depends in part upon developing an enjoyment of talk” (Muir, ibid p.4). Student officer 3 had come to that realisation too. Student officer 8, appeared too young in mind to achieve that. All concerned should have been taken heed of McNamara’s words,
“Rather than conceiving of ideal police work as being irreconcilable with many aspects of actual police work, training personnel perhaps should make every effort to introduce what they consider ideal practice into the training in such a way that it does not call for a major scrapping of what the men in the field units consider to “tried and true”. In this way the ideal practices would be less likely to call forth a defensive reaction…” (McNamara, 1967, p.199).

‘Don’t’ like dealing with dead bodies’

What follows, are some examples of the reflections of student officers concerning aspects of police work that they found emotionally problematic. Dealing with ‘jobs’ that some student officers found personally difficult was often expressed as a problem to overcome. These kinds of anticipated ‘stumbling blocks’ could assume an enormous importance in the mind of the student officer and often revolved around various matters to do with children and with death. A large part of the fear associated with these kinds of policing activities was that the student officer would somehow let their feelings be known. Crying, vomiting or other similar displays of feeling, emotion and physical reaction were often at the forefront of a student officer’s thoughts and were considered something that may have to be suppressed but that, equally well, may be impossible to contain. One of the reactions was to ‘switch off’ the emotions as a form of defence.

Student officer 8, contrary to his ‘action man’ image demonstrated elsewhere in this thesis, articulated a frailty he felt he had in not liking ‘jobs’ involving death of the elderly. He said that he feared that he might cry and be overwhelmed by the event. He said that he associated this with being, “…sensitive to the needs of the elderly. Grand-parents were very important in my upbringing…Don’t like dealing with dead bodies” (SO.8). Student officer 1, on the other hand, who had recently attended a tragic death of a young person at a local school, expressed the view that he did not
find death to be a problem for him. It seemed perverse but the training programme itself appeared unable to address the potential for delayed emotional reactions that student officers may experience at some point in the future. The student officer said that his Relief Sergeant and one of the Inspectors had asked if officers in attendance were ‘alright’ but that was as far as it went in terms of immediate supervisory emotional help, for him at least. Possibly naively, he seemed to think it was somehow a mark of strength not to need any help. Conversely, student officer 12 had a worked out strategy for sudden deaths. She said that, when she attended Sudden Deaths, she liked to talk to the deceased person. She was well aware that it may seem odd to others (her colleagues, especially) but it made her feel more comfortable when moving around the space and when searching the body for important items of identification (13). She appeared to have tuned in very well to the sensitivity and gravity of this aspect of police work.

Student officers had to learn how to carry out ‘reactive’ police work in stressful and emotionally fraught situations but had little formal support with that and little time or resources to reflect on their responses. Their exposure to highly stressful events increased considerably and so, it may have been expected that the impact of this would form part of the training programme. A number of studies have noted that police officers have to grapple with the inherently stressful nature of police work, its particular organisational, cultural and personal pressures and its emotional impact (Van Maanen, 1973; Burke, 1993; Rowe and Regehr, 2010). Stradling, Crowe and Tuohy (1993),

“Police work is itself inherently stressful, requiring of operational officers that they ‘hold themselves in a state of continual readiness for presently unknown,
potentially challenging actions in the public arena which may remind them of their own mortality and other frailties, have limited long-term utility and for which they will, individually, be internally and externally accountable”. (p.132)

Whilst there may be potential benefits to ‘switching off’ and whilst it is important not to make the assumption that not talking will have a negative impact. ‘Switching off’ emotions is a common feature of police work that can have pernicious effects, often delayed for some time. Expressions of grief, fear, or vulnerability are often viewed as signs of weakness in many emergency service organizations (Pogrebin & Poole, 1998; Regehr et al., 2003; Young, 1995). Vincent (2005) noted that the academy phase did not prepare recruit officers for emotional difficulties they may face, especially death and that once in the field these issues would certainly become prominent.

‘My wife does that every Saturday night’

Humour often seemed to be present amongst student officers and their Relief colleagues, which was not always comfortable to listen to. In the Relief office late one evening a discussion took place concerning a report of rape that had come in to the Relief to take action on. A Relief colleague asked student officer 8, ‘who had been raped?’, and the student officer’s reply (very quickly thought of) was that another officer’s wife had “called it in.” The ribaldry continued around the theme that if that officer had had sex with his wife it must have been rape because she would not otherwise have allowed it. There were other arguably more innocuous jokes that student officers shared such as that concerning a man who ‘called in’ because his wife had been lying on the sofa for a long time and was very unresponsive. Another officer responded that his wife was like that every night of the week and another
Humour can be a coping mechanism and to allow police officers to dissipate some of the tension surrounding difficult and troubling matters. Rowe and Regehr (2010, p.450) argue that it is universally used amongst emergency service professionals and that it serves the function of, “venting their feelings, eliciting social support through the development of group cohesion, and distancing themselves from a situation, ensuring that they can act effectively”. This would have included the issue of death addressed above (Joyce, 1989). Charman (2012, p.152) identified the role of humour in creating enduring, mutual and idiosyncratic bonds between colleagues and between different emergency service workers. It can enhance interoperability but can also exclude other agencies. However, it is risqué and not to be used outside the particular relationship in which it develops but it allows officers to release the tension that is inherent in the frequently frightening and disturbing aspects of their work. It also means that they don’t need to dwell on these aspects of their work and they can return to it each day/shift. Wear et al (2006) demonstrate how medical students apply rules to humour and often categorise those who are ‘fair game’ because they suffer from conditions they perceive as self-inflicted. This can be addressed, according to the authors, by open and critical discussion in training sessions. Pogrebin and Poole (1998) demonstrate how police officers use humour to reinforce their own perspective of policing and demonstrate how police might blame a victim to assure themselves that such a fate would not befall them. Rowe and Regehr 2010, p.459-60.
“The exposure of recruits in the emergency services to black humor can potentially have negative effects. The use of humor as a coping strategy must be based on a firm foundation of knowledge, professionalism, and empathy. Young recruits must be taught that compassionate care is key to emergency service provision and to positive outcomes for individuals, families, and communities. However, the individual costs of caring must also be acknowledged so that new professionals are not led to believe that being emotionally affected by tragedy is a personal failing. Thus, when black humor is used in teams, this must be explicitly addressed with recruits. Further, while the limits of black humor may seem obvious to the initiated, they may not be clear to students, resulting in damaging interactions with others. These unspoken rules must also be made explicit for the benefit of both the recruits and those they serve.”

‘Don’t do more than is required mate’

The work-place assessment programme was underpinned by the concept of ‘competence’. It is further underpinned by the National Occupational Standards. These are in turn underpinned by Competence Based Education and Training (Armstrong, 2010). In particular, the requirement to produce a Portfolio of evidence, the Student Officer Learning and Assessment Portfolio (E-SOLAP), became a problematic feature of this phase of the training programme. This portfolio was completed by the regular submission of entries consisting of a knowledge element and supporting practice element. Entries were submitted to and checked by police officers whose task it was to monitor the progress of the completion of the portfolio for all officers in initial training in the force. In order to attain this award the student officer had to provide workplace evidence of their policing practices, which was then recorded on the Cumulative Assessment Record forms (Ashton Police, 2007). This allowed them to ‘claim’ achievement of the Units of the Diploma.

The portfolio was commonly and openly denigrated by student officers and those involved in managing it, alike. Although training staff half-heartedly opined that it
was, “not about getting it done quickly but about choosing the best jobs”, the reason 
that was offered was that, “It'll be easier to fill in”. Its completion was encouraged to 
be as perfunctory as possible. One member of training staff advised student officers, 
“Don’t do more than is required, mate”. He also referred to the Portfolio using the 
epithet, used by student officers themselves, the “e-So-crap”. Cutting and pasting of 
material from often unverified sources of online information, used to support 
competence in occupational practices, was acknowledged, without censure, as a 
common practice. It was further indicated that student officers should,

“Get it out of the way…You can do 30% of this without leaving the 
station…Can cut and paste material concerning the legislation, health and 
safety and race and diversity (generic stuff)…Do knowledge first and get it out 
the way…I don’t know about the HRA (Human Rights Act), haven’t got the 
foggiest. We’re not familiar with certain technical things so will accept cut and 
paste from Wikipedia. You’ve researched it presumably anywhere that you’ve 
read it” (Observation: PDU 3).

However, that the portfolio needed to be completed as a condition of Confirmation 
was held over the heads of student officers as a legal requirement and that it was 
subject to ‘reg13’, a reference to the Police Regulations that govern police conditions 
of service and facilitate the swift removal of student officers from the force at any 
point prior to Confirmation, should they contravene it (Police Regulations, 2003). 
This was highlighted during an observation when a student officer, further forward in 
the training programme, was expressing her irritation with the portfolio. She was 
having a problem with the progress of her Confirmation because of an element of the 
Portfolio that hadn’t been completed ‘satisfactorily.’ She was a little belligerent about 
the matter and said that the force should have flagged it up earlier than they had. 
She felt the force were being unreasonable and that she was being forced to do 
something that she hadn’t, in the course of duty, had to do. She implied they should
just leave it at that and Confirm her anyway. To paraphrase her sentiments, she said, "I’m sorry but if the force is saying because I’ve not done this thing (just one thing) that I’m not a good police officer. Then…", they can ‘bugger off’, was the implication.

During a training session focussing on the portfolio it was joked that two student officers, who had made an arrest before the session started, had only done so to avoid that session. “Anything to avoid the E-SOLAP," quipped one student officer. Student officer 6, a young male officer was scathing in his criticism of it that reflected his view of training staff at headquarters, which he had displayed from the Induction phase onward (see Chapter 4). In the quotation below he seems to just want to get on with his job.

“Solap – pain in the arse. So bad, really bad. Need 20% completed by Monday. Had a discussion with [S.1]. I thought we had no time in which to do it. I went to my line manager (shift skipper) and the whole shift got a reprieve. [S1] speaks out of a textbook to you. So, you have to go elsewhere. No point speaking to her in the first place” (SO.6).

However, for student officer 1, the problem was that the portfolio was not occupationally meaningful. He was disappointed that what he thought was an occupation that valued high quality professional development, was rather more prosaic in reality. He said that the,

“E-SOLAP is tiresome. Not connected to anything. Stand alone. NVQ in Policing is “just covering their arse.” Copied and pasted from last entry…Not produced in a relevant way…Can be completed without being competent. Entries flowered up – rubber stamp. No work place assessor. No time on shift to do SOLAP.” (SO.1)
Another student officer talked at some length about the inadequacies of the E-SOLAP, stressing the importance of its incapacity to recognise variation in performance and the message from training staff that it was not a priority to improve it.

“The SOLAP is a massive inconvenience. Not just because it requires time outside of work, it's pointless in my opinion. Doesn’t seem to add any weight to your ability. Tick boxes. Needs to be continuing assessment using realistic methods...I can write out a job and make myself look good. I can write it out and make it sound right. What would be more beneficial is for one of these assessors, one of these IPLDP trainers to actually come out, crewed with you. There’s only 20 of us. Could come out 2 or 3 times over the two year...More beneficial to come out with us. I can’t put down my strengths and weaknesses. I can just go, yeah, competent at this...It doesn’t give you much to try and excel in anything. Whereas, I would prefer it if somebody would come out and say “in this area you’re absolutely fantastic but you need to work on this area….It’s supposed to be this 2 year probation thing to actually gel and develop. It’s not. It’s a 2 year, “we can get rid of you in case you suck or cause any problems... Snotty email from [S.1] asking why SOLAP is not up to date. Email from [T.1] saying week 60 review is now 3 days not a week.” (SO.3)

This criticism took on more sinister and concerning undertones. Training staff stressed to student officers that to meet the force’s standard for National Occupational Standard 9, Manage Conflict, (Unit GC10 of the Diploma in Policing) the student officer should have been involved in “a scrap, a rucus”[and that the] conflict needs to be of a “significant magnitude” (T.4). One student officer argued that this had meant that she had to massage an event for the purposes of the portfolio whereby it had seemed as if all restraint techniques had been demonstrated (SO.12). Another student officer in the cohort said that he knew of a student officer who needed to complete this Unit and that two officers (noted for their enjoyment of physical confrontations) provoked a conflict to give the student officer material for an assault to be used for an entry in the portfolio (SO.6).
Some of the issues raised by student officers concerning the Portfolio reflect wider issues related to competence based training. In Chapter 1, I discussed the paucity of this approach, which is thought by Hyland (1994) to fail to capture the process of learning, foster critical reflection or to address alternative perspectives. White (2006, p.397) argues that, “…we get exactly the police officers we ask for, and they behave in just the way they have been trained…the evaluation of police training practice ought to be guided by an ethical framework”.

Chan (2003, p.5) argues that the experiences and sentiments about the Portfolio, above, reflect a credentialist form of professionalism in the police, that is designed to protect the police organisation from external criticism. Chan describes credentialism in the Australian police and Harris (1973) describes a similar feature of US police, where bureaucratisation of police is expected to establish that things are done ‘by the book’ and so, to avoid allegations of corruption, malpractice or impropriety.

**Reactive, we’re the workhorse**

Response policing came to occupy a low position in the hierarchy of police work for some student officers. Student officer 6 put this well when he said that,

“Reactive, we’re the workhorse…You look at people on Neighbourhood Policing Teams…what are they doing…In Op Redesign we lost four officers…a lot of people don’t want to be on shift…Where do people go when they muck-up, where do firearms officers go when they get it wrong, they go on shift.” (SO.6).

Student officer 3 expressed this perception of training after the beginning of the Independence phase very forcefully.
“...So, it’s farcical really that you’ve got this whole 2 years where you’re still in training thing. No, you’re not. No, I’m not! I’m a year into the job, only six months doing the job out of training school and I am as an important member of that reactive policing team as a 15 year veteran. I am deemed to have the skills to do it. I’m deemed competent to do it...with regard to the training, it stops when you go Independent in my opinion...6 months, in my opinion.... I haven’t spoken to those people since… There’s no contact from the Inspector. There’s no contact from the Sergeant. There’s no follow-up. How are things going? No, you’ve gone...They’re not bothered...Just assumed no news is good news. I got on well but they didn’t know that.” (3).

Conclusion

A number of conclusions can be drawn from the analysis of the experiences of this phase of training. Firstly, that student officers developed discretion in a context that created confusion about how it should best be achieved. It was understood to apply to a narrow range of police work, whereas it was being exercised in a much broader way by student officers. There appeared no professional forum to discuss its effectiveness, impact or ‘best practice’.

Secondly, the Independent Patrol Phase, by comparison with other stages of the training programme, was experienced by some student officers as police work to which had been added a bureaucratic assessment burden, the Portfolio. As a result, ‘response’ police work came to have a variable status amongst student officers, some of whom ‘jumped ship’ as soon as possible.

Thirdly, in their efforts to establish a personal occupational identity, student officers started to demonstrate preferences for clear but different occupational strategies that focussed on the merits or demerits of a placatory, discursive policing style. This was associated with some highly critical views of some practices they were expected to take part in. There appeared to be little attempt to order or rank these developing
styles, according to understandings of ‘better’ or ‘worse’ police work (Chan et al, 2003).

Fourthly, that student officers had to learn how to carry out ‘reactive’ police work in fast changing, stressful and emotionally fraught situations but had little support with that and little time or resources to reflect on their responses. Some strategies to cope with this started to emerge that centred on closing off or opening up some emotions and the use of humour, which might also have been formalised as part of initial training.

As a consequence of some of these issues, reactive policing came to occupy a low status for some student officers. As student officer 3 said, “…everyone wants to get off shift because of the crap you take and the fact you are the bottom of the rung” (SO.3).

As principally an informal influence on initial training, the Independent Patrol phase displayed a range of cultural adaptations to the socialisation process, evident in the policing styles and judgements about what constituted ‘better’ or ‘worse’ police work. The training practices, as contained in the Portfolio, seemed to capture little of this or allow the opportunity to reflect on it. Moreover, it appeared to conflict with what was a very clear perception during this phase that student officers had ceased to be ‘student officers’ but were ‘on probation’.
Chapter 9. Coming and going: Two case studies of resignation

Introduction

This chapter explores the nature of resignation from the training programme, through the case studies of student officers 3 and 13. I argue that, whilst it may appear inevitable that some student officers would find the training programme and the working life of a police officer so challenging that they would resign during initial training, the process of resignation was more complex and nuanced than that. Nevertheless, the case studies I present do point to some significant problems with the training programme that could be heeded by all and reflect on the nature of police work, culture and organisation during initial training.

Three student officers ‘voluntarily’ resigned before the end of the probationary period, which constituted 15% of the total cohort of 20 officers. I was able to keep in contact with two of those that resigned. Both student officers demonstrated very different problems when it came to the decision to resign and the epithets I have chosen to refer to them (‘the very thoughtful policeman’ and the ‘very nice policeman’), whilst meant a little ironically, do indicate something about why they resigned and reflect as much on the police organisation and on police work, as they do on the student officers themselves. Inevitably, decisions about resignation (as with decisions about application and recruitment) involve the vagaries of personal choice but that is always heavily influenced by the wider characteristics of police work, culture and organisation (Reiner, 1978). In order to contextualise the two case
studies of resignation, I briefly review some of the significant issues raised by research.

Resignation during initial training: Key features

As Van Maanen (1973 p.6) argues, “Organizational socialization also implies a man may be forced to relinquish certain attitudes, values and behaviours.” If the police recruit cannot or will not relinquish those things, the implication of this message is that it may not be possible to remain as a member of the organisation. Fielding (1986) notes that police work constitutes an extreme case of an ‘occupational community’ where work and non-work are strongly connected. Police officers tend to view themselves as of higher status than others, are socially marginalised and require internal rather than external validation of their work. Police work is occupationally exclusive because of legal restrictions and shift work. It is also the case that police officers display typical features of occupational culture such as solidarity with one another, suspicion of others, a pragmatic view of work, a concern with unpredictable danger, their own authority and with being seen to be efficient (Reiner, 2000; Skolnick, 1966). Whilst police occupational culture varies considerably (Fielding, 1988; Chan et al, 2003) there are commonalities that all those joining police organisations as police officers negotiate (Waddington, 1999). In this sense, police officer resignation is usually associated with the specific nature of police work and the occupational culture (Haar (2005). So-called ‘burnout theory’ suggests that officers resign because of organisational and occupational dissatisfactions that accumulate over time. As Sparger and Giacopassi (1983, p.108) suggest, “…voluntary resignations…would be a difficult occupational choice made
only for very serious reasons”. Haar (2005) demonstrates that the exposure to and performance of police work during the initial training period is different to that of officers beyond that stage of career. Although, experience of police work itself is what they have in common (Van Maanen, 1973; 1975; Fielding, 1988; others).

It is necessary, though, to re-visit the issue of recruit background that was discussed in Chapters 1 and 3. Recruits to the police often join with somewhat idealistic motivations (Van Maanen, 1973; Fielding, 1986, 1988). At that point they have not worked as a police officer and their understanding of it is not entirely accurate (Van Maanen, 1975). Expectations are consequently idealistic (Van Maanen, 1973). In this respect, Fielding (1986) argues that it is necessary to understand the impact of the recruit’s influences prior to joining the police.

Age may impact upon the experience of initial training and Fielding (1986) found that younger recruits were more likely to resign during training than their older counterparts. Furthermore, the recruit who has had some experience of work in “a similar occupation” and who when resigns during initial training does so, in some relation, to their former employment (Fielding, 1986; 1988). Van Maanen (1973; 1975) and Fielding (1986) argue that during initial training the recruit’s orientation changes from an idealistic one to a more instrumental, pragmatic and realistic one but that ‘resigners’ lose that early idealism more quickly than those who do not resign. How the recruit comes to understand what happens to the ideals they have on entry is crucial in influencing their orientation to ‘the job’. Because the ideal and the real have not been accommodated in recruits, it can be expected that resignation
at this time is because that process cannot be completed. Haar (2005) hypothesises that,

“police recruits who ‘voluntarily resign’ from police work within the early stages of police training and service experience problems of adjustment as a result of conflict between the version of policing embodied in their ideal…and the reality of policing in practice”.

This constitutes so-called, cognitive dissonance (Festinger, 1957), described by Sparger and Giacopassi (1983) as “a psychologically painful experience that occurs when the officer has contradictory perceptions or beliefs about his or role as a police officer”, which is much enhanced by fundamental ethical dilemmas caused by police specific work environments, first experienced and negotiated on the streets, that lead to changes in attitude (Alain and Grégoire, 2008).

Resignation case study 1: Student officer 3. ‘The very thoughtful policeman’

McNamara (1967 p.250) argues that, “The costs of the battle between reformers and the entrenched interests in police departments are not few…The consequence for the “rookie” in police work is that he must choose between one faction or the other and his choice of one precludes conforming to the expectations of the other.” This could well summarise Student officer 3’s dilemma.

Background characteristics

Student officer 3 had what he described as a stable, law-abiding, professional middle-class family background. He achieved relatively well at school, up to and including A-levels and had graduated in law shortly before the start of the training
programme. He had decided not to go to university immediately after completing ‘A’ levels. By his own admission, he had enjoyed the benefits of life in an affluent city, especially during his time studying for ‘A’ levels and struggled to apply himself to education at that point and had come to see himself as somewhat liberal and unconventional.

He had thought about a career as a police officer in a careful and planned way, so that all he had done had a connection to this future career. After finishing A-levels, he had worked in a number of jobs (some with career progress built in) one of which was as a Police Community Support Officer. This police role convinced him that he really wanted to work as a police officer but he decided to complete a degree in law, in part, to give himself better chances of entry and progression in the police (but also to give him other career options too). He said,

“I enrolled at university to do a law degree…with the intention of using it to get back into the police force and work my way up the ladder. Not necessarily as fast as possible but to arm myself with as much tools as I could have” (SO.3).

He had been working in a local bar (ultimately managing it), which he was doing, up until starting the initial training programme. This, he thought, had given him some invaluable experience of policing and the ‘night time economy’, especially concerning strategies for controlling behaviour associated with excessive alcohol consumption.

He also argued that he and those he worked with in that job were quite liberal, even hedonistic in their outlook, which was what he liked about it.

Student officer 3 expressed a number of reasons for wanting to become a police officer. Firstly, he wanted to do a job that was varied and eventful (he liked the thrill of the ‘adrenaline rush’, as he described it) and he was also quite keen to play a part
in crime-fighting (‘catching criminals’), after becoming sensitised to its pernicious impact as teenager. He had been the victim of crime and had been stop-searched by the police, both of which made him feel more confident in understanding what the police role entailed. He then felt certain that he wanted to head for a police career.

“From then on it was definitely where I was heading. I just wanted to do some stuff in-between because I knew that when I started the police I knew that I was going to be in it for my career so I wanted to do as much as I could in the meantime. So I tried different jobs here and there.”

He also had a strong commitment to the city in which he lived and had planned to work, as a police officer, there. Whilst he had considered applying to other forces and to work in other places, his hand was somewhat forced when recruitment practices changed and less places for training were available which, he argued, meant that he was keen not to ‘miss the boat.’ This did have an impact on a personal relationship and a possible move to another city and in that sense, he felt that he had given up some opportunities to pursue a police career with this force.

At a pre-employment meeting, Student officer 3 stood out amongst his peers because of the confident and articulate manner in which he often spoke. One detail that was prominent was that he had recently completed a degree in law and I did wonder, at the time, how his legal education might articulate with ‘real’ policing. He said he had thought deeply about the timing of his entry into the service and the appropriateness of his past career choices and indicated that he felt ready for the challenges to come.
Student officer 3 experienced the earliest phase of training, Induction at headquarters, as useful to attune him to the need to be very careful about the way in which the police officer presents himself to the public. Whilst he felt that some of the induction was somewhat prosaic and common-sense, he did indicate that it forced him to think carefully about the role, its importance in the community and the need for “exemplary behaviour”.

Student officer 3’s parents attended the attestation event and were pleased that he had maintained his interest in the police through a lengthy period of application. They thought that he had a tendency to ‘get itchy feet’ and his successful entry to the police was a sign that he was settling in to stable employment. He had also been experiencing the gradual breakdown of a personal relationship, as he was starting the training programme, which he attributed, in part, to his desire to pursue a police career.

As soon as the cohort finished Induction and were posted to their respective Police Development Units, he became very well attuned to the developments he would have to make and he seemed to be thinking a number of steps ahead. He expressed this foresight in this way,

“So, we’re in the classroom phase. The ones that came in before us they are just going out on Consolidation and they are all a bit wide-eyed and shocked by how much they’ve got to do and they are being taken out and thrown in at the deep end but then you’ve got the guys who are just being signed off as Independent and they are starting to get their swagger. Not in an arrogant way, in a, ‘I can actually do this job’ kind of way. That’s very pleasing to see
because you know that…within the last year they were sat in the seat you’re sat in and…it’s good.”

He was a little frustrated at the pace of the course in the Learning Modules phase but understood the need for training not to disadvantage those without police experience. He supported the idea that student officers should be able to ask what may appear to be questions that demonstrate ignorance or intolerance. He also supported the approach to learning of his Police Development Unit as opposed to the ‘stricter’ one of the Unit in Police Development Unit 2 (examined in Chapter 4), which he was somewhat dismissive of. He said that,

“Importance is placed on learning the legislation but not enough that we know it verbatim. Glad that pressure wasn’t put on. Don’t need to learn every single word of legislation to be able to understand it and be able apply it. Whereas colleagues in [Police Development Unit 2], [it] was like quoting scripture. Don’t agree with that. Never had a problem with understanding my powers…so it clearly worked for me”.

He felt quite humbled by some of the learning experiences during this phase, especially the early role-plays on aspects of policing like stop and search where he felt like a ‘rabbit caught in the headlights’ trying to deal with a fast moving scenario and remember the law at the same time.

However, a short time into the Learning Modules phase an incident occurred that precipitated what he described as “a wobble”. This centred on an allegation by another student officer, of ‘inappropriate’ use of the social media website, Facebook, whereby another student officer, from Police Development Unit 2, alleged that he had intended to be disrespectful to the Trainer from that Unit, in ‘posting’ a particular image. He thought this was, in part, due to the conflicts between the different approaches of the Police Development Units and that he had been labelled as
someone who openly challenged the rules. Despite his insistence that it was a misunderstanding, training staff passed the allegation to the force Police Standards Department who undertook an investigation. No further action was taken by that Department but it sensitised him to the possibility that this may occur again, over what he thought was such a trivial matter. He said rather plaintively and rhetorically,

“I want some assurance that this is not going to be the way things work always...Is this always going to happen that when anyone with no or little cause complains, the PSD will investigate...?”

Field training experiences

Having excelled in the Learning Modules phase and having achieved the best marks in knowledge checks, student officer 3 was thought to be someone who could cope with the demands of the Relief environment and reactive policing. Because of that and also because there was a dearth of Police Development Officers, he went straight to a Relief and was mentored by another officer there. He felt flattered that he was well thought of but also regretful that there wasn’t “a proper ending” to the Learning Modules phase. In a strong sense, he felt that initial training had finished after the Learning Modules phase.

He progressed very well during the Consolidation phase, completed his Police Action Checklist activities (see Chapter 7) and all the associated documentation at his own initiative, with very little recourse to training staff. At the time, he entertained hopes of getting onto the High Potential Development Scheme13, possibly undertaking the assessments for suitability as a firearms officer and of applying for Special Branch

---

13 This is a scheme open to all officers and represents a way of progressing through ranks and roles much more expeditiously than would otherwise be possible.
selection. At the end of that phase he was transferred to a new Relief to start the Independent Patrol phase.

Informal training experiences

I was intending to arrange to conduct a Relief observation with student officer 3, when I bumped into him, off-duty, in the city and had quite a long, somewhat intense conversation with him about his progress during the Independent Patrol phase. He had completed 12 months of the programme by this time but it was at that point that he felt that the working environment had become particularly, personally difficult for him. In fact, he thought that he may have to resign and was seriously considering it then.

His understanding of the root of the problem, at that time, was that he had been moved to a Relief that he found very difficult to work with. However, he had not been particularly happy at this Relief, where he thought that he was not permitted enough freedom to deal with ‘jobs’, in the way he had been, during Consolidation. He said that officers on that Relief,

“...wanted us to watch until they thought we had learnt it and only then to go ahead and do it. Didn’t like to take the back-seat role. Felt like I was in the way. Always double-crewed. Unless you went out on foot on your own which gave the impression that it was to get you out the way. Sometimes walked 9 hours of a 10 hour shift. Waste of time”.

Because he had voiced some of these criticisms, he felt he had gained a reputation as someone who spoke his mind and that when he was moved again he became more concerned that,
“...I'd been pegged as a trouble-maker because I spoke my mind. That Relief (the original Relief) were under-strength. Can't believe they'd have been asked to supply an officer. [It was a] Case of taking the opportunity to move me. ‘Let him be someone else's problem’...My current Sergeant was briefed about me in a negative way...Some Sergeants...thought that I had certain problems in certain areas and have been surprised that I don’t. I have my own ways of working. [I take an] ethical stance.”

In particular, he had been asked by his supervisors to explain why he had carried out such a comparatively low number of stop searches. One can imagine the nature of the response he received after expressing the sentiments below.

“I hadn’t encountered people who need to be searched throughout my daily work. Had submitted some but not at same level as others... When I learned the legislation [Section 1 PACE. Section 23 of the Misuse of Drugs Act], which are the main ones we use. Grounds first, search second. Grounds should be objective. That enables you to stop that person...For me it’s always ...it’s one major thing or several circumstantial things that end up in too much of a coincidence. If someone smells of cannabis, I know what cannabis smells like, therefore I’ve got grounds”.

He was supportive of the need to use stop and search powers to investigate some crimes but had a well-developed alternative perspective, which is worth quoting from extensively.

“However, my view of it is that, I don’t know whether this comes from me having spent so much time looking at law in an academic background or whether it comes from my upbringing or who I was as a younger person, but I feel it shouldn’t be abused. Any power shouldn’t be abused...[especially] this...one, that I know has had very contentious issues [surrounding it]....If you are detaining people going about their daily business that’s a huge invasion of their rights and then to go rifling through their pockets, that’s another thing... When I was younger I had some over-zealous police officers stop me. The way I dressed. Times I’d be out. Had several uncomfortable stop searches where they thought I had drugs. Never really been a drug user. Never been in trouble with police so it was quite funny for me. At the time I didn’t care. Only being in the job makes me realise how big a thing it is.”

At this point in the training programme he felt that he was battling with his conscience and being expected to do something illegal and immoral. He said that he
was asked to make a stop-search without what he thought were ‘sufficient grounds’, which is when this all came to a head. He felt he was brow beaten by a Relief sergeant and was put in the “naughty corner” in a way that was evident to the whole shift. He said,

“I then had this real inner battle to play the game and do the job or do I stand by my beliefs and say no and to have, what I genuinely believed, was the law on my side. Unfortunately that’s when it seemed like, “you’re not a team player.”

It should not be thought that student officer 3 was averse to the crime-fighting perspective of policing. He was entirely comfortable with making arrests, pursuing ‘known criminals’ and using police powers to do this. He said,

“…let’s be realistic, we do know who the criminals are. They are all repeat offenders and you need to be putting pressure on them and making them realise you know… they are engaging in illegal activity. However, I don’t like harassing someone just because of what they’ve done in their past. Even though I know they’re a ‘scumbag’….”

When new supervisors took over the Relief he felt much more comfortable working in a different way with some protection from the pressure he had felt under. He said that,

“…new Sergeants protect us from that pressure. Don’t feel you should be scrutinised. They are aware of what you are doing. Pleasure working for them…I’ve been flatly told, my sergeants have both said, ‘if your grounds are insufficient we will not sign it, full-stop”.

By this time student officer 3 had developed a sophisticated understanding of how to provide police services to all. He said,

“…for me when I have a known nominal who hasn’t done anything wrong say to me, ‘thank you for not being an arsehole to me’, that means a lot to me. Sounds quaint but I treat every single person the way I’d want my mum to be
treated. That’s what I was told and that goes for criminals as well…Don’t’ like being heavy handed or fighting but do what have to do to get the job done.”

However, the doubts he was having about working as a response police officer had not disappeared. They ran far deeper than the issue of stop and search and related to the organisation’s approach to policing crime.

“With regard to the grand picture…[I] feel that as a reactive officer I need to be high vis for public reassurance and to attend calls. I feel that CID and priority crime teams, they’re the ones who need to be going out and focussing. Not reactive officers, that’s not why I joined the job”.

He also had significant reservations about his place in the police organisation and felt powerless to make any changes. He said that,

“Suddenly, I’m in this massive organisation where I am insignificant and that’s taken a bit of getting used to and as a result me stamping my feet will fall on deaf ears because they will rather go, “trouble-maker”, rather than embracing what you say…”

Furthermore, his views about the way that colleagues may be inclined to stereotype others also created some distance between himself and other officers. In a very evident way, he appeared to take the side of the underdog and to be critical of the way in which the police handled certain groups in the community.

“It’s a class stereotype in my opinion. I don’t think it has anything to do with the race. Some of these police officers who…are slightly bigoted, consciously or subconsciously, haven’t got enough of an understanding of it for the race thing….Associate lower class kids of those families as being trouble makers. They will always pigeonhole them in that way.”

He had also developed a coherent critique of what should characterise police performance and it did not correspond with the way in which Ashton Police saw it. He argued that what the force prioritised as performance did not reflect the hard work he felt he was doing that went unrecognised.
“We do PIs\textsuperscript{14}…Forms at the end of each month to say how many of certain things we’ve done [but]…it doesn’t have how many DA\textsuperscript{15} risk assessment forms have you done. Sometimes I’ve done 4 in a shift. [These are not thought to be] a performance indicator. Domestics are hard. DASH\textsuperscript{16} forms not allowed to be counted. [Our managers] don’t ask to know incidents attended. Could be found but not in the statistics. I work my arse off every day…Unfortunately the senior officers can’t change it and they actually make it harder for us to change it. Too much pressure from officers who haven’t been operational for years. [They are] fast-tracked through ACPO ladder scheme. Just want their crime figures reduced”.

What student officer 3 thought as the Sisyphean task of reactive policing had an impact on his sense of personal happiness. It appeared to him that, as a police officer, he was helpless to make lasting changes in the lives of those he policed and that this contradicted his essentially optimistic demeanour.

“Other personal things. I’m a happy person, good upbringing, good parents. Perfect middle class upbringing. Gets me down seeing the other element of life. Mix of seeing awful situations that I can’t help enough with and seeing the awful members of society who are out there”.

This led him to see further police work as damaging to his ability to live life in what he considered a ‘normal’ way. He thought he was becoming embittered, especially because of the routine calls that he had to return to on a frequent basis. He said, “[The]…longer you’re in, the more embittered and numb you get. I don’t want to get like that.” He was also disillusioned with some of his colleagues who would exacerbate problems because they appeared unable to communicate effectively.

Student officer 3 had become concerned about his career prospects too. Having spent some time doing what he thought were the ‘right’ things to prepare for his

\textsuperscript{14} PIs are police work performance indicators that are recorded each month to demonstrate the performance of the Relief’s activities.

\textsuperscript{15} Domestic abuse

\textsuperscript{16} DASH – Domestic abuse, stalking and honour based violence risk assessment. (DASH, 2016)
career he felt he was faced with significant obstacles to his progress that were exacerbated by the way in which he felt he had already been labelled. He said that it,

“Could be great time to start this career...[But] some are looking at demotion because of changes. Temp sergeants going back to PC. How long will it take me to progress? 5 or 6 years. HPDS? But have to get on it...Had set route. Reactive 2 years. Firearms. Shift sergeant. CID and then counter-terrorism/serious organised crime. Have to go back to shift to get sergeant [before applying for] firearms post. No natural progression...Makes it longer...2 years in each post. [I’m] not old but not very young. By 40 I wanted to be close to [Detective Chief Inspector]. Those on [High Potential Development Scheme] don’t have respect of their colleagues. [They] didn’t get there through graft but intelligence...That’s awful that they should be criticised for that but it’s not the kind of job that appreciates intelligence...it’s not what you know, it’s who you know. That still applies and for me who’s bumped heads already with supervisors, I don’t feel playing the game is for me. So, how do I get there? I’d have to be the best of the best. Maybe, but...[they’ve] got no positions [anyway]?”

The police organisation has systems and practices in place for holding officers to account for their action. Because of this, student officer 3 felt that he was perpetually at risk of investigation. He described an incident that had taken place that resulted in an investigation of his actions and said,

“Feel exposed as police officer...I had to have a physical confrontation with someone the other day and luckily I haven’t had many because I pride myself on being able to talk to people but this guy was so intoxicated he was up for a fight. There was no two ways about it. He’d assaulted a young person so there’s no way we weren’t going to take him in. We used classical Home Office, OSTU approved techniques. Classical ‘take down’, it was all caught on headcam footage to prove...we weren’t using excessive force...and he does this...[The person moved their hands to cause them to be cut by the handcuffs] so he has to go to hospital...it’s a case of “if you’ve injured someone. You know, you could be in a lot of trouble and suddenly you’ve got this cloud, this sword of Damocles hanging over you...” Constantly stuff about police brutality in the media. Any force that can make an example of someone, you feel they will. As someone who’s still in probation be ‘reg 13’ me out of the job, just like

---

17 High Potential Development Scheme is open to all officers including Student officers and provides a fast track promotion programme and training in police leadership and management, for those successful in applying to it. (College of Policing, 2016c)
that [is very easy]. [I] feel that you have to be able to prove everything or you're vulnerable.”

Student officer 3 expressed considerable unease about the impact of police work on his social and personal life. He often felt fatigued and a little lonely. There was a notable dilemma here where, on the one hand he said that he wanted to have colleagues he could talk to who would understand the difficulties of police work but on the other that he did not want to talk about the job with them all the time. He also developed a distaste for the bureaucracy of police work (but completed it very well, according to the feedback he received from others) and saw that as only likely to worsen.

Student officer 3 came to take a view that reactive policing had a low status. Most of the officers on Relief had not completed initial training but he thought that most were wanting to get off ‘reactive’ police work as soon as possible. In the interview extract below, it is possible to see the struggle he had between the concepts of the response police officer as ‘first line of defence’ and, as he described it, ‘bottom rung’.

“No other department like reactive. Quantity and expectations of quality of work. All work goes upwards...Always being scrutinised. Got chastised by senior officer coz [I] referred to reactive as ‘bottom rung’. He said he didn’t look at it like that. I said, with respect, you don’t do it anymore...We’re the ones that go to domestic after domestic and fill out endless forms that just seem to get bigger and bigger. [He argued that] you don’t feel bottom of the pile, you feel the first line of defence. It sounds a bit clichéd but you’re proud of the fact it’s you who goes...As soon as you start to lose that adrenaline buzz that’s when you go somewhere else because that’s what keeps you going...and that’s why it’s so admirable that you’ve still got some in their late 40s who still get that adrenaline buzz, like the first day...Biggest issue was the paperwork, the bureaucracy. Tied up with doing utter rubbish. Shoplifter versus foot patrol. Take the latter”.

Ironically, he experienced some of the best working relationships just before his resignation. “Excellent camaraderie, team work with [on new Relief] Relief right at
the end. I was happiest when I was on my way to a job. Getting that adrenalin buzz, getting that thought that I might be able to do something worthwhile”.

Resignation

After feeling increasingly lonely and isolated because of shift work, the nature of his job and its impact on friendships, he took the decision to resign, despite better relationships being created in the last Relief and despite force efforts to keep him in ‘the job’. The decision followed a long period of thought, where he sought advice from colleagues, friends and family, especially his father.

Some days, have a wobble that I’ve not made the right choice. Had a bit of a wobble after putting resignation in, told could withdraw it up until the end of my final working day. Last day, handed kit in, warrant card, went home, woke up next day – utter panic! Rang sergeant. Said, [I’ve ] “made a balls up”. She went straight to divisional commander, he invited me in, talked and realised it was the right decision at the time. Divisional Commander very supportive. Decision was right but I wish it wasn’t…Felt proud that I…gave everything I had. Walked away with my head held high. Good reputation. Told I’d be welcome back…”

Resolutions and alternatives

Some significant resolutions to the difficulties outlined above had already taken place. The early allegation concerning his behaviour had seen him exonerated and the investigation of the complaint received near to the point of his resignation had also been resolved in his favour and there did not seem to be any lasting damage from the stop-search issue. Indeed, there has been a recent significant reversal of policy on stop-search across police forces in England and Wales, toward the approach he advocated (HMIC, 2015). Had he stayed a little longer he could have rightly paraded his stop-search policy before the Chief Constable as the new ‘force
policy’. Indeed, he did have some supporters amongst colleagues and amongst supervisors and senior officers and so, it may not have been the case that his career had been irreparably undermined. Furthermore, he had not applied for the High Potential Development Scheme or actively pursued application to specialist roles, both of which may well have ‘borne fruit’ (one of this cohort was selected as a firearms officer shortly after finishing training). Over time, the force did devote some considerable resources to trying to keep him and stressed they would welcome him back, when he did eventually resign.

The feeling he had that response officers were at the ‘bottom of the pile’ was not something that was agreed with by all. An alternative perspective did exist and was expressed to him but he felt he could not believe it. He was, perhaps, overly sensitive to these differences of status and not able to see the nuances and variations that existed. The isolation from others (including the ‘nominals’ and ‘scumbags) he felt does ‘come with the territory’ but his capacity to develop good relationships with all he worked with, through his discursive approach to policing, was important, at least to those he policed. The service needed officers like him.

Whilst he did feel ‘thrown in at the deep end’ without any organisational support, he also argued that this had forced him to become competent very quickly, aided by another officer and an approach to policing that he venerated. He even proposed that the entirety of initial training should more resemble his experience.

It may not have been the case that his education, in itself was necessarily problematic. Other student officers in the cohort had completed higher education, had adopted similar policing styles too and had remained in ‘the job’. Student officer
12 fits that profile. It was not necessarily related to the subject he studied either but rather his evident personal liberalism, coupled with a sophisticated knowledge of criminal law, that so annoyed some of his colleagues. Whilst he had a low opinion of some colleagues, he did regard others with great admiration, not least of all for their understanding of the effects of social inequality. This is what underpinned his relationship with his first Relief mentor and does indicate that there existed an element of police culture that did not clash with his wider political views.

The social isolation he felt was not the result of isolation per se but isolation from those of a similar mind. There were considerable benefits that he felt from the camaraderie, esprit de corps and responsibility that came with his role as a police officer. However, his perception was that the two worlds (of his life before becoming a police officer and after it) were mutually exclusive, when this may not have been the case. This is demonstrated by his vacillation, especially at the point of his departure and he intended (even to this day, perhaps) to take up the offer of re-joining the police. Student officer 3 might have found a more comfortable home within that culture, had he ‘braved it out’ a little longer. Although, I did meet him shortly after his resignation and he expressed a feeling of levity, despite his working hours increasing significantly. Whilst he had taken some time to shed the yoke of his former occupation, he felt free to say what he wanted, do what he wanted and go where he wanted but the force had lost, by all accounts, a ‘very good’ police officer.

Discussion:

In summary, Student officer 3 had a good and police relevant education, a balanced approach to police work, a law-abiding and stable family background, lots of
experience of ‘the right kind’ of service work, knowledge of the police role, a commitment to the concept of public service and a strong concern for the ‘best interests’ of the local area. He also stressed that he supported the need to treat all with respect, especially in relation to ethnicity and social class. Student officer 3’s personal biography seemed to make him an ideal candidate for the role of a ‘modern’ professional police officer. He was indeed, what Jones (2015) has called the ‘thinking police officer’ and just the kind of recruit that Wortley and Williams (1996) called “diversifying the recruit mix”. He could have gone on to occupy a senior position in the police organisation had things worked out differently.

So, what went wrong, when and why? The answer to these questions are more complex than they may seem. Indeed, he had not reached a personal accommodation with his decision to leave at precisely the point at which it had finally been made. So, his resignation was certainly not a foregone conclusion and in what follows, I attempt to address some of the key issues that contributed to this complex decision and begin by addressing the reasons that he had to leave.

It could be argued that Student officer 3 knew exactly what he was ‘getting himself into’ and that he did not have unrealistic or idealistic motivations for joining the police. However, on closer inspection he did have some significant idealisations. He wanted a career with promotion, variation, good status and one that would be supported by the police organisation. He also wanted to make a contribution to ‘fighting crime’ by catching the ‘real baddies’ but to be seen to be a ‘good copper’, by his colleagues and the ‘scumbags’, at the same time. All of these were problematic, as his experiences demonstrate. Student officer 3 came to take the view that all of
his aspirations and ideals had been fettered in one way or another. His transition from idealism to disillusionment occurred very quickly, possibly stimulated by his pre-existing fears that his hopes may not be fulfilled. Student officer 3’s prior police experience may, ironically, have served to expedite his dissatisfaction with ‘the job’.

This accords with research that has demonstrated that aspirations undergo significant alteration during initial training and that those with occupational experience of a similar kind can come to a decision to resign more quickly than otherwise would be the case (Van Maanen, 1973; 1975; Niederhoffer, 1967; Fielding, 1988).

Student officer 3’s motivations for becoming a police officer were partly driven by what he saw as the impotence of Police Community Support Officers in relation to ‘catching criminals’ and their low status in the ‘wider police family’ of jobs. Pepper (2014) and Cosgrove (2016) demonstrate the aspiration evident amongst Special Constables and Police Community Support Officers to become police officers, in part to gain greater status amongst the increasing number of police-related occupations. Student officer 3 shared this aspiration but also believed he would be bringing skills of effective, placatory communication (talk) and ‘service delivery’, as much as a ‘crime-fighting’ zeal, that he had developed as a Police Community Support Officer. He felt he was led to believe that the organisation also wanted those skills. His experience as a Police Community Support Officer had attuned him to the need to have as much ‘ammunition’ (as he called it) with which to progress his police career. This indicated that he was anticipating he would need to be engaged in some kind of battle for career progression that he may or may not win. He was aware of the
hierarchy of the police occupational environment and that status resided in both rank and/or role, both of which he thought were capriciously obtained and rewarded. Student officer 3 quickly came to perceive a ‘glass ceiling’ that he thought barred his progress. His age was an important factor and the associated feeling that he had to get up the occupational ladder quickly. Wilson et al (2010) and (Orrick, 2008a) both point out that younger officers expect frequent training opportunities to improve their abilities and that without such training, they can lose confidence and become discouraged.

He had achieved a goal of upward mobility within ‘the wider police family’ by becoming a student officer but he quickly came to feel that he was at the ‘bottom of the pile’ again, within the police officer occupational hierarchy itself. Moskos (2008) in the US context, demonstrates the failure of ‘911’ and the low status of response policing.

His tolerance of the social isolation of police work diminished to the point where he felt that the police organisation should have done something to help. He became a little bitter. To extricate himself from that situation was not, he thought, going to be easy or even possible. He saw himself as relatively young, talented, well-educated and so was able to consider other occupations. He was also unable to generate a sense of satisfaction precisely because his role was to act as someone who could patch things up but could not make things permanently better.

He came to see the police organisation as anti-‘education’. His understanding of fast-track promotion (that would satisfy his career ambitions) was that he would have to struggle against the prejudice and disdain of the majority who thought he would have
succeeded without hard work. His education came to be seen increasingly as an impediment to and not a facilitator of occupational success. Some studies have argued that graduates have a difficult time in the police (Holdaway, 1989). Its anti-intellectual and pragmatic culture have been shown to denigrate and stand in opposition to academic culture (Adlam, 1981; Canter, 2004; White, 2006). Vodicka (1994, cited in Marion 1998) argues that educated officers are more likely to leave, question orders, become bored, expect promotions and request reassignment”.

Jones (2015) identifies some of the cultural problems of creating what he calls the “thinking policeman” and Sato (2002) advocates the establishment of networks of support to help officers accommodate to the diversity and impact of police culture.

Student officer 3 became aware of the difference between the ostensible motives of the organisation and what he thought were the ‘real’ ones. Whilst the Police Standards Department investigation occurred before operational experience, he was quickly able to anticipate that this might be a feature of operational experience in the very near future. The problem with the lack of Police Development Officers and his feeling that he was ‘dumped’ by his Police Development Unit, gave him the impression of an organisation that just wants officers at ‘jobs’ and one that would not support him when ‘the going got tough’. This feeling only deepened over time and with further incidents that generated, what he thought were, unsupportive organisational responses. The complaint received after he had completed what he thought was an entirely correct arrest using force, ‘sealed the deal’. At that point, he was hankering after his bar job – more hours but more psychological freedom. He was free-thinking and free-talking and was critical (both positively and negatively) of the police role. This did not endear him to some of his colleagues and disrupted his
acceptance into and acceptance of the organisational culture supported by some of his colleagues. That his supervisors appeared to support unlawful practices further confirmed his growing dissatisfaction.

He had not experienced the metamorphosis identified by Van Maanen (1973; 1975) where recruits, “lay low and don’t make waves” but had adopted what Fielding (1986, p. 281) describes as an ‘employee’s’ perspective’, which meant he compared policing, ultimately not very favourably, with other jobs. Fekajer et al (2014) found that background characteristics had little impact on a common movement, after academy training, toward non-legalistic practices even after comparatively long academic training. Student officer 3 does not fit that profile.

He struggled with a conflict between his background that represented aspiration, achievement, liberalism, self-expression, choice and hope and his occupation that represented resignation, failure, conservatism, suppression, constraint and despair. He did not think he could make any difference to the lives of those he policed and resigned before he became what Wambaugh (2010) calls “prematurely cynical”. He would have been well advised to have read, Muir (1977) who argued that a ‘good’ policeman has to develop both a moral (achieving good ends with ‘coercive means’) and an intellectual (the inevitability of human suffering) virtue. Student officer 3 was comfortable with the former but not the latter. Furthermore, the differences between his personal characteristics and what Bennett (1984, p.49) calls the “police reference group” appeared to retard his affiliation to the police occupation.

His perspective of the police role brought him into conflict with some of his supervisors, who stressed ‘crime-fighting’ over the ‘service’ dimension His
understanding of the predicament of those that he policed, appeared to his
supervisors as justification for criminality and openly ‘siding with the enemy’. That
this was supported by a well-argued legal position was the ‘icing on the cake’, for
some of them. Haar (2005, p.442) identified a ‘resigner’, with a similar view, who
said,

“I guess maybe I just have a different approach to policing than some others
do. A lot of them just like to go out there and kick ass. I like to talk. I liked
actually being able to help people”.

So, it might be argued that the organisation has some significant problems to
address with regard to the way it exposed student officer 3 to the operational
environment and allowed one of their ‘best’, by their own admission, to leave.

Resignation case study 2. Student officer 13: The ‘very nice policeman’

Background characteristics

I only had the opportunity to interview Student officer 13 once, sometime after he
had resigned. I had observed formal training activities that he had taken part in but
he had not wanted to be a part of the interview cohort, from the start. His
commentary is less expansive as a result and constitutes his post-hoc reflections of
his time in initial training.

At the time of the fieldwork, Student officer 13 was 27 years old, married and lived in
the local town where he was brought up. He had previously worked for a number of
years as a local bus driver for a major national bus company. He was born in one of
the two cities of the force area but subsequently, lived in a nearby town, where he
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went to school. His mother was a cleaner and his father worked in a semi-skilled occupation and had a number of different jobs over his lifetime. Student officer 13 had left full-time education at 16 not having achieved well. By his own admission he, “hated school…never saw myself going to university…just wanted to work”. He had explored the opportunity to join the Army but did not like the discipline and failed an asthma test, in any case. He worked instead in electronics for a short time and as a Special Constable but later, a Custody Officer at a Detention Centre. He had applied to join Ashton Police on the 9 prior occasions that recruitment was open, but had been unsuccessful until his last attempt when he had received help from a serving officer. He had also applied to become a prison officer and a Police Community Support Officer, both of which had also been unsuccessful.

I first remember student officer 13 from the first class during the Induction period and wondered whether training staff and his peers might think him a little remote. He was though, very pleasant and polite, but occasionally appeared a little naïve and inclined to give those he encountered what they wanted and found it difficult to be firm enough in some circumstances.

Formal initial training experiences

The classroom phases of training had been somewhat enjoyable for student officer 13 and he had progressed satisfactorily through the knowledge checks and role-plays.

“I liked the training…I actually quite enjoyed the classroom stuff…I liked making notes. I’m not a vocal person. I make comments…I wasn’t controversial. Some people were, some people weren’t…It was good at
Headquarters when we were in a big group. It was a big laugh. As time wore on, once we went to our own respective Divisions where there were just 7 of us. It was really, really enjoyable cos we all had a good laugh. There were so many varying characters and ages...We used to have little tests at the end of each week as well that was healthy competition to see how we were doing...really enjoyed all that. It was very informative. A lot to learn. A lot to read...I still read the books now” (SO.13).

It all seemed a little too good to be true though. In fact, a significant hurdle to successful progress on the programme had already made an ominous appearance.

Most of the applicants saw the family as supportive of their aspiration but student officer 13 felt that his wife had not supported him from the outset.

Early field experiences

The lack of support became exacerbated once he had progressed to the Consolidation phase and was sometimes required to work beyond the end of a shift. He was bitter about this problem and it had clearly caused something of a rift between himself and his wife. He said,

“whilst I was being tutored my wife was very difficult. She didn’t understand ... I held this one for a while, I finally told her that I basically, pretty much hated her for not supporting me...I needed it at home. That was probably a pivotal point as well...she said she didn’t want me to not do it but I think she found it difficult to understand. [She would say] ‘why can’t you come home now’? Why are you still at work? [I would say]’well, because I’m trying to finish my work. If I come home now and this lady gets stabbed to death by her ex-boyfriend, it’s my fault...It’s my job to stay here and sort this out” (SO.13)

This problem was very prominent in his mind whilst at work and he indicated that his wife sent him many text messages asking where he was, which contributed to his feeling that he just could not cope with the police work.
“You know and when we went out on to the ground I kind of folded in on myself. I went very quiet which is very unusual for me. I’m not very quiet at all [but]...I’d find it very hard to string sentences together” (SO.13).

One of his colleagues expressed the problem quite well and related it to his apparent incapacity to think ill of others. One of his peers said that, “

“The problem is that he can’t understand why people might want to hurt him and that not everyone is happy to see you. He has a problem with officer safety and protecting himself. He told me that he was helping an old lady out of a car. Should always stand on the nearside and on the pavement. This person went to the offside and was close to being hit. He applied many times and finally got in. He came from one of the ‘fluffy’ public service backgrounds”.

Training staff attempted to help student officer 13 to overcome his ‘stage fright’ but they seemed inconsistent and a little desperate at times.

“...at first we thought maybe...of a different learning style [would help]. So, we tried Hilary, who’s dyslexic...because she has a very different way of teaching....We just sat down, had a coffee, good long hour chat of just trying to work out what we can do to solve this [but] we then decided that maybe a good boot up the bum would solve it. So, we tried Arthur…and I had two choices. Choice one was, learn and start talking or choice two, which I happen to have chosen for some reason, which was to completely melt down” (SO.13).

Resignation

The decision to resign came for this student officer quite soon during the Consolidation phase and was precipitated by a really ‘bad day at the office’.

“I went out one day and I had the most diabolical day ever. Ridiculous day. I must have done everything wrong. I did a search, forgot to give the bloke his ID back, forget to get him to sign the forms. I did a couple of searches and I turned my back on the criminal bloke. The guy I was searching had a knife. I could have been stabbed. I stood in the road looking the wrong way to the traffic. I wasn’t thinking at all. I was having a real bad day and then it got to the point...I got back to the station and [my Police Development Officer] de-briefed me and it was about an hour or two before I was supposed to go home
and [he] said, ‘Just go home. You’ve had the worst day ever. Literally, you look like shit’ and I felt shit...So...as I got on the bus I text my old boss...and my exact words were, “Am I number 1...I’ve always been number 1. Screw everyone else. I’m the best one. I get the letters of compliment. I left with a great report. I didn’t burn any bridges...and I cried on the way home. I felt horrible. I felt so bad...[My former boss said]...when do you want to come back? And I was like, lovely” (SO.13).

At this point he decided that he’d had enough and that there was no way that the force would let him through to the Independence phase. Whilst the decision appeared to be his alone, it was in fact a culmination of the views of others as well as his own experiences of police work.

“I went back in the next day...saw (my) Inspector and he was the nicest guy I could ever talk to. I think he was the greatest guy ever. He said, “if it’s not for you, it’s not for you....I left like a week later...had a couple of days off and I went back to work and I’ve slipped my way up the ranks again....I know that’s where I belong for now...”(SO.13)

This resignation whilst apparently initiated by the student officer was, in fact, a combination of both the officer’s experience and the force’s own termination. He did say that he resigned in part, “because I figured that I wouldn’t get set loose on my own anyway because I was having such a rare time of it” (SO.13). When I met him to undertake the interview he certainly seemed a lot more relaxed than he had appeared on the occasions I had seen him during training. He had kept in touch with some of his student officer colleagues and said that,

“...Student officer 12 now says that when we first met up after we left, she says I’m a different person. She didn’t even recognise me because I was so subdued and quiet when I was out in the, being mentored. As soon as I left...weight off my shoulders”.
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Discussion

Student officer 13 had joined with some significant ‘warning signals’. He was working in an occupation that he clearly liked and was good at, before joining the police and was unsure why he was leaving that job. He appeared to feel that he had only managed to get through the recruitment process by force of perseverance and the help of a serving officer friend. He seemed to have been applying for so long that he had lost sight of the reasons he was applying. When he eventually got through he seemed to feel that he had to carry on with it and as a result his original motivations were a little half-hearted.

The conflict between what his wife was expecting and what his experience of police work was, started from an early point. The little indication, during the Learning Modules phase, of what it would be like to work shifts started the tension between home and work life. Ryan et al (2001) demonstrated the importance of the family and the potential conflict between work and family life. Difficulties emerged where there was a lack of congruence between family perception of the police role and the officer’s perception. Burke (1993) indicated that the lack of “social support in the non-working environment was related to work/family conflict among police officers”. Ryan (2001) argues that applicants may not perceive the job as high in work/family conflict and that, “the organization may be affected negatively when the individual must ultimately face work/family conflict”. Ashton Police might have addressed the Police Development Officer pairing more effectively though. Haar (2005) notes that some recruits resigned in part because of difficulties with their relationships with the FTO. The attempt to get this sorted out seemed a little haphazard.
However, for student officer 13, ‘service’ seemed to be naively understood and from the outset he seemed to be too trusting of the motives and intentions of others, to be a police officer. His Special Constabulary experience was a distant memory and created an unrealistic understanding of the breadth and nature of the meaning of service in police work. Whilst it may lead to problematic stereotypes, one of the key attributes of police culture and police work is the development of ‘suspicion’ (Reiner, 2000; Skolnick, 1966; Waddington, 1999). He seemed to have little understanding of this and so, found it very difficult, during police encounters, to hold important suspicions in his head whilst maintaining dialogue with those he encountered.

Student officer 13’s demise came quickly, when it was evident that his ‘stage fright’ (Fielding, 1986; 1988) was overwhelming and deleterious, not to mention dangerous for all concerned.

It is hard to imagine that student officer 13 could have had any other trajectory than resignation. To some extent his peers had made an accurate assessment that he was ‘too nice’ to be a police officer. Indeed, one is tempted to conclude that he should not have been employed in the first place, a problem contributed to by the recruitment process itself, in his case. His introduction to police work came far too soon for him and he felt relieved of the burden as soon as he left the station for the last time. Nevertheless, resignation was a very painful decision for him that took some time to take and involved some considerable ‘help’ from colleagues. He had very quickly returned to an occupation he enjoyed, that eminently suited his, apparently uniformly, ‘nice’ personality and a job that was less mired in confusion about the meaning of service than is the police occupation.
Conclusion

It is important to reflect on lessons that these two cases gave rise to. Firstly, it would have been instructive for Ashton Police to have known better, the fine detail of the backgrounds of these two officers. That may have allowed it and the officers to have developed more agreeable accommodations to the changes that took place during initial training and to predict better the outcomes of it. Secondly, some sensitisation had taken place to the demands of being a police officer during early phases of training that might have been attended to more effectively. Thirdly, the way in which both student officers were exposed to the operational environment and the way in which they were supported with its impact, appeared vulnerable to organisational problems. This has been identified as a recurring problems in initial police training and the transition to the occupational environment (HMIC, 2002; ALI, 2005). Lynch and Tuckey (2004) argue that ‘voluntary police turnover’ (resignations) whilst lower than in other public sector occupations does experience fluctuations and could be ameliorated by police organisations. Fielding (1986) and Wilson et al (2010) make a number of suggestions that the police might consider concerning better convergence between recruitment and training, seeking contributions from other professions in the recruitment process, the communication of a more realistic understanding of police work, quotas of recruits with profiles that are less likely to resign and to screen out those with a vulnerable profile. It may also be noted that other student officers did not resign but came perilously close to doing so. Student officers 4 and 11, both young and female had to move a long way culturally but had different original backgrounds and different kinds of support to those that resigned. To predict, intervene and assure successful outcomes is no easy or entirely predictable task.
Chapter 10. Conclusion:

Introduction

What follows is, firstly, a short reflection on the strengths and weaknesses of the research methods used in this thesis. Secondly, I make some conclusions on my fieldwork findings with regard to questions that emerged from Chapter 1. I argue that cultural continuity overshadowed change and that initial training in Ashton Police very much resembled previous iterations. In that respect it had maintained the status quo. Thirdly, I consider current developments in police education and initial training in relation to trends and issues identified in Chapter 1. Fourthly, I develop the broader conclusion that initial training reforms aimed at creating change in the police are sometimes and in some cases, necessary but not sufficient. I argue that this accords with a social democratic understanding of the police which contends that reforms, whilst necessary, are constrained by social, political and economic conditions in liberal democracies. Finally, I provide my concluding thoughts on what initial training might look like in the future and what further research on initial training might be undertaken.

Strengths and weaknesses of research methods

The longitudinal methods that I employed in my research allowed me to understand the process of socialisation in the time frames that were experienced by student officers themselves. This is particularly important in the study of initial training and police socialisation, where affiliation with the police reference group is so important
and builds on existing research (Van Maanen, 1975; Bennett, 1984; Fielding, 1988). The interview method that I discussed in Chapter 2, allowed me to understand the complexity of student officer’s experiences and enabled them to articulate those experiences in their own terms. The observations I carried out revealed findings and their situated nature that would be difficult to uncover using other methods. This built on existing police research that has used similar methods and reasons (Van Maanen, 1975; Harris, 1973). Furthermore, I was able to develop some very productive research relationships with student officers and training staff because of the personal connections I was able to develop. This certainly happened with student officer 3, with whom I felt some affinity as he struggled with resignation. In addition, the case study model (Darke, et al, 1998) was effective in drawing out the detail and idiosyncrasies of initial training in Ashton Police initial training and its strengths and weaknesses. My research was small scale but it does provide a detailed case of the variability of initial training (Wood and Tong, 2009; Heslop, 2013) and so, allows future comparisons to be made to it, in other forces and in different contexts.

It is important to recognise the limitations of my research. Its small-scale nature meant it was not able to provide detail about the general patterns of initial training in the current environment where, despite nationalising tendencies there is also considerable local variation and fragmentation in approach, about which, little is accurately or extensively known (Heslop, 2013). As I discussed in Chapter 2, the access I had to the research environment was extensive and allowed me to understand the heterogeneous nature of initial training in Ashton Police, across its organisational, cultural and geographical parameters. However, the organisational restructure hampered my access to the field training component during the
Consolidation phase and I had limited access to Police Development Unit 1 and to student officers training there. I did also indicate in Chapter 2 that I was unable to focus on the Community Development phase.

Fieldwork conclusions

In this part of the chapter, I provide a consideration of my fieldwork findings in relation to the questions identified in Chapter 1. This falls into two parts, the first of which, contends that cultural continuity outweighed discontinuity and the second that the initial training programme itself had, largely, maintained the status quo.

Continuities in police culture and recruit socialisation

In chapter 1, I discussed some of the principle explanations of the nature, causes and consequences of police culture and recruit socialisation and indicated that I would return to the questions I identified then, in this chapter. In the responses developed below, I argue that my fieldwork demonstrates far more continuity of culture and socialisation than change (although, there did exist some glimpses of discontinuity and progressive cultural features) and that the wider context of police work and of Ashton Police proved highly influential in determining that.

The first question that emerged from consideration of the literature in Chapter 1 concerned the origins of police occupational culture. In Chapter 3, I demonstrated the homogeneity of the recruit cohort (although graduates and a sizeable proportion of women had been recruited), particularly in relation to their police occupational background. This was demonstrated, in later chapters, to have contributed strongly to pre-existing features of police culture, rather than having been imported from
elsewhere. For student officers without that background, my fieldwork showed that police work, subsequently engaged in, resulted in a movement toward the occupational attitudes and practices of their peers and colleagues. This was experienced as a painful and difficult process and as one that left behind their prior persona and indeed some of their prior perceptions of what it would be like to work as a police officer. There existed considerable pressure to take on police cultural characteristics, sometimes specifically in order to override pre-existing ones. Whilst their backgrounds (personal, educational, occupational, familial) were important, the work being undertaken and that had already been undertaken, appeared the primary determinant of the way in which they (more or less successfully) acquired police occupational values and practices.

The second question that emerged from Chapter 1 related to the relationship between the agency of officers and the structures that may exist in forming police culture. My findings demonstrated that there existed a complex set of individual articulations with the process of socialisation and the development of cultural attitudes and practices. However, occupational culture did not disappear into infinite personal variations, principally, because the personal agency of student officers was highly circumscribed by the organisational and social context of Ashton Police. The Divisional cultural differences, developed in the separate Police Development Units, demonstrated this well. The practice of recruiting those with prior policing experience in Ashton Police resulted, in part, from the force’s belief that this would be culturally progressive and cost effective. The latter may have been the case but the former, largely, was not. In turn, as discussed in Chapter 1 and 3, this practice originated in the wider political context of the police during the Blair governments and following
the 2008 financial crisis. It was also very evident from observations I conducted in the real work environment that student officers worked largely with the disadvantaged in their communities. This had profound, although not entirely uniform, impacts on the student officers, as I discussed in Chapters 8 and 9. This context was not of their own making but, originated in the complex relationship between the student officer, police work and the socioeconomic divisions that characterised those communities.

The third question to emerge from Chapter 1 concerned the emphasis given to variation or homogeneity of occupation culture. The fieldwork demonstrated some variation in the backgrounds of student officers and in the ways in which they accommodated to the vicissitudes of the programme and the complex acquisition of police culture. This was particularly evident in Chapter 9, where all the findings from my research coalesced as part of the decision to resign, during the programme, of one of the most promising student officers in the cohort. This demonstrated that the process of socialisation was complex and somewhat unpredictable and one where ‘good’ and ‘bad’ practices of both formal and informal socialising influences were present. However, it also demonstrates the limits of variation and the painful choice that some recruits make when their ‘take’ on occupational culture becomes too difficult to maintain and resignation becomes likely. Whilst there existed some variation in approaches to police work, they centred on a simple division between forceful or conciliatory solutions. The dominant culture of police work appeared to be a ‘tough’, law enforcement one that was cynical about the idea of ‘customer service’ in police work. Those that begged to differ had a tough time.
The fourth question that was identified in Chapter 1 concerned whether and how far police culture and occupational socialisation may have changed or may have retained its essential features. The process of recruit socialisation in Ashton Police was highly continuous with those of the past. As a result, familiar patterns of occupational culture developed (and pre-existed) where formal training came to occupy a low status and student officers developed cynical and prejudicial views of some that they frequently encountered during the more informal elements of training. The informal practices and attitudes of training officers and their Relief colleagues were highly influential. The purported ‘transformation’ of policing and its associated cultural change, discussed in Chapter 1, seemed overshadowed by training for a crime-control, managerialist and action-orientated approach to the police occupation. Student officer 3’s eloquent critique of this was evidence of the existence of the critical views of some student officers, although his subsequent resignation demonstrated the power of the dominant position.

The final question identified in Chapter 1 related to the normative understanding of occupational culture and to what extent it might be perceived as ‘good’ or ‘bad’. It is tempting to apply normative judgements to the varying occupational attitudes and practices that developed amongst the recruits in this study. Indeed, they certainly applied judgements to one another and to other colleagues, especially concerning what they thought were ‘better’ or ‘worse’ ways of dealing with conflict. However, their choices of police practice were made in constrained circumstances and were heavily influenced by their supervisors and colleagues. This might absolve them of personal blame or condemnation. For example, student officer 10 eloquently described himself, in interview, as an officer who was considerate and helpful, yet he
knew exactly that his supervisors wanted him to 'get in the faces' of certain 'nominals', in pursuit of which he was prepared to suspend legal stop and search practices. In that sense, student officer's spoken descriptions of their occupational attitudes and practices functioned as a support for, rather than an accurate description of, their working practices.

The status quo of initial training

Also in Chapter 1, I discussed the development of initial training reform in England and Wales and indicated that I would return to those questions in this chapter. In the responses developed below, I argue that my fieldwork demonstrates that despite the introduction of a new initial training programme and apparently more robust recruitment practices, the training outcomes very much resembled the status quo, although there was some evidence of alterations in initial training that could be seen to have had some beneficial impacts. The tendency to the status quo can be traced to the organisational context of Ashton Police and to the problems associated with the wider historical and political context of police recruitment and initial training.

The first question to return to, concerns police recruitment and its relationship to initial training. Whilst this study is not one of the recruitment process per se, as I described in Chapter 3, it can comment on some of the results of it in the initial training environment. The preponderance of those with occupational experience in the wider police family (and Ashton Police itself), who lived locally, were educated to 'A' Level equivalent, who were young and male, was very clear. It was a very homogeneous cohort. The consequence of the occupational background, in particular, as I described in Chapter 4, was that the pre-existing attitudes of some
student officers undermined the customer, community service and diversity focus of the formal elements, from their outset. Furthermore, as demonstrated in some interviews with training staff, the reliance on initial training as a corrective for the recruitment of student officers who held views and attitudes inimical to those of Ashton Police, as they were formally stated, was precarious, to say the least. In that sense, the personal background of some student officers might have been better understood by Ashton Police upon recruitment, particularly because they were already working for the organisation. Some student officers from these backgrounds appeared to exhibit classical features of police occupational culture on appointment, notably cynical and prejudicial views about ‘customer service’ elements of police work and of the communities they policed. A further prominent feature of the backgrounds of the student officers was the length of time some had taken to be recruited. ‘Staying power’ seemed immensely important as a criteria for selection and overrode other qualities recruits may have had. They had been through a protracted period of ‘anticipatory socialisation’ that heightened and largely strengthened their need to adopt police cultural attitudes and practices. Despite this, Ashton Police stuck to the view that they recruited a broader social range of applicants than other recruitment strategies, especially graduate only ones. This position on recruitment has its origins in the wider political priorities of the police and was something the police have clung to since their inception, a point I discussed in Chapters 1 and 3. Nationally, the practice of recruitment from force’s complements of Police Community Support Officers was thought to provide an effective way of increasing ethnic minority representations amongst the police officer complement and so to meet workforce diversity targets. The spending restrictions, implemented in
the wake of the financial crisis of 2008 also drove the practice of recruiting Special Constables, many of whom were subsequently employed by forces.

The second question, identified in Chapter 1, concerned the nature of the pedagogy and syllabus content in initial training. My fieldwork demonstrated that this pedagogy was not what it officially aspired to be. In Chapters 4, 5 and 6, the purported success in substituting a regressive rote learning approach with a progressive adult and student-centred approach, was nothing of the kind and the hidden curriculum of initial training that stressed the student officer’s requirement to conform, became all too obvious at many points. The training Sergeant managing Police Development Unit 2 and his practices embodied this retrograde approach. But, even in the other apparently more progressive Units, similar ends were pursued, although in more subtle ways. This was discussed in Chapter 5, during the Learning Modules phase, where considerable focus was placed on traditional pedagogies and legal curriculum content in the acquisition of police-related knowledge. Little systematic attempt existed to develop a wider and/or critical understanding of the police and its role in society. As I discussed in Chapter 6, the scenarios training appeared to come closest to authentic police encounter simulations but was far too removed from operational practice and contained some regressive symbolic gendered messages. Here, the teaching staff became particularly influential but, not always in ways that Ashton Police might formally support. During the Independent Patrol phase, training seemed to have largely disappeared and with it much semblance of evident pedagogy.
In relation to initial training, the third question to consider concerns the understanding of professionalisation evident in initial training. The long-standing question of whether initial training should be constituted on the model of the more established professions, especially concerning collaboration with higher education, did not seem to form part of the focus of Ashton Police. Indeed, training staff took the view that its own practices and resources were entirely adequate and did not need to be supplemented by collaboration with universities. It also, formally, stuck faithfully to a belief in the Competence Based Education and Training approach. However, that appeared unable to differentiate ranges of ability and its labyrinthine bureaucratic burden restricted the effective development of policing skills. As I described in Chapter 8, the bureaucratic overload of the Student Officer Learning and Assessment Portfolio left little time for effective reflection. It was disliked by student officers because of its perceived disconnection from the training and working process and was sometimes completed perfunctorily. The claims for the ‘high quality’ of the programme sounded somewhat hollow in the light of this finding.

The fourth question to consider is the organisation of initial training. The much vaunted new programme that student officers were undertaking proved to be highly similar in structure and focus to past iterations. As I discussed in Chapters 4, 5, and 6, the formal phases were largely removed from the real police environment and fostered a feeling that those phases were of lesser importance than those in the operational context. In Chapter 5, the experiences of the Police Development Units fostered stereotypical understandings of the nature of police work that conflicted with those of the formal organisation. As I detailed in Chapter 7, the field training process encouraged connections with field trainers that did not always coincide with the
expectations of Ashton Police. Student officers took on the practices and attitudes of their Police Development Officers, for good or ill and there was insufficient resources to provide student officers with a broad enough range of approaches to police work. Student officers felt, for a long period of time, in an inferior position as ‘novices’ in the organisation. This eventually facilitated their ‘insider’ status but as I discussed in Chapter 9, anyone with innovative and challenging ideas appeared to find it very difficult to ‘fit in’. This particularly applied to student officer 13 but also student officers 4 and 11, both of whom were young, female and with no police experience. Furthermore, Attestation, so early in the programme, appeared to create an unnecessary expectation and cropped up again at different points where student officers felt they were expected to be able to do something that they were ill-prepared for. Informal training in Ashton Police was largely designed for response policing. The Reliefs relied on the labour of student officers in the Independent Patrol phase of initial training, which contributed to a negative perception of response policing and positive perception of the opportunities available elsewhere in the organisation. In Chapters 8 and 9, I demonstrated how some student officers became tired of the monotony of response policing and its perceived lack of status. After the fieldwork for this thesis ended, Ashton Police created a new, tri-force centralised system of training where all student officers from Ashton Police and two other neighbouring forces were trained, until Consolidation, at the force’s headquarters. This continued the separation of formal, field and informal training and would have been likely to have led to similar issues described in the fieldwork chapters above. This continues the long-standing features of the organisation of initial training discussed in Chapter 1.
The final question concerned the nature of the political context of police initial training. My fieldwork demonstrates considerable connections between the programme in Ashton Police, wider changes to initial training and the wider issues related to the police. One of the stated reasons for the abolition of the central training schools and the introduction of the Initial Police Learning and Development Programme was to move initial training entirely (including formal training) into the police forces to tailor it better to local needs. However, what my research has shown, as I described in Chapters 4 and 5, is that the Police Development Units reflected Ashton Police Divisional differences rather than local needs (whatever they are understood to mean) and meant that the experience of initial training varied within Ashton Police. Recruitment and initial training in Ashton Police should also be understood in the context of a perceived crisis for the police in the wake of the Macpherson inquiry in 1998 and more specifically in relation to concerns about recruits in initial training that had racist attitudes and behaviours, as found by an undercover BBC report in 2003. The force were keen to formally present their programme as one that addressed and even counteracted the problems of the police more widely. In that respect presentation may have outweighed reality and fits with a long-standing historical feature where recruitment and initial training reforms are presented as solutions to police-related problems but ultimately serve more to mask rather than to solve them.

In the light of the discussion above, the initial training programme in Ashton Police resembled traditional practices and principles but in the context of a new programme. Its specific features are contained in table 17 below.
Table 17. Ashton Police initial training: A traditional model in a new programme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key components</th>
<th>Key features</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Structure</strong></td>
<td>Field and informal training separated from formal training. The latter was diminished in status. The former lost status over the course of the programme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Purpose</strong></td>
<td>Formal training was for learning legal knowledge in didactic fashion. Field training for forming personal training bonds. Independent Patrol was more for ‘working’ as probationer, not ‘training’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location</strong></td>
<td>Formal training restricted by Police Development Units promotion of internal cultural stereotypes. Headquarters seen as remote. Field training in Police Development Unit allows protection for student officer. Informal training insufficiently varied location.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Culture</strong></td>
<td>Formal training was insular. Some militaristic features. Strict enforcement of rules, either in militaristic or bureaucratic way. Field training, dyadic. Informal: deference to experience and rank. Some evidence of ‘this is how we do it here’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Content</strong></td>
<td>Formal: Focus on police rules and regulations and police related law. Police Action Checklist activities create formalisation of operational learning but are insufficiently varied by tutor. Student Officer Learning and Assessment Portfolio has poor status because of perceived lack of connection with ‘training’ and heavy burden of bureaucracy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Participants</strong></td>
<td>Homogeneous cohort, especially police background. Trainers all experienced police officers. Conflict between Headquarters and Police Development Unit staff. Whilst neither necessarily constituted a benchmark for training purposes, the internal conflict over which one had greater status and power linked with deficiencies in the programme.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Adapted from Stanislas, 2012)
There have been considerable developments in police education and training as my fieldwork developed and since it concluded, which reflect the trends I identified in Chapter 1. In particular, the College of Policing, formed in 2011 as the new professional body is purporting to be bringing in a new era of police professionalisation along the model of those in other longer established professions.

The College has introduced a code of ethics (College of Policing, 2017a), a new educational qualifications framework - The Police Education and Qualifications Framework (College of Policing, 2017b), a re-formed competency and values framework (College of Policing, 2017c) authorised professional practices and a system of licence to practice (a professional register of police officers so licenced is on the agenda too) (College of Policing, 2017d) and is amassing a body of knowledge of ‘what works’ in policing (College of Policing, 2017e). A number of routes into the police officer role are being clarified and changes are imminent but all culminate in national qualifications in policing at level 6 (Bachelors) in both education and training (College of Policing, 2017e). From 2018-19, all new police officer recruits will be graduates in policing or another subject area or undertake Degree Apprenticeships in a police force (College of Policing, 2017f). This is an important development in light of the preceding fieldwork chapters in this thesis. Brandon Lewis (2017), whilst Minister for Policing, stated that “Workforce reform is improving the attractiveness of policing as a profession and new recruitment initiatives…are widening the talent pool and the range of prior experience available to policing….policing is becoming a more open profession, attracting applicants from different walks of life”. The College of Policing describe the new policing curriculum
as, “professionally transformative, covering a breadth, depth and range of professional education for the police constable beyond previous national specifications of the training required to perform this role” (College of Policing, 2017).

“The College of Policing is progressing plans for changes to the [Police] regulations to reflect the introduction of the PCDA as a recognised entry route for constables and for the requisite extension of the probationary period for entrants via this route to three years. (College of Policing, 2017)

However, it is important to raise concerns about this apparent, bright new future. The scope for continuity and homeostasis remains, for a number of reasons. First, there is a continued reliance on a competency based framework. White (2006) argues that competences do not tell us what moral choices to make. Competencies establish standards but not the criteria for [their] proper application” (White, 2006, p.393). It is noticeable that, in the College’s documentation (CoP, 2017) the ‘ethical principles, become ‘policing principles, that become ‘standards of professional behaviour’ (CoP, 2017). Furthermore, a code of ethics, embedded in initial training, may be welcome but questions must be asked about the capacity of police trainers to incorporate it into practice (White, 2000). Second, the status and exact nature of the Police Constable Degree Apprenticeship is uncertain and appears to be emerging from ‘procurement’ procedures used by police forces. This does not appear to constitute a collaborative process but one where the police appear to want to remain in control. Because of this, there is a real possibility that the new arrangements will continue the erroneous separation between education and training articulated by White (2006, p. 393) that characterises the Initial Police Learning and Development Programme, with police forces ‘training’ and universities ‘educating’. Third, significant concerns exist about how student officers on the Police Constable Degree Apprenticeship will
manage work and training requirements. They will not be supernumerary and will be expected to reach Independent Patrol Status before 12 months service. The pull of police operations remains tempting for forces, especially in extremis. In this context, training can assume a secondary and inferior status. Fourth, there is no indication of balance in recruitment numbers between different graduate and non-graduate entry points. Crucial workforce diversity issues will remain in the hands of forces and further entrench a very heterogeneous context. Fifth, the status of the different entry points is unclear but all will be differentially perceived in police culture and parity of esteem may well not transpire. There does not appear to be embedded practices for knowing what the exact cultural impact of university based programmes are. Further, it is still possible, in the Police Constable Degree Apprenticeship route, for forces to recruit non-graduates from those working in their own organisations. The ‘pre-join’ option constitutes a route from the Special Constabulary into police officer recruitment and MacVean and Cox (2012) demonstrate the problems associated with this where ‘undesirable’ cultural patterns are already constructed upon appointment as police officers. Last, the development of the syllabus of initial training is a somewhat mystified affair largely involving internal stakeholders and lacking a broader connection to other interested parties.

*Necessary but not sufficient: A social democratic interpretation*

In light of the above discussion of the fieldwork findings and current developments in initial training, I suggest now that reforms in police recruitment and initial training are (sometimes and in some cases) necessary but not sufficient and that the reason for this lies in the constraints on the police in liberal democracies. I argue that this is
consistent with a social democratic understanding of the police (Reiner, 2010; 2012) which I develop below and which explains the cultural and training features of my fieldwork.

In Chapter 1, I discussed some of the significant issues in police culture and recruit socialisation in the literature. I pointed out that what most social science perspectives of police culture have in common is that they regard police work as the prime determinant of occupational culture. Prominent in what was referred to as the ‘orthodox’ perspective, was the idea that police officers at the ‘street level’ are crucial in accomplishing police culture. I also pointed out that this has to be seen in a wider structural context and as a more flexible construct. In that respect, I discussed the identification of some variations and change in police culture and patterns of early socialisation, especially in the work of Fielding (1988) and Chan (1997 and 2003). However, as Fielding himself (1997, p.2) argues, because Chan’s analysis of change is rooted in ethnomethodology (that focuses on ‘how’ but not ‘why’ we do things) as such her formulation attempts but fails to seek support on the basis of “practical relevance.” Similarly, Brogden and Graham (1998, p.96), arguing from a more structural Marxist perspective, refuse to engage on a practical level at all with reforms to police education and training, decrying those that do as, “parasitic academics”. Fielding’s own (1988) analysis can result in an infinite regression where cultures have no boundaries and appear as entirely individual manifestations. None of these explanations provide an adequate understanding of the correlation between the wider socioeconomic context, the police, police culture, recruit socialisation and initial training.
I also pointed out in Chapter 1 that it is important to contextualise recruitment and initial training reform and to recognise its development in relation to political pressures. These often exist in the context of real or perceived crises for the police which skews and constrains the impact of reform. Furthermore, initial training reform has not been a simple ‘march of progress’ and it is not the case that all reforms in recruitment and initial training have been equally of merit, necessary or efficacious.

Because of the points addressed above, I argue that the social democratic understanding of the police is the most appropriate explanation for my findings. In that perspective, the police are defined, not by their monopoly of policing (this is carried out by many other organisations and institutions), nor by its functions (these are too numerous and diverse) but by its tactics as the “state’s symbolic monopolisation of legitimate force in its territory” (Reiner, 2000, p.208). The police in democratic societies, are not like other institutions. They have to resolve social conflict by acting decisively whilst carrying the ultimate sanction, to use legitimate force, but where their work is largely reviled as ‘dirty work’ (Hughes, 1961), not to be too openly acknowledged. Whilst policing has undergone significant change, it remains the case that police work largely concerns the maintenance of order. For Bittner (2005, p.161), police work consists of, “something that ought not to be happening and about which someone had better do something about now!” For Reiner (2000a), policing is inherently an activity concerned with the ordering of conflict but, whilst the police contribute to general social order (from which we all benefit) they also defend particular social orders (from which some benefit more than others). In this view, conditions of high inequality contribute to poor relationships between communities and the police but, by contrast, as Reiner (2010) contends, “In
conditions of relative social harmony, acceptance of judicious policing may be a lot
more wholehearted”.

The ultimate sources and solutions of social problems, for Reiner (2000b), lie with
the way in which resources are unequally distributed in the social structures of
societies. Whilst police culture is undoubtedly an accomplishment of human agency,
it is highly constrained by the circumstances of the wider socioeconomic
environment. As Reiner (2010 p. 136 and 86) argues, “there is some scope for
change, although this is constrained by the social and political context...the degree of
freedom facing reform strategies is undoubtedly never very great [and that]...The
culture survives because of its elective affinity with the demands of the rank and file
cop condition.” In this sense, it is a culture, like any other, that is constructed by
officers but not in circumstances of their own choosing (Reiner, 2010). Rather, the
cause of police culture is police work that is suffused with authority, danger and the
need to appear efficient (Skolnick, 1966) and so, creates its ‘core characteristics’.
Variations exist as sub-cultures of the dominant police culture (Reiner, 2000;
Waddington, 1999). As Reiner (2000, p. 85-6) argues,

“There are particular variants – subcultures – that can be discerned within the
broader police culture, generated by distinct experiences associated with
specific structural positions, or by special orientations officers bring with them
from their past biographies and histories...

In this view, what constitutes ‘good’ police work is very much a contested idea but is
defined in this way:

“The craft of effective policing is to use the background possibility of legitimate
coercion so skilfully that it never needs to be foregrounded...These skills are
not adequately recognised, rewarded or understood, largely because popular
and police preconceptions about the nature of the police task have precluded
Reiner (2010, pp.243-244) argues that, in England and Wales, after a ‘golden age’ of legitimacy, the police since the 1960s have been in a period of sustained crisis. Loftus (2009, p.21) contends that this has resulted from a society increasingly riven with conflict between communities and the police and that this has created a ‘new field of policing’. In this view, the social democracy that characterised British society until the 1960s has given way to neo-liberal democracy where the acceptance of police legitimacy has declined. In this context, the police maintain the social order of an increasingly unequal society and have been drawn into defending those who benefit most from it and are now pitted against those who benefit least.

Debates and controversies surrounding police recruitment and initial training are reflections of these circumstances which give rise to attempts to use reform to regain police legitimacy. As a result, the formal police approach to professionalisation appears defensive and its success can always be disproved by the inevitable ensuing cases of malpractice. As Reiner (2000, p. 62) argues, “Despite the merit of…developments [in recruitment and initial training] they have not prevented an erosion of public confidence in police professional standards.” The causes of the decline of legitimacy reside not in recruiting the ‘wrong’ people or providing the ‘wrong’ initial training but in the police function in liberal democracies. This places limits on the efficacy and permanence of reform and encourages reversion to familiar patterns. Reiner goes on to argue that,

“Fundamental change in this requires not just changes aimed at individual officers (for example in selection and training), nor grand policy declarations, but a reshaping of the basic character of the police role as a result of wider
social transformation of the structures of economic inequality and power” (Reiner, 2010, p. 138).

Solutions, though well-intentioned, are aimed at changing the police and so, miss the essential connections with the wider society. As Reiner (2010, p.254) argues, the police, “…cannot control, but rather are buffeted by, prevailing social currents.” This is not a variation of the ‘nothing works’ argument - It is very clear what works - change at the socioeconomic level. More equal societies have less crime and are more stable and the opposite is true of more unequal societies (Wilkinson and Pickett, 2010; 2015). In such circumstances, the police may not behave much better but their symbolism is stronger (Weinberger, 1995). This and the myriad more effective policing institutions that exist in more equal societies, curb crime and disorder in longer-lasting and more effective ways (Reiner, 2010; 2012). The current problems of the police originate ultimately in the police function in what has become an increasingly conflicted neo-liberal democracy. No amount of tinkering with the recruitment criteria or how recruits are initially trained will solve those problems. It can, however, knock off some of their rougher edges.

What should initial training look like?

Given the reservations about current and past developments and the limits of reforms, it is important to ask, what should initial training look like? What follows are speculative thoughts and I understand that current legal, labour market and fiscal restrictions, might limit the capacity to put them into effect.

In general, any changes to initial training should be closely linked to other changes in the police and would be much more uniform in impact within a national but more democratic police policy context. The current environment appears overly market-
driven (on both the police and university’s parts), organisationally complex and heterogeneous. It is, therefore, not clear what priorities are really driving change. Firstly, recruitment strategies might be directed at knowing the student officer better through supportive but realistic relationships with applicants, especially current police staff, Special Constables and Police Community Support Officers. They might also be directed at disseminating information to communities about the ‘real’ working environment of the police. These things might allow a less problematic period of anticipatory socialisation. Secondly, it is important not to attest the student officer upon appointment. This removes the temptation to use them as operational resources and tones down the desperation that student officers may have, to do police work too soon. In this respect, student officers could assume a rank below Constable, as is practiced in Australia. Thirdly, in terms of its structure it should integrate, much more closely, learning in the operational and non-operational environment. This would be better facilitated by being largely work based, not university based, but with a close relationship between university staff and police training staff. The latter should have far more extensive training, be able to continue their own operational police work. This might facilitate a greater status for this role as a career direction. Fourthly, assessment should be based on real police case studies where requirements exists to link learning in the operational environment with available and already studied research in policing. In this respect, there might be a formal division between operational training and police research based learning, along the lines of the medical model. Universities can be adept at attracting and retaining non-traditional students that reflect a range of demographics. Fifthly, there should be a much longer period where student officers observe police work in situ.
before they are allowed to practice it themselves and a much longer period of observation of the student officer’s own work-placed practices. This might embed good practice more solidly and make it less likely to degrade. Lastly, response police work, that remains the bedrock of the occupation, should have much greater status and career development opportunities to avoid the clamour to leave it at the earliest opportunity, in pursuit of higher status police work.

Further research

With regard to occupational culture, quantitative research on national sample populations of student officers would be valuable in understanding the current patterns of attitudinal change. This might throw some light on the question of whether the development of occupational culture during recruit socialisation has changed. This has not been carried out in the British police since Fielding’s research in the 1980s (Fielding, 1988) and then was on a relatively small sample of recruits in one police force. Further qualitative and ethnographic research is needed, of the kind pioneered by Van Maanen (1975) that may reveal hidden attitudinal changes during this process.

As for recruitment and initial training, future studies might concentrate on building a much more extensive knowledge of the interaction between the social origins and occupational experiences of student officers and their impact on practice. This is particularly important in relation to poorly understood workforce diversity issues such as student officer’s social class, occupational, educational and age backgrounds. The work of MacNamara (1967) provides a solid foundation on which to build.
Whilst police forces are very different from one another they are simultaneously very similar. The programme in its national form imposes certain restrictions on forces and it would be reasonable to expect that many aspects of initial training in my study of initial police training in Ashton Police are similar in other forces. It is important to develop research that allows an understanding of the commonalities and differences in initial training practices and structures. There is little known about the myriad initial training arrangements that exist across England and Wales currently (Wood and Tong, 2008; Peace, 2005; Heslop, 2013) There exists a need for further research to map and to understand these arrangements in relation to current and future reforms.

Finally, future research should map carefully the correlations between wider developments in society, the police and recruitment and initial training reforms. It may be possible then to understand better the limits of reform and to provide more realistic expectations of it.
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Appendices

Appendix 1: Research Agreement

Research Agreement

The following is an agreement concerning a research project for a PhD qualification being undertaken by Julian Constable of Anglia Ruskin University, Cambridge. The agreement sets out the parties to the agreement and the key terms and conditions by which the parties agree to work.

What is being proposed?

A longitudinal (2 yrs 6 months) research project into the IPLDP at Ashton Police. A student officer cohort will be followed from just prior to induction to immediately after the initial learning and development period. In general, the project focuses on issues of Student Officer (SO) learning and development and of occupational culture during the period prior to and immediately following completion of initial training. The exact focus of the project is contained in further documentation. It is intended that, as well as publication of the text of the PhD, further research articles will result from the project.

Parties

Constabulary: ******* Constabulary (Learning and Development)

Researcher: Julian Constable. Department of Humanities and Social Science, Anglia Ruskin University, Cambridge.
Terms and Conditions

Resource Requirements from Constabulary to Researcher

General: Access to student officer cohort for research purposes from pre-induction to post IPLDP. Access to constabulary data, information, documentation and staff involved with IPLDP.

1. Student officer cohort interviews will be completed outside of duty time to facilitate a more informal environment and to make reasonable distance between the researcher and the constabulary. It is intended that the SOs that agree to the interview element of the research will not be known of by the Constabulary.

2. Interviews with other parties such as PDOs, trainers, senior officers and others will be by arrangement and take approximately 2 hours per person per year. (2 x 1 hr interview). Some of this time will be used to gather wider secondary data such as key documents (by negotiation).

3. Observational access to training environment. (Examples include access to classroom, role-plays, meetings, community placement and BCU activity). These will be completed on an on-going and needs related basis by negotiation with all parties concerned.

4. Data access to secondary data from constabulary records.

Right to Withdraw

Both parties will have the right to withdraw from the agreement. Should this become a possibility both parties should seek to provide adequate notice and to explain the circumstances that may have led to that situation.

Anonymity and Confidentiality

The name of the constabulary and the personal details of all individuals will be anonymised, as far as is practicable, in all publications.

Primary data and all draft and final copies of written materials will be held securely by the researcher according to the professional and ethical policies of the university.

It is of paramount importance that student officers are assured that no connection is made between the information gained from the research process and the officers’ progress through the IPLDP. To this end a letter to each SO (requesting the SOs’ voluntary participation in the research) that explains the constabulary’s and the
researcher’s aims and practices in relation to the project will be drafted and signed by both parties.

This letter will also explain the process of anonymising information, the process of reviewing written material, the procedures used for assuring confidentiality and for following professional ethical standards.

**Research Ethics**

The researcher has completed the research ethics process in place at Anglia Ruskin University. The successful completion of this process means that the university is satisfied that appropriate ethical issues have been and will continue to be followed. Anglia Ruskin University’s research ethics policies can be accessed at this URL: [http://web.anglia.ac.uk/anet/rdcs/research/support/documents_forms/Research%20Student%20Handbook%202008%20and%202009%20Section%205.pdf](http://web.anglia.ac.uk/anet/rdcs/research/support/documents_forms/Research%20Student%20Handbook%202008%20and%202009%20Section%205.pdf)

In addition, the researcher also agrees to carry out work with the constabulary according to guidelines issued by the British Sociological Association which can be accessed at this URL: [http://www.britsoc.co.uk/equality/Statement+Ethical+Practice.htm](http://www.britsoc.co.uk/equality/Statement+Ethical+Practice.htm)

**Constabulary Access to Researcher Generated Materials.**

The constabulary will have the option to request access to material written for the public domain in order to check factual accuracy and to contribute to an effective anonymisation process in relation to the constabulary’s interests.

It is unlikely that written outputs will be published until after the research period. SOs will have completed IPLDP and immediate operational issues in relation to the research will have been resolved.

**Researcher Obligation to the Constabulary**

1. Regular (x4) **feedback and development meetings** on issues raised by the research to include **cascade** of academic/police research on issues affecting the IPLDP.

2. Academic contribution to understand and address issues affecting IPLDP.

3. Identification and facilitation of **'noteworthy practice'** with other constabularies and bodies involved in IPLDP.

4. Provide evidence of on-going **relationship with HE**.

5. To assure secure storage of data.
6. To assure safe, ethical and professional practices of working with all concerned within the constabulary.

Name of Researcher……………………….Signed…………………….Date

Name of Constabulary……………………….Signed…………………….Date
Appendix 2: Participant Information

Continuity and change in Initial Police Training

Julian Constable (MA, PGCE)
Senior Lecturer
Department of Humanities and Social Sciences
Anglia Ruskin University

1. The Project

• Starting in 2005 the Police Service in England and Wales developed a new initial training programme called the Initial Police Learning and Development Programme (IPLDP). This was in response to the report by Her Majesty’s Inspectorate of Constabularies (HMIC) entitled Training Matters which argued that the then training course for probationer police officers was unsuitable for purpose. This project will attempt to understand the nature of the impact of the new IPLDP on a range of issues related to both operational policing and wider debates in policing.

• This research has significant links to the curriculum for public services and criminology and to the priorities of Anglia Ruskin University in relation to employer engagement and successful publication of high quality research.

• It is thought that the current changes to initial training mark a new era. It therefore offers a unique time in which to understand the development of occupational cultural values which have been identified in previous academic research as so fundamental to police work. This study will mark a contemporary supplement to past literature.

• By taking a longitudinal approach it is hoped that the complexity and variety of police initial training will be understood within a changing police learning and development context.

• It is also noted that constabularies across the country are expressing a desire to develop as ‘learning organisations’ and to make good use of academic research relevant to policing.

• Although the intended outcomes are primarily academic, the project will generate valuable information that may contribute to changes in police service policy and practice.
2. The Researcher

- I am a senior lecturer at Anglia Ruskin University teaching on Public Services, Sociology and Criminology pathways whilst also studying for a PhD. The latter forms the detail of this project.
- I have undertaken semi-structured interviews for an action-research project most recently at Anglia Ruskin University concerning the restructuring of the senior management tier.
- I have undertaken semi-structured interviews of senior managers and senior scientists for ESRC funded project for Science and Technology Studies Unit (now based at York University).
- I have undertaken literature reviews for the above projects surrounding the United Kingdom Higher Education context and business/university coalitions.
- I have worked as a Constable in ……
- I have worked as a lecturer in Further and Higher Education, latterly as a teacher trainer for the Post-Graduate Certificate of Education (FE) where a number of trainees were seconded from a neighbouring police force.

The Aims of the Research

- To complete a longitudinal qualitative study on the application and experience of initial training in a single constabulary.
- To develop an understanding of the contemporary initial training phase as it is experienced by student officers, staff beyond student officers and those involved in the wider policing policy and academic context.
- In the light of the study, to contribute to academic and policy discussion of learning and development issues within initial police training.

The Design of the Study:

- A ‘triangulated’ and multi-method approach will be followed to capture a range of practices and views.
• The project will focus on an in-depth, longitudinal case study of one police force.
• Interviews will take place with the selected student officer cohort on a developmental basis each year or at appropriate stages in the data gathering phases.
• Observations of individual Student Officers will take place in the operational environment during appropriate phases of the Programme.
• A cohort will be followed for the purposes of data gathering for the duration of initial training (2 years).

Data Gathering:

• Secondary data such as official and constabulary statistics concerning matters connected with initial training will be collected. This is likely to originate from the Home Office and other public bodies such as the National Police Improvement Agency (NPIA) and the Association of Police Authorities (APA).
• Semi-structured interviews with selected student officers, their training officers and with other ranks in Ashton Police. A group of student officers will be interviewed at intervals during their initial training and early post-training career.
• Observational access will be negotiated to processes and practices in relation to IPLDP at a number of different levels. These will involve real police learning and development contexts such as role-play activities, classroom activities and community placements.

Issues Addressed:

• Police learning and development practices and policies
• Police occupational culture
• Police and community relationships
• Police research
• Police National Occupational Standards
• Developments in training after the introduction of the new Initial Police Learning and Development Programme
Issues of Confidentiality and Risk

- Ensure informed consent through dissemination of participation information and consent materials.
- Initial meeting with key police personnel to clarify aims of the project and researcher role.
- It is expected that access to the whole population involved in initial training will necessitate a reliance on gate-keepers at a senior level in the first instance. After that, requests to participate will be by face-to-face meetings with Student Officers and others. Individual interviewees will not be known to senior and supervisory officers.
- Allow participants to see transcript of interviews and notes of observations to ensure accuracy and appropriateness of recorded data.
- It is intended that issues of anonymity within the organisation and its limits should be discussed with respondents and gate-keepers.
- Clarify researcher role as an academic and policy orientated one which would resist any potential role as an advisor, consultant or participant.
- Secure storage of information.
- Anonymise names, places and dates. Ensure disassociation of data from individual identity.
- Undertake risk assessment concerning research tasks.
- Ensure that participants are able to give informed consent.
- Information to include key issues of freedom to participate and to withdraw.
- Key information will be disseminated to participants regarding the nature of the interview and the practices to be undertaken with regard to the collection, storage and destruction of data.
- It will be necessary also to clarify intended dissemination points and schedule of feedback.
Appendix 3: The Research Populations

Whole Cohort statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Division</th>
<th>AGE</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Highest Educational Qualification</th>
<th>Prior Police Experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Whole Student Officer Cohort Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average age:</th>
<th>26.85</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age range:</td>
<td>Oldest 47; Youngest 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number:</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divisional split:</td>
<td>Division 1 = 7; Division 2 = 6; Division 3 = 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender:</td>
<td>8 female (40%) 12 male (60%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Qualification Framework level:</td>
<td>Level 3 = 17; Level 5 - 1: Level 6 = 1; Level 7 = 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity:</td>
<td>White = 20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Training staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trainers</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Teaching, learning and assessment during Learning Modules phase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police Development Unit Managers</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Management of Police Development Unit at Divisional level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial Police Learning and Development Programme Quality Assurance Manager</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Management of whole programme from Headquarters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police Development Officers</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Supervise Student Officer completion of Police Action Checklist</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Research Participants Group individual biographies

**Student officer 1.**

Student Officer 1 is male and white and was 21 at the start of the programme. He was posted to Division 3 and had lived and worked in that area all of his life, hitherto. He was a quiet, softly spoken and very focussed person, not given to demonstrativeness, and had a well-developed sense of what he wanted from his

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Researcher assigned no (anonymised)</th>
<th>AGE</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Highest Educational Qualification</th>
<th>Prior police</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
career progress in the police. He had taken and passed A Levels and so his highest qualification was at Level 3 in the National Qualification Framework. His step-father was a professional engineer and his mother worked in administration. He had been a cadet in one of the armed services from a young age and had wanted a career in one of the uniformed services since childhood. Student Officer 1 thought that his decision to join the police (or another uniformed service) occurred quite early on in life. The police seemed the ideal, stable occupation to meet his criteria for work. He said,

“I joined the cadets at the age of 13 and before that I had been in the scouts as I’d always quite liked the idea of a uniform... By about the age of 15 or 16 I was quite convinced that a uniform service would be good for me. I’d still not decided whether I wanted to go to Uni at that stage but I was quite sold on the idea (of working in the police service) as such” (SO.1).

Whilst there was a good deal of family experience of higher education, he had not wanted to go to university after completing A levels at a local college. This related to the process of sensitisation that took place to educational and occupational status prior to joining the police, which was particularly heightened in a very competitive social and educational environment. The ‘clever’ went to one college (that had a ‘hot house’ reputation) and the ‘less clever’, to the other. He became very aware of the educational and occupational hierarchy that existed in the area in which he lived. Student Officer 1 did not have a good experience of this stage of his education because of what he saw as, the pressurised and ‘snobbish’ approach taken by the college to the educational and occupational development of its students.

“I didn’t get along with them (the college itself) very well... I didn’t get along with their mentality so I didn’t come out with great marks from there. I didn’t go to Uni, as I wasn’t sure what I wanted to do...At that point I was still reeling a bit from (his college experience). I wasn’t quite sure what I was going to do. I
started working at a pub in our village...‘til I decided what I was going to do” (SO.1).

The police as an occupational choice would certainly have taken second-place at the former college, compared to higher professional occupations requiring extensive, high achieving, prior academic and vocational training, such as medicine and the law. Student Officer 1 worked in stop-gap jobs in service related work. He had talked to a friend’s father who was in the police about how officers were treated and asked him if it was it a ‘good’ career, which had reassured him of its stability. He was keen that he was entering an occupation that would provide promotion and professional development opportunities and that it would be well organised and proactive in encouraging that amongst its officers. He applied to the police locally so that he could remain living and working in the area.
Student Officer 2.

Student Officer 2 was 22 at the time of the study and is male and white. He was posted to Division 3 and had lived and worked in that area all of his life, hitherto. He was a slightly built young man, quiet and a little diffident in the way he spoke. He completed a two year degree in a police related subject and so, his highest educational achievement was at Level 5 in the National Qualifications Framework. He lived in a small village some miles from the main city located in the southern part of the county and experienced life as somewhat non-descript. In his own words, “there’s nothing there…Nothing to make it stand out”. Family life was supportive and stable and he felt that his parents and sister were always ‘there’ for him. His parents had both always had paid work but it was his father whom he had seen as the principle figure in that respect.

Student Officer 2 expressed the idea that his parents had been the ones that guided and supported in him in making the decision to join the police. He said that,

“I never had a set idea…I know a lot of people have had a set idea of what they want to do… I never had a set idea and they’ve (parents) always been trying…not guide me but trying to push me to doing something and they’ve always said that this could be, you know, joining the police could be a good thing for me to do. I’ve always thought about it and they were the ones that have been trying to get me in and push me to go for it in the end” (SO.2).

He attended the local state primary school but came to the city to attend secondary school, further education (A levels) and after that to attend university to complete a 2 year Degree. When he had first enquired about joining the police he had been told
that he needed some ‘life experience’. He summed up his approach to joining the police in this way;

“I’ve always had the idea of this, it was just a question of working out in my head where to go, how to do it, how best to achieve it and how to get there really...I think it was to do with my age. I’m now a little bit older. I don’t think joining that bit earlier was going to give me the experience of the world” (SO.2).

He took a year out of education, working in sport retail and returned to higher education but it appeared to be a ‘stop-gap’ for him that he took up partly because he was too young to join the police. He applied to join the police during the second year of his higher education course and so did not continue another year in higher education to achieve a Bachelor of Arts degree. He joined the Special Constabulary whilst at university, which he knew would be considered as evidence of appropriate occupational experience that he had been told was needed from younger would-be applicants. At that point, he had passed the Assessment Centre part of the recruitment process but did not know how long it would be before he was offered a training place. He decided not to jeopardise that offer by continuing in higher education and worked part-time locally.

*Student Officer 3.*

Student Officer 3 is male and white and was 27 at the point he joined the police. He was posted to Division 3 where had had lived and worked all his life, hitherto. At times, he spoke fluently, eloquently and in a complex way. He often appeared to be
thinking deeply about initial training and police work. His father was an accountant and his mother was a retail worker. His sister, who was a number of years older than him, worked at a university elsewhere in England and had studies social sciences as an undergraduate. He had what he thought was a naïve childhood desire to be a police officer but became aware of the ‘real’ opportunity to join the police at 17 when police officers visited his college and he had the opportunity to complete some of the relevant forms that constituted part of the application process at the time. He expressed a desire to make a personal contribution to the ‘crime problem’ that was seen as something separate from and contrary to ‘helping people.’ He said,

“I do want to help people [I sensed a ‘but’ contained in the pause that was evident here]…I don’t like crime generally. I’ve seen it in several different capacities. I’ve been the victim of it…I genuinely want to do a varied job, something that is very eventful. I like adrenaline rushes and this was a good way of getting adrenaline rushes through a job.............Having run a bar, I see what can happen”.

Student officer 3 had strong familial, personal and social ties to the village he grew up in but also to the city that dominated the wider socioeconomic context. Student Officer 3 said that he had, “...hung around in a village as a young teenager, as a lot of them do, and I could easily have gone the other way but I realised I didn’t want to” (SO.3). He took his A Level exams at one of two of the large, city based Sixth Form Colleges and in his own words, “...found the freedom of independent education in town a little too easy to go to my head”. He had chosen that college (rather than the other one, referred to in student officer 1’s biography) because his friends had chosen it but was aware that it was seen to be a less prestigious organisation but
that the college he chose would suit his more liberal approach to life and education. Indeed, he decided not to go university after completing A Levels, choosing instead to work in a variety of jobs (one a management training scheme) and then decided to apply for work in the police and was successful in applying for a post as a Police Community Support Officer. He was aware that this post did not occupy a high status in the police organisation and that what he really wanted to do was to become a police officer. As he said, “All it did was make me realise how much I’d like to be a police officer but they weren’t recruiting at that time…” (SO.3). As Ashton Police were not recruiting police officers at that time, he decided that the best thing to do for his future application to the police would be to take a higher education qualification. He completed a Bachelor of Arts degree in a legal subject and so had achieved his highest qualification at Level 6 in the National Qualifications Framework when he joined the police. After that he worked and then managed a local bar. He applied to the police as soon as it was possible and in the meantime continued with that job. He thought that this would be career choice for life. Student Officer 3 took what he thought was a realistic and pragmatic view of higher education and its role in the police occupational environment. He recognised that his degree would not guarantee any particular position in the police organisation but that it may have helped in promotion opportunities. Nevertheless, he was aware that his university education was of no ‘special’ and ‘necessary’ advantage in the police work context. He said,

“I enrolled at university to do a law degree…with the intention of using it to get back into the police force and work my way up the ladder. Not necessarily as fast as possible but to arm myself with as much tools as I could have” (SO.3).
Student Officer 4 is female, white and was 26 at the start of the programme. She was posted to Division 3 and had lived and worked in Division 1 for the greater part of her life, hitherto. She was an engaging person and very able to express what were complex thoughts about her progress and experiences, although she often preferred to observe first and act later. Her highest educational qualification was at Level 3 in the National Qualification Framework. She was one of only two Student officers that had no prior police experience. She came from a large family and was the eldest of 7 siblings and her parents had divorced. She had spent some period of her secondary education at drama school. She went from there to college to study performing arts and tried university for one term before deciding that it was not something she wanted to continue. It had been difficult for her family to support her at drama college and she had lost a lot of the motivation she had had for a drama career. After this, she had travelled around the world for some time and had returned to her home town, married and had a young son. She did a number of temporary jobs that had not been satisfying, before applying to the police, which she said she had always respected as a “really good job”, although she did describe the application process as a rather serendipitous activity but it ignited what she felt had been a long-standing but latent respect and admiration for the police role.
Student Officer 4 saw the organisation as something that provided secure and varied employment that would sustain interest for some time to come. It was seen as a job with many varied roles. She articulated this well when she said,

“I knew…that there were lots of avenues in the police in terms of it’s not just being reactive…like family liaison and all the different avenues…I’m keeping an open mind. I would like to do something about it and I would have a genuine interest but I wouldn’t want to limit myself to that coz I know there’s so much out there” (SO.4).

She had the desire to join the police to be of help to others although, by the time of the first interview, it was tinged with a degree of reticence. Student Officer 4 rather hesitantly said that she decided to apply to the police because she wanted to ‘help people.’ She said,

“It’s the massive cliché...something I’d always thought I wanted to do…I felt that being part of the police, it was helping people, it was varied work, it was challenging, you were doing something good for the community and it seemed to be quite well paid. So, it seemed like a really interesting job to do…I always, even up until we joined…If I saw a police person I’d be… really interested, really respectful and kind of really appreciative of what they do and the knowledge they have, even though I didn’t know too much about it” (SO.4).

Whilst she expressed an altruistic motive for joining the police, it was accompanied by an idea that it would be superseded by a ‘hardening-up’ to the realities of police work. She was aware of the view that some of her student officer peers thought that some people do not deserve help and need to be ‘hindered’, rather than helped. She did recognise the complex, dual function role of the police. She thought it could be ‘exciting’ (fast response to incidents) but also ‘tragic’ in that it may be necessary to
carry out sensitive practices, like informing someone of the death of a relative. She embraced the juxtaposition of these two aspects of the police role. When asked why she had decided to join the police, she commented that,

“Different aspects, I guess. The excitement of the role but also the more tragic side of the role... That's not something somebody, obviously, would really want to deal with but I think it was my realisation, from a youngish age that it wasn't just all blue lights and racing around. There's also the human side to it as well and you could be going round to someone's house and telling them that whoever has just died and that sort of thing” (SO.4).

She did also express a ‘law enforcement’ orientation or motivation for joining the police, in relation to legal offences (not always criminal ones) that she particularly disliked. She said that,

“I've always had a personal interest in cars and vehicles and things on the road really. That's a real kind of thing of mine and you know when I see people driving really unsafely, it's one of the things that really winds me up” (SO.4).

Student Officer 6.

Student Officer 6 is male and white and was 21 at the time of the programme. He was posted to Division 1 and had lived and worked in the major city there for the greatest part of his life, hitherto. He was a quietly spoken person but had an intense and zealous reaction to elements of initial training and police work. He had developed a fascination with the police as a young person and would be impressed by the “blue lights” but also fascinated to know where police officers were going that
was so important. He had spent periods of time, as a child, being largely cared for by his grandparents and felt that their values that centred upon respect for others, smartness in appearance, orderliness and especially respect for older people had been formed in interaction with them. He also felt that both he and his brother, who had become a military medic at the same time as he had joined the police, had similar values of protecting the vulnerable, because of this upbringing. His parents had divorced when he was very young and he had no contact at all with his father since then. His mother remarried and he considered his step-father to be his bona fide father.

He had been to a local primary school and secondary school, achieved well and completed ‘A’ Levels at the same school in its Sixth Form. He went on to university after getting better than expected ‘A’ Level results but left shortly after starting. He thought he had no strong motivation to do a degree but conversely felt very motivated to join the police and he joined the Special Constabulary as soon as he returned home. Whilst his educational record was, in his view, ‘good’ he felt that he had not done as well as he could have. He said, “I kind of thought that they (teaching staff) thought that the potential was there but I drifted off quite a bit”. He thought of himself as a law-abiding, reliable person, wanted others to think of him in the same way and would stand up for those that he felt were poorly treated. He also considered himself to be competitive and never wanted to be second-best, at things he thought to be important. He was sensitive to differences of opinion of the value of higher education and of the status hierarchies that accompany occupations. He
asserted that, once the idea of a career in the police had formed, it seemed superfluous to study further. He commented that,

“I decided to go to University. Did English Literature there but I didn’t like it at all. I left within two months. Just didn’t really have much desire to do it really. It seemed just like, to me it was just wasting three years. For me, personally, because I was, from a very early age eager to get into the police force” (SO.6).

The anti-academic orientation and the sensitivity to the perceived snobbery associated with higher education was evident as he developed a critical view of what he saw as the accepted route into a ‘good’ job.

“…it was seen as the kind of thing you had to do. You went to ‘A’ levels and you went to uni and you got your degree coz that’s how you got a decent job and now that doesn’t matter… I think it’s maybe changed now because of the recession but it was seen as the kind of thing you had to do” (SO.6).

He was keen to prove that way of finding a route to employment as erroneous (to his mother but also to his friends that were still at university and were expecting him to ‘drop out’ and end up in a low-paid, low-skilled job) and felt that he needed to do so because he had not been able to complete his own university education. He felt vindicated in his view, citing some friends who had graduated but couldn’t find jobs at that level. Indeed, he thought he had been labouring under a false impression that the police would look more favourably upon him as a graduate and was hoping to graduate and go on to an accelerated promotion scheme in the police. He said,

“I thought that if they see me with a degree they’ll want to put me on some sort of ‘fast-track’ programme. But at that stage I’d had no real input by the police. So, I didn’t really know that much about it” (SO.6).
When he left university his mother was not pleased, since she had been planning a graduate career for him and despite her own late entry to undergraduate study, felt strongly that he should have stayed at university to give him the best opportunity in his future working life. He had a period of work locally that was just to fulfil the criteria the force had made him aware of. He said,

“...and they (the force) made it quite aware that I had to get involved in more customer service based roles so I went to work... selling insurance, dealing with customer service. I then went from there on to being a security guard and then finally...insurance based, dealing with more of the fraudulent side of it...I really...felt like it was just leading up to the police really...I think it was pretty clear in my attitude that it was just a 'stop-gap'. I'd do work and then I'd be a Special on the side. So, I'd work 9-5 on a Saturday and be on duty at...7 o'clock in the evening until 4 in the morning the same day. So, you know, that caused strain and stuff but it’s what I wanted to do” (SO.6).

Student Officer 6 had created, in his thinking, a hierarchy of status amongst occupations that put the job of police officer high on that ranking system. He said about his reasons for wanting to join the police that,

“I think it’s a mixture of things...it is good when you get to help people but it’s also...I don’t know...the presence that you have. So, if someone says, ‘What do you do for a living’...’oh, I’m a police officer’, it’s a bit you know, or ‘I work at Tesco’s’. It’s something that I can turn around and say I’ve done this, this and this, kind of thing [that have a ‘good’ status] ...like the other jobs I did all seemed a bit meaningless...to me...I got bored easily. I was always thinking about the police” (SO.6).

He had spent more than two years as a Special Constable and regarded it as a time when he finally knew he wanted to join the police as a ‘regular’. To be paid for something he would do for nothing seemed a dream come true. However, he was very uncomplimentary about his training as a Special Constable but felt fortunate to
work with a ‘regular’ officer on a ‘reactive’ Relief and got what he thought was a better experience of ‘real’ policing and not just ‘bimbling about’, as he put it, that other Specials did. The high status job in the police organisation was, for him, the police officer role and nothing else.

Student Officer 7

Student Officer 7 is female and was the oldest officer in the cohort, at 47. She was posted to Division 1, where she had lived, in that area’s major city, for some time. She had also lived and worked in other parts of Britain. She had considerable experience in a professional capacity, working in the Health Service, had been married and had one of her adult children living at home. She felt that her own personal history had inculcated in her an approach that the force wanted to see. She had been the victim of domestic violence herself and felt strongly that its policing had not been good in Britain in the past and she was keen to adopt a better approach. She had also experienced and was still experiencing, considerable family related difficulties from the start of the programme and showed remarkable resilience to persist with it, despite those difficulties. She appeared to have a stoical and phlegmatic approach to life, underpinned by the knowledge that she had endured difficult times before and survived. The police, she regarded as more community and customer-focussed than the Health Service, where she had worked previously, a view that had been fostered during her conversations with police officers before joining. She had also worked as a Police Community Support Officer but felt that this
was a limited role and did not have the same status or power as police officer. She had had some success in that role, though, that had sown a seed of interest in a career as a police officer. When she applied for a post as a police officer it was at the instigation of a colleague. She said,

“ I'd never, ever even thought about it or even wanted it but because I want to specialise in domestic violence and those sorts of issues, I can't do that as a Police Community Support Officer and I was probably getting a little bit bored… if I hadn't've tried I'd have always regretted it. I'd have always thought well maybe…” (SO.7.

She thought that she had only joined Ashton Police to work in a domestic violence related police role. Other Student officers had aspirations for specialist police work but she had a more singular goal in mind.

Student Officer 8

Student Officer 8 is male, white and was 20 at the time the programme started. He lived with his mother who was divorced. He had not had contact with his father since he was a young child. He was, at times, quite voluble and excitable in character but was very engaging and enthusiastic. As a young man, he clearly had nervous and physical ‘energy to burn’. He was brought up in what he saw as a ‘respectable’ family where entry to the police occupation was to be celebrated as an achievement and a consolidation of his view that the police is an occupation of good status. He felt the pressure to succeed “succeed” occupationally. He had been attracted to the police by, “the cars, the blue lights and the uniform from a young age” but at 14 realised
that this was the job that he would aim for when he had left education. For Student Officer 8, the generic value system represented by the religion, that formed a large feature of the extended family’s life, was part of the source of his values which were held in contra-distinction to the values he thought were held by others in the community. He said,

“I think it helped to bring me up a bit better than what some other people have been brought up with cos I’ve always had that religious side that you have to go to church. Like, it’s a routine, isn’t it? You’d go every Sunday whether or not your friends are around…So, that was a bit of discipline installed in me…from primary school. We had a chapel in the school. So, it was installed in there…Be good to your neighbour. Treat people like you want to be treated” (SO8).

He expressed a desire to join the police for a job that was secure and had good long-term pension benefits. He thought that this value had been particularly encouraged by his grandfather and said that,

“My family has always pushed me to aim for a decent career or one with a pension anyway. So, I’ve always aimed myself to get into a job that’s worthwhile…My Grandad’s always been that leading role. He’s always put me in the forefront of looking at how to spend, how to like save your money. How to get a house…He’s always been the one, like the financial side of it” (SO8).

He also described his choice of the police in relation to those he went to school with and had a strong sense of comparative achievement.

“…I’d rather have a career where I could actually progress in life rather than sit on my bum doing nothing like a lot of my old friends from school did” (SO.8).
Student Officer 8 found the academic study element of ‘A’ levels very difficult and changed course to a pre-vocational one that he knew would give him a qualification at the level required by the force. He had developed a negative view of the ‘A’ level style classroom environment but felt that his college course suited him better, in part, because it was not academic. He had enjoyed that aspect of it and had come to prioritise the non-academic over the ‘academic’ and considered that classroom based study had little to offer for him.

Student Officer 8 became sensitive to the hierarchy of work within the police organisation as a Special Constable, when a Relief regular Sergeant had made it very clear that he did not like Special Constables. The Student Officer did get what he thought was some good experience of ‘real’ policing when that Sergeant moved on and he was able to get some ‘shifts’ accompanying the ‘regular’ officers. Working with such officers had a much higher status in his view. He became convinced of his suitability for the police in contra-distinction to others he observed that were working as ‘Specials’. He felt that many could not deal well with confrontation and could not communicate well with members of the public. He felt able to handle the kind of behaviour he had experienced as a ‘Special’. He said that,

“This job is confrontation. I mean, that is it…People’s barrage of abuse. If you can’t put up with one little bit of abuse, then the abuse on shift is not gonna be good for ya”.

This Student Officer’s service as a Special Constable served to reinforce his desire to become a ‘regular’ police officer and to reinforce his view that the police officer
occupied an elevated status in the wider police occupational context. Of the experience of training to become a Special Constable, this Student Officer remarked that,

“Pretty much anybody could pass it. Because you're gonna be working voluntarily, It’s made that if anyone wants to work voluntarily, we're not gonna turn them away. You get three opportunities anyway. If you fail once, you get two more tests to give it a go. It’s not hard at all”.

He had also completed some service as a member of ‘police staff’, which he indicated had been to build up experience that might improve his chances of recruitment as a police officer.

**Student Officer 10**

Student Officer 10 is male, white and was 35 years old at the time the programme started. He was married with two young children and his wife was also a police officer. He was a talkative (some might say, verbose), helpful and charming person and became an avuncular figure amongst his peers but harboured some insecurities, especially with regard to education, that emerged during initial training. In his own assessment, he always wanted to help others, which was one of the reasons he joined Ashton Police. He had wanted to be a police officer as a child and watched police soap operas that he felt were real (particularly, *The Bill*), especially in relation to the action (lights, sirens and chases and that this was ‘doing good’ but beyond that he found it a little difficult to articulate exactly why he wanted to join the police. When pressed on the subject he connected his early desire to join with a school
project on Robert Peel and early policing. He felt very serious and a little solemn about that project and thought (in retrospect) that it taught him that crime was happening in the past, is still happening, which is a bad thing and so, we need the police to try and stop it. He remembered the praise he received from his teacher which reinforced the solemnity with which he came to understand crime and the police.

By his own assessment he “was quite pleased” with his achievement at school (although not so, in the view of his parents) but he was not able to do ‘A’ levels or to go to university, which he did have aspirations to do at one point. He repeated some GCSEs, in part with the aim of pursuing another ambition to become a physical education teacher but this also did not ‘bear fruit’, for similar attainment reasons. He had been a police cadet during some of his secondary education and there, made long-lasting police related friends. He left education and worked in retail for 6-7 years where he discovered he had good communication skills that were well thought of by customers and employers. At the same time, he joined the force’s Special Constabulary, where he met his wife and they subsequently applied to join the police as ‘regulars’, together. She was accepted he was rejected and he said,

“It knocked my confidence…Ok, I’m doing it for free as a Special Constable but they don’t want to pay me to do it. Why not? I could never get it out of my mind…I was at the point, ready to hand back my warrant card…”

Despite this, his parents and wife encouraged him to continue but despite his reluctance he got back into the ‘Specials’ work, which he did for the ensuing 15
years. At that point he gave up the retail work to take up a job in the force Control Room and Call Centre as a member of police staff, partly to accommodate family life better. The process of application was quick as an internal one but he kept it secret from his colleagues. He was very conscious that he might still not ‘get in’ and would have seen himself as a failure at that point. This took 12 months but there were many already accepted that the force had to offer training places too as well and he had to wait some time for a training place during which he reduced his Specials work to avoid complaints and injuries, so as to provide maximum chance of success and minimum chance of failure.

Student Officer 10 had many friends and quite a few family members in Ashton Police. Indeed, the family childcare arrangements worked using collective family resources (his sister and brother-in-law). He was posted to the city in Division 2 where he had lived all his life.

Student Officer 11

Student Officer 11 is female and was 23 at the start of the programme. Her father worked in a skilled manual occupation and her mother in retail work. She is the youngest of three sisters and had lived in the county and the town, to which she was posted, all her life. She was a very pleasant and engaging person who thought quite carefully about and reacted sensitively to training and police work. After secondary schooling (where in her own words she had achieved at an average level) she had
nearly completed a period of A Level study but because of a family tragedy had not been able to continue. She mocked her own desire as a young child to be a ‘police lady’ (as she put it) but never thought she had the confidence to do it. She was attracted by the idea of ‘helping people’ and of getting to know other people’s affairs. After the family difficulty she felt more aware of the passage of time and a little more emboldened to try to join the police. After a number of years working in the travel industry she had satisfied a desire to travel and then applied herself seriously to applying to the police. Because the force were not recruiting, she thought seriously about joining other forces. When she was able to apply to this force, she then went through the application processes in a somewhat hesitant way, taking each one as it came and being a little surprised (as were family and friends) that, as she passed each one, joining was becoming a reality. Her parents were “super-proud” attending the Attestation ceremony and telling people that their daughter was a police officer, although she felt a need to dampen their enthusiasm. “Not everyone needs to know!” she said.

*Student Officer 12*

Student Officer 12 is female and was 35 years old at the start of the programme. She had completed a degree in English Literature and an MSc in computer science and had worked as a computer programmer in a number of companies. She was a very engaging, forthright talker and knew her own mind, usually. For her, life was moving on and she did not take kindly to impediments to her goal of becoming a police
officer. She had moved from another part of England to London to study but had come to the city to which she was posted to complete her undergraduate and postgraduate degrees. She had been to a Roman Catholic school until 18 and had been interested in theology and then philosophy but until she was 32 had “zero interest” (as she put it) in a uniformed public service. Her boredom with her current job had led to idly reading police internet blogs which she had found fascinating. The police “job” appeared to be “awful” but excitingly and challengingy so. It appeared to be the solution to her dissatisfactions. She said,

“I mean you read some of the policing blogs and some of the stuff is horrendous but I thought that sounds interesting and then they were recruiting for Special Constables…So, I thought I'll try being a Special, see what it's like. So, I got in as a Special and I loved it because I was lucky enough to go out…Special Constables are only meant to work…with other Special Constables, they're meant to be a separate resource. Kind of like, part of NPT. But NPT was boring and not very exciting and I was lucky enough to get to go out with reactive officers very regularly…and I loved it. It was the best thing I'd done and I suddenly found what I thought I'd find when I was 18 or 19 and would just turn up and I suddenly found what I wanted to do. So, they opened up recruitment and I went “right” and I applied.”

She completed a considerable number of hours as a Special Constable but considered some of the activities a little tedious and the problems encountered a little trivial and immutable. She had been able to do a good deal of ‘reactive’ policing, which she had engineered for herself but had also been ‘fortunate’ to be in the right place for. She then shoe-horned herself onto a ‘reactive’ relief, much to the annoyance of her Special Constabulary Inspector. She said, “I wanted to go and play police officers and so…by basically misbehaving myself, that’s how I did it” (SO.12).
She also expressed the idea that her parents had been important in her career choice but in order to gain some stability that had been absent in her own family life. She rather plaintively said that,

“My mother was a bad role model. My father was a bad role model. When I saw this officer (a regular with whom she had been able to work, as a Special Constable) I thought, I want that…your moral certitude” (SO.8).

Her application went perfectly until she was offered a training place that conflicted with a carefully planned and extensive travel holiday. She had thought that she would be moved onto the next available place but said that, “You’ve probably had other people tell you how dreadful their experiences of getting in through occupational health and HR was and mine was pretty shocking” (SO.12). This centred on a disputed medical condition and she suspected that the force saw an opportunity to get an older candidate out in favour of younger ones. She was extremely suspicious of their motives that was further exacerbated when the force tried to move her intake start further and further back. She said that she became absolutely furious with Human Resources and her case had been referred to more senior staff but that after what seemed a massive trauma, she eventually got a start date for the training programme. She expressed her opinion of this process well.

“Everybody on my intake that I’ve talked to has got a HR or Occupational Health horror story and it’s shocking because people who want to join the police force are very driven people…because you go through so much. I mean, just getting your hands on an application form is like a golden ticket for the chocolate factory isn’t it?... they had been telling (another applicant) all about my trials and tribulations to get in, which is shocking. You know, “oh, there’s this woman who’s trying to get in but if she doesn’t get in you can have
“her place.” That’s awful. I mean, absolutely dreadful but I was lucky in that I’d been a Special and I knew that the HR department was not reflective of the job. You know, they were civilian police staff and I wasn’t applying to be civilian police staff. I was applying to be a police officer and I wasn’t gonna give up so I didn’t and I got in……”

Student Officer 13

I conducted an interview with Student Officer 13 after he had resigned. He did not want to participate in interviews before then but I contacted him and we discussed his short but emotionally draining police career (for a fuller discussion of the resignation of Student Officer 13, see Chapter 9). I did though observe him as part of the whole cohort during the Induction phase. He is male, was 30 years old at the start of the programme and was married. He was a very polite and kindly spoken person but appeared very withdrawn at times and occasionally came across as a little naïve in his understanding of training and police work. His parents worked in unskilled or semi-skilled occupations and he had been to school locally and worked in and around the city to which he was posted all his life. By his own admission he hated school, had not attained well and had made a dash to get out of it when he could and so, worked in semi-skilled occupations since then. He had applied to the Army but had been unsuccessful because of a medical condition and had also been a Special Constable for a year, after which he had been applying to join as a ‘regular’ for some considerable time and on many occasions but had been unsuccessful each time. He had even applied for a post in MI5.
He had enjoyed the year he spent as a Special Constable, which he described as fun but stressful. He said,

“I was 19 and I saw more stuff than most people would ever see at that age.” Good fun. Went out on helicopter, dog section, traffic. Got to do all the good stuff, kicking doors in. Fun despite not being paid for it. Possibly more fun than a regular because it’s their livelihood...If I had the time, flexibility with job, would be back being a Special now.”

He had failed the Assessment Centre element of the application process on the many occasions he had taken it but got some advice from a police officer that he knew with experience of this part of the process. He subsequently passed but still felt that he had not done well and did not know why he had been successful on that occasion and not on the others. Moreover, he did not want to know and just wanted to pass. However, he had been aware that he had found some of the pressurised and conflicted role-plays that formed part of the Assessment Centre process, as very difficult, in part because they appeared to have no obvious resolution.

He was a very pleasant and talkative person and was aware that before he joined the police his work had been built on ‘helping’ people that meant ensuring they were content with the service received. In this respect he had been quite upset to leave his previous job as a local bus driver.
Appendix 4: Interview Schedules

Questions on Induction

1. What were your general impressions of the induction week? Was it what you were expecting?

2. Did you find some elements of the induction week of varying interest and/or usefulness? If so, for what reasons? Organisation (mission, vision, values), Federation, PPF, PPF in community, getting the uniform, fitness test, IT/NCALT, presentations, knowledge check

3. What did you expect from the induction week?

4. How might you describe the nature of the relationships between the individual members of your intake? Were there some SOs you felt more affinity with than others? If so, why? Did the division between those already having worked for the constabulary make an impression on you? If so, how and why?

5. How might you describe the nature of the relationships between the SOs and the other members of staff such as the IPLDP manager, trainers and others?

6. How did you experience the atmosphere of the environment of HQ?

7. What were your thoughts before, during and after meeting the PDU managers?

8. What were your experiences of attestation? Was it appropriate (length, formality/informality) for the occasion?

9. Could you suggest any changes to induction?

10. How do you think that induction contributed to the process of becoming a police officer?

11. How did you find the general learning environment of induction? (Classroom, HQ, activities etc).
PDU Managers Interview Questions

Yourself

1. What is your role within the constabulary and how did you arrive at this role?

The PDU

2. Do you have a particular approach to the way in which you manage the PDU?

3. If so, could you describe that and its provenance/origin/basis? Might this have some connection with your own experiences of training and/or occupational experiences?

4. Do you notice differences in the way in which you manage this PDU and the way in which others within the constabulary manage other PDUs?

Student Officers

1. Do you have any observations to make about the nature of the student officers that pass through the PDU? This may relate to learning issues, personal issues, the nature of the personality, the approach to policing, the background of the SO, etc.

The IPLDP

2. What do you think about the changes to initial police learning and development brought in with the IPLDP?

3. Is the IPLDP or the student officer training a good programme in your view?

The Constabulary

4. Could you tell me about your working relationships with colleagues here in the PDU, with colleagues at other PDUs and with the wider constabulary management of IPLDP and training more broadly?
Learning Modules Phase

Interview Questions

1. How would you describe the overall experience of the phase of training (completion of ‘learning modules’) that has just recently finished?

2. Has there been a development in the way in which you understand the purpose of the role of the police officer since you first joined?

3. Could you describe your experience of the role plays that you took part in as part of this phase?

4. How would you describe the overall approach to teaching and learning practiced in the PDU?

5. Did you notice any problems encountered by the trainers and PDU managers in delivery of this phase?

6. How have your relationships developed with your fellow student officers and other members of staff in the PDU?

7. How do you think that others in the constabulary (involved in training and elsewhere) think of you as a police officer?

8. Have you developed friendships with colleagues outside the PDU? If so, with whom and why?

9. How have you experienced OSTU as a phase in training that is aiming to prepare you for policing?

10. Could you describe a typical day in the PDU?

11. How do you understand the way in which you have been assessed during this phase of training?
12. Have you been conscious that you are expected to demonstrate certain kinds of skills and knowledge? If so, what are those skills and what is the nature of the knowledge required?

13. Are there skills and is there knowledge that you have that you feel is not a focus of this phase of training?

14. Over and above the formal learning materials used in classroom work have you noticed other more informal approaches to teaching and learning that convey opinions of aspects of policing and police training held by training staff?

15. How did you get on with the ‘knowledge checks’ carried out periodically during this phase? Were marks for these checks made available to you? If so, how did this occur?

16. How do you now understand the concept of ‘discretion’ in policing?

17. How do your experiences of teaching and learning on the IPLDP compare with experiences of teaching and learning elsewhere?

18. Have your prior expectations of the IPLDP been met so far?

19. Do you feel that the constabulary has supported you so far in progressing
Topics to cover.

1. Your role for the constabulary at the moment.
2. The period of transfer from the previous occupant of your role.
3. Your role in and thoughts about student officer (SO) development.
4. Comparisons between training in the past and present.
5. Your own career and learning and development.
6. Your thoughts about the strengths and weaknesses of IPLDP in Ashton Police
   This might include issues in existence at PDUs, relations between PDUs,
   management of PDUs, cultures of PDUs.
7. NPIA.
8. NCALT.
9. NPLD.
Thank you for taking part in this focus group. The purpose of the group is for you to discuss with the group your answers to and thoughts about the questions and topics below. It is not intended as a group interview but is an opportunity for you and the other group members to discuss these matters together.

I would like you, first of all, to write some thoughts on this paper below:

- Can you simply describe what you have been doing on the IPLDP so far?
Discussion questions:

- If you could alter any aspect of the IPLDP what would it be?

- Please discuss the nature of and experiences that you have had in the classroom environment.

- How did you find the role plays in both the divisional context and OSTU?

- Could you summarise your own development as a police officer since you joined in June 2010?
PDU Managers

Yourself

1. What is your role within the constabulary and how did you arrive at this role?

The PDU

2. Do you have a particular approach to the way in which you manage the PDU?

3. If so, could you describe that and its provenance/origin/basis? Might this have some connection with your own experiences of training and/or occupational experiences?

4. Do you notice differences in the way in which you manage this PDU and the way in which others within the constabulary manage other PDUs?

Student Officers

1. Do you have any observations to make about the nature of the student officers that pass through the PDU? This may relate to learning issues, personal issues, the nature of the personality, the approach to policing, the background of the SO, etc.

The IPLDP

2. What do you think about the changes to initial police learning and development brought in with the IPLDP?

3. Is the IPLDP or the student officer training a good programme in your view?

The Constabulary

4. Could you tell me about your working relationships with colleagues here in the PDU, with colleagues at other PDUs and with the wider constabulary management of IPLDP and training more broadly?
Learning Modules Phase

Interview Questions

1. How would you describe the overall experience of the phase of training (completion of ‘learning modules’) that has just recently finished?

2. Has there been a development in the way in which you understand the purpose of the role of the police officer since you first joined?

3. Could you describe your experience of the role plays that you took part in as part of this phase?

4. How would you describe the overall approach to teaching and learning practiced in the PDU?

5. Did you notice any problems encountered by the trainers and PDU managers in delivery of this phase?

6. How have your relationships developed with your fellow student officers and other members of staff in the PDU?

7. How do you think that others in the constabulary (involved in training and elsewhere) think of you as a police officer?

8. Have you developed friendships with colleagues outside the PDU? If so, with whom and why?

9. How have you experienced OSTU as a phase in training that is aiming to prepare you for policing?

10. Could you describe a typical day in the PDU?

11. How do you understand the way in which you have been assessed during this phase of training?
12. Have you been conscious that you are expected to demonstrate certain kinds of skills and knowledge? If so, what are those skills and what is the nature of the knowledge required?

13. Are there skills and is there knowledge that you have that you feel is not a focus of this phase of training?

14. Over and above the formal learning materials used in classroom work have you noticed other more informal approaches to teaching and learning that convey opinions of aspects of policing and police training held by training staff?

15. How did you get on with the ‘knowledge checks’ carried out periodically during this phase? Were marks for these checks made available to you? If so, how did this occur?

16. How do you now understand the concept of ‘discretion’ in policing?

17. How do your experiences of teaching and learning on the IPLDP compare with experiences of teaching and learning elsewhere?

18. Have your prior expectations of the IPLDP been met so far?

19. Do you feel that the constabulary has supported you so far in progressing
IPLDP Manager HQ

Interview
14.7.2010

Topics to cover.

1. Your role for the constabulary at the moment.

2. The period of transfer from the previous occupant of your role.

3. Your role in and thoughts about student officer (SO) development.

4. Comparisons between training in the past and present.

5. Your own career and learning and development.

6. Your thoughts about the strengths and weaknesses of IPLDP in Ashton Police. This might include issues in existence at PDUs, relations between PDUs, management of PDUs, cultures of PDUs.

7. NPIA.

8. NCALT.

9. NPLD.

Central Focus Group Questions

IPLDP Research Project

Date: 11.1.11

Thank you for taking part in this focus group. The purpose of the group is for you to discuss with the group your answers to and thoughts about the questions and topics below. It is not intended as a group interview but is an opportunity for you and the other group members to discuss these matters together.

I would like you, first of all, to write some thoughts below:

- Can you simply describe what you have been doing on the IPLDP so far?
Discussion questions:

• If you could alter any aspect of the IPLDP what would it be?

• Please discuss the nature of and experiences that you have had in the classroom environment.

• How did you find the role plays in both the divisional context and OSTU

• Could you summarise your own development as a police officer since you joined in June 2010?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Observations</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Induction</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Engagement</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e-Student Officer Learning and Assessment Portfolio</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officer Safety Training Unit</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police Development Unit</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent Relief</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 6: The police workforce 2010-2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Workforce total = 180,389</td>
<td>Workforce total = 223,426</td>
<td>Workforce total = 244,497</td>
<td>Workforce total = 207,140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>% of workforce</td>
<td>% women</td>
<td>BM E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police officers</td>
<td>124,418</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>17.2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police Community Support Officers</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police Staff</td>
<td>53,227</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Constables (supernumerary)</td>
<td>14,347</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Adapted from: Sisson et al, 2000; Bibbi et al, 2005; Sigurdsson and Dhani, 2010; Home Office, 2015)
In the service as a whole in 2000, 2% of all police officers were from a Black and Minority Ethnic background, which had increased to 5.5% in 2015. The proportion of women police officers was 17.2% in 2000 and had increased to 28.2% in 2015.
Appendix 7: Police Recruitment in England and Wales

Across the police forces of England and Wales, the numbers of police officer joiners (see Table 2.1) peaked at over 13,000 in 2004, reduced steadily until 2010 but dropped dramatically from then to 2,197 in 2011 only to pick up again to 6,432 in 2015. The proportion of joiners that are women has remained at approximately 30% over the period. In 2010 3% of joiners had been special constables (Sigurdsson and Dhani, 2010), which rose to 17.8% in 2013 and was 13% (820) in 2015 (Home Office, 2015). In 2014, 8.6% of joiners were from a Black and Ethnic Minority background and that increased to 8.8% in 2015 (Allen and Dempsey, 2016).
Appendix 8: Student Charter. Ashton Police

The Cambridgeshire Constabulary Student Charter supports the Initial Police Learning and Development Programme which offers a range of studies and activities developed to meet the needs of the student officer. The programme is designed to enable students to assimilate the correct level and mix of skills, knowledge, behaviour and attitudes to reflect the requirements of their role and Cambridgeshire’s policing priorities.

**Our responsibilities**

**You can expect us to provide:**

- A learning environment based on support and encouragement;
- Facilities and resources to help you fulfil your training needs;
- Access to, and support from, trainers and Professional Development Unit staff;
- An open style of fair and objective assessment;
- Flexibility and support for your individual needs;
- A response to queries from you and appropriate feedback on work subject to assessment, as soon as is practicable;
- A safe, confidential procedure to report any concerns, inside or outside of the training environment, and be brought to the attention of the appropriate authority
- A commitment to diversity and equal opportunities and an assurance that any activities will not be designed to disadvantage particular groups

**Your responsibilities**

We expect to you:

- Behave in a manner that reflects the constabulary’s policies on diversity, dignity at work, the Human Rights Act, Equal opportunities, harassment and bullying;
- Comply with Force Policies and Procedures;
- Dress appropriately for activities and in accordance with the dress code;
- Attend for all scheduled training sessions punctually and in the submission of set work;
- Complete any pre-course reading;
- Provide early notice if you are unable to attend any training for any reason
- Contribute to a supportive learning environment for the benefit of all student officers;
- Respect the confidentiality of both the course content and fellow learners within a safe learning environment
## Appendix 9: Induction Programme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week 1</th>
<th>0900</th>
<th>1200</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Monday</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14/06/10</td>
<td>Welcome to Community</td>
<td>Introduction to IPLDP program / Learning Agreement &amp; Learning as student officer</td>
<td>Uniform Collection Group A: Orientation &amp; Induction Booklet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15/06/10</td>
<td>Putting People First</td>
<td>Putting People First</td>
<td>Uniform Collection Group B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/06/10</td>
<td>Putting People First in the Community</td>
<td>Putting People First in the Community</td>
<td>Training in Classroom 2 B 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tuesday</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/06/10</td>
<td>Payroll &amp; Federation</td>
<td>Payroll &amp; Federation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wednesday</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18/06/10</td>
<td>Health &amp; Well Being</td>
<td>Health &amp; Well Being (Level A)</td>
<td>Issue SIGPUS resource pack</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Draft**
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Monday 21/06/10</th>
<th>Tuesday 22/06/10</th>
<th>Wednesday 23/06/10</th>
<th>Thursday 24/06/10</th>
<th>Friday 25/06/10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0900</td>
<td>Fitness Testing (60 min)</td>
<td>Network Basic / Night (Per &amp; 180 min)</td>
<td>Community Interface</td>
<td>Role of Constable (180 min)</td>
<td>Weekly Round and Knowledge Check</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1200</td>
<td>Definitions / SPE Preparation</td>
<td>Definitions / SPE Preparation</td>
<td>Improving and safety Brekfast</td>
<td>Prep Assignment</td>
<td>Deposit &amp; Evaluative / F2F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1500</td>
<td>Fitness Testing (60 min - 78)</td>
<td>Network Basic / Night (90 min)</td>
<td>Preparing for significant public enquiry presentation</td>
<td></td>
<td>Press 2 Briefing / Closure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1700</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Attatchment - Conference Room 1 &amp; 2 FHQ</td>
<td></td>
<td>Prep for Community Engagement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Confirmed 14/12/10

DRAFT
### Appendix 10: Learning Modules Syllabus

**IPLDP LM 1 & 2 Trainer Copy**  
**Cohort 1 of 10/11**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Monday 05/07/10</th>
<th>Tuesday 06/07/10</th>
<th>Wednesday 07/07/10</th>
<th>Thursday 08/07/10</th>
<th>Friday 09/07/10</th>
<th>Notes/Homework</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0900 - 1000</td>
<td>Course Introduction - Needs, Concerns &amp; Expectations</td>
<td>Pocket Note Books &amp; Personal Descriptors LPG 1.4.3 &amp; 1.7.15</td>
<td>Powers of Arrest LPG 1.4.1</td>
<td>How to Arrest, Use of Force &amp; Section 32 (Person only) LPG 1.4.1</td>
<td>Summon &amp; Warrants LPG 1.4.11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1000 - 1100</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pocket Note Book Exercise</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1100 - 1200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1200 - 1300</td>
<td>Course Introduction - Needs, Concerns &amp; Expectations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1300 - 1400</td>
<td>Criminal Justice System LPG 1.4.12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1400 - 1500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1500 - 1600</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1600 - 1700</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Monday 05/07/10**: Course Introduction - Needs, Concerns & Expectations
- **Tuesday 06/07/10**: Pocket Note Books & Personal Descriptors LPG 1.4.3 & 1.7.15, Pocket Note Book Exercise
- **Wednesday 07/07/10**: Powers of Arrest LPG 1.4.1
- **Thursday 08/07/10**: How to Arrest, Use of Force & Section 32 (Person only) LPG 1.4.1
- **Friday 09/07/10**: Summon & Warrants LPG 1.4.11

**Notes/Homework**:
- Division
- Powers of arrest
- &&.entry
- Caution
- PACE & Codes of Practice
- Cautions, Significant Statements & Unsolicited Comments LPG 1.7.20
- Division
- Powers of Arrest LPG 1.4.1
- Division
- Powers of Entry - Sections 17, 18, 19 & 32 LPG 1.4.8
- Division
- Theft
- Criminal Attempts
- Robbery
- Burglary
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day</th>
<th>0900 - 1000</th>
<th>1000 - 1100</th>
<th>1100 - 1200</th>
<th>1200 - 1300</th>
<th>1300 - 1400</th>
<th>1400 - 1500</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monday</td>
<td></td>
<td>Theft</td>
<td>Criminal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/07/10</td>
<td></td>
<td>LPG 1.1.4 &amp; 0.1.5</td>
<td>Attempts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LPG 1.1.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td></td>
<td>Robbery</td>
<td></td>
<td>Burglary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13/07/10</td>
<td></td>
<td>LPG 1.1.4</td>
<td></td>
<td>LPG 1.1.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td></td>
<td>Handling Stolen Goods</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LPG 1.1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14/07/10</td>
<td></td>
<td>LPG 0.1.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td></td>
<td>Criminal Damage</td>
<td>Bail</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15/07/10</td>
<td></td>
<td>LPG 1.1.9</td>
<td>LPG 1.4.2 &amp;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday</td>
<td></td>
<td>Crime Knowledge Check</td>
<td>Methods of ID &amp; Street ID</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/07/10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LPG 1.7.4 &amp; 1.7.27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 3</td>
<td>0900 - 1000</td>
<td>1000 - 1100</td>
<td>1100 - 1200</td>
<td>1200 - 1300</td>
<td>1300 - 1400</td>
<td>1400 - 1500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Monday</strong> 19/07/10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tuesday</strong> 20/07/10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wednesday</strong> 21/07/10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Thursday</strong> 22/07/10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Friday</strong> 23/07/10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTES**
- Conference Room 2 HQ Offensive weapons, articles with blades
- HQ, Classroom 1
- March PDU
- HQ, Classroom 1
- Division

**DNA sampling**
- Fingerprints/ DNA/ Photograph LPG 1.1.11 & 0.1.21

**Airwaves (confirmed)**
- Offense Weapons LPG 0.1.3
- Other Persons Powers/ Schools & Colleges LPG 0.1.17
- Airwaves (confirmed)
- Other Persons Powers/ Schools & Colleges LPG 0.1.17
- HQ, Classroom 1
- Division

**Stop & Account**
- LPG 1.2.2, 1.2.3 & 1.24
- Stop & Account Role Plays
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week 4</th>
<th>0900 - 1000</th>
<th>1000 - 1100</th>
<th>1100 - 1200</th>
<th>1200 - 1300</th>
<th>1300 - 1400</th>
<th>1400 - 1500</th>
<th>1500 - 1600</th>
<th>1600 - 1700</th>
<th>NOTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monday 26/07/10</td>
<td>Network Vision (3 trainers confirmed)</td>
<td>Blackberry (confirmed)</td>
<td>Football / Sporting Events LPG 0.17 Self read</td>
<td>Conference Room 2 HQ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday 27/07/10</td>
<td>CSI Input LPG 1.4.4, 1.4.10, 17.6, 1.7.101, 1.7.19 &amp; LPG 0.4.5</td>
<td>CSI Input LPG 1.4.4, 1.4.10, 17.6, 1.7.101, 1.7.19 &amp; LPG 0.4.5</td>
<td>Conference Room 3 HQ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday 28/07/10</td>
<td>PEACE Theory OP6A Witness Interviewing (Statements)</td>
<td>PEACE Theory OP6A Witness Interviewing (Statements)</td>
<td>Division</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday 29/07/10</td>
<td>PEACE Theory OP6A Witness Interviewing (Statements)</td>
<td>PEACE Theory OP6A Witness Interviewing (Statements)</td>
<td>Division</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday 30/07/10</td>
<td>PEACE Witness Practical OP6A</td>
<td>PEACE Witness Practical OP6A</td>
<td>Division</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 5</td>
<td>0900 - 1000</td>
<td>1000 - 1100</td>
<td>1100 - 1200</td>
<td>1200 - 1300</td>
<td>1300 - 1400</td>
<td>1400 - 1500</td>
<td>1500 - 1600</td>
<td>1600 - 1700</td>
<td>NOTES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Anti - Social Behaviour</td>
<td>Drunkenness</td>
<td>Illness in the street</td>
<td>Division</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/08/10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LPG 1.3t</td>
<td>LPG 1.3.16</td>
<td>LPG 1.5.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Public Order</td>
<td>Public Order</td>
<td>Breach Of</td>
<td>Division</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/08/10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LPG 1.1.3</td>
<td>LPG 1.1.3</td>
<td>the Peace</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Crimefile (grp A) (conf)</td>
<td>RCAT Workbook -self study</td>
<td>Explosive Awareness</td>
<td>HQ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/08/10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Firework</td>
<td>Fireworks</td>
<td>(IT classroom or classroom 1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RCAT Workbook -self study</td>
<td>Explosive Awareness</td>
<td>Firework</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/08/10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Assaulats</td>
<td>Conflict Management (E-Learning)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Division</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NSPIS (2 classes of 10)</td>
<td>Conflict Management (E-Learning)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HQ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/08/10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 6</td>
<td>0900 - 1000</td>
<td>1000 - 1100</td>
<td>1100 - 1200</td>
<td>1200 - 1300</td>
<td>1300 - 1400</td>
<td>1400 - 1500</td>
<td>1500 - 1600</td>
<td>1600 - 1700</td>
<td>NOTES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday 09/08/10</td>
<td>Confiscation of Alcohol LPG 1.3.3</td>
<td>Penalty Notices for Disorder LPG 1.4.18</td>
<td>Penalty Notices for Disorder LPG 1.4.18</td>
<td>Penalty Notices for Disorder LPG 1.4.18</td>
<td>Division</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday 10/08/10</td>
<td>Vehicle Interference LPG 0.1.18</td>
<td>Road Checks LPG 1.4.20</td>
<td>Human Trafficking - e learning</td>
<td>Railways (Self Read) LPG 1.9.9</td>
<td>Actions at Scene of a Fire LPG 1.3.27</td>
<td>Division</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday 11/08/10</td>
<td>Drugs (Possession &amp; PWC) + Solvent Abuse LPG 1.1.10 + 1.3.11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Division</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday 12/08/10</td>
<td>Taking a vehicle Without Consent (TWOC) and Aggravated TWOC LPG 1.1.4 &amp; 0.1.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Division</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday 13/08/10</td>
<td>Knowledge Check</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Division</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Division discretion/tutorials
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week 7</th>
<th>0900 - 1000</th>
<th>1000 - 1100</th>
<th>1100 - 1200</th>
<th>1200 - 1300</th>
<th>1300 - 1400</th>
<th>1400 - 1500</th>
<th>1500 - 1600</th>
<th>1600 - 1700</th>
<th>NOTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Training clash Monday 16/08/10</td>
<td>Officer Safety Training - Alconbury Building 201</td>
<td>Officer Safety Training - Alconbury Building 201</td>
<td>RAF Alconbury</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training clash Tuesday 17/08/10</td>
<td>Officer Safety Training - Alconbury Building 201</td>
<td>Officer Safety Training - Alconbury Building 201</td>
<td>RAF Alconbury</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training clash Wednesday 18/08/10</td>
<td>Officer Safety Training - Alconbury Building 201</td>
<td>Officer Safety Training - Alconbury Building 201</td>
<td>RAF Alconbury</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training clash Thursday 19/08/10</td>
<td>Officer Safety Training - Alconbury Building 201</td>
<td>Officer Safety Training - Alconbury Building 201</td>
<td>RAF Alconbury</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training clash Friday 20/08/10</td>
<td>Officer Safety Training - Alconbury Building 201</td>
<td>Officer Safety Training - Alconbury Building 201</td>
<td>RAF Alconbury</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week 8</th>
<th>0900 - 1000</th>
<th>1000 - 1100</th>
<th>1100 - 1200</th>
<th>1200 - 1300</th>
<th>1300 - 1400</th>
<th>1400 - 1500</th>
<th>1500 - 1600</th>
<th>1600 - 1700</th>
<th>NOTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Officer Safety Training - Alconbury Building 201</td>
<td>Officer Safety Training - Alconbury Building 201</td>
<td>Officer Safety Training - Alconbury Building 201</td>
<td>Officer Safety Training - Alconbury Building 201</td>
<td>Officer Safety Training - Alconbury Building 201</td>
<td>Officer Safety Training - Alconbury Building 201</td>
<td>Officer Safety Training - Alconbury Building 201</td>
<td>Officer Safety Training - Alconbury Building 201</td>
<td>RAF Alconbury</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training clash</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>23/08/10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training clash</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>24/08/10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training clash</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>25/08/10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training clash</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>26/08/10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training clash</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday</td>
<td>27/08/10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week 9</th>
<th>0900 - 1000</th>
<th>1000 - 1100</th>
<th>1100 - 1200</th>
<th>1200 - 1300</th>
<th>1300 - 1400</th>
<th>1400 - 1500</th>
<th>1500 - 1600</th>
<th>1600 - 1700</th>
<th>NOTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>BANK HOLIDAY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30/08/10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31/08/10</td>
<td>Missing from Home</td>
<td>LPG 1.3.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/08/10</td>
<td>Police Protection &amp; Cruelty</td>
<td>LPG 1.3.15 &amp; 1.3.20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Classroom 3 - HQ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/09/10</td>
<td>Firearms Specialist Input</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday</td>
<td>Knowledge Check</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/09/10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MONDAY</td>
<td>Intro &amp; Scenarios, Belt Management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TUESDAY</td>
<td>Tac. Comms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEDNESDAY</td>
<td>Handcuffing Recap</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THURSDAY</td>
<td>Incapacitant Skills &amp; Car Shield</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRIDAY</td>
<td>Custody Skills Recap, Cell Pad</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MONDAY</td>
<td>Final Exam</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TUESDAY</td>
<td>Competency Check</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.M.M.</td>
<td>Medical Implications</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LUNCH</td>
<td>Unarmed Skills Takedowns Strikes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unarmed Skills Breakaways Ground</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Defence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.P.E.A.R.</td>
<td>Meth DVD, Custody Search</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Edged Weapon Awareness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Course Recap</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Course Recap</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.P.E.A.R.</td>
<td>Baton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Limb Restraints, Split Hood, Cell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Insertion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Use of Force Reporting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Competency Check</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Competency Check</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Course Close</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week 11</th>
<th>0900 - 1000</th>
<th>1000 - 1100</th>
<th>1100 - 1200</th>
<th>1200 - 1300</th>
<th>1300 - 1400</th>
<th>1400 - 1500</th>
<th>1500 - 1600</th>
<th>1600 - 1700</th>
<th>NOTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Training clash Monday 13/09/10</td>
<td>Protection from Harassment LPG 1.3.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training clash Tuesday 14/09/10</td>
<td>Role Plays - all subjects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training clash Wednesday 15/09/10</td>
<td>Domestic Abuse Debbie Lewsey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training clash Thursday 16/09/10</td>
<td>National Intelligence Model Mark Butler</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training clash Friday 17/09/10</td>
<td>National Crime Recording Standards &amp; Management of Crimes Jon Allen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Role Plays - all subjects &amp; debrief</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Honour Based Violence Ruth Sheehan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Public Protection Helen Roseman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FHQ Classroom 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FHQ Classroom 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FHQ Classroom 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FHQ Classroom 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FHQ Classroom 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week 12</th>
<th>0900 - 1000</th>
<th>1000 - 1100</th>
<th>1100 - 1200</th>
<th>1200 - 1300</th>
<th>1300 - 1400</th>
<th>1400 - 1500</th>
<th>1500 - 1600</th>
<th>1600 - 1700</th>
<th>NOTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monday 20/09/10</td>
<td>Highways &amp; Causing Danger on Highways LPG 1.8.17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday 21/09/10</td>
<td>Registration &amp; Driving Licences LPG 1.8.16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday 22/09/10</td>
<td>Production of documents LPG 1.8.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday 23/09/10</td>
<td>Construction &amp; Use Regulations LPG 0.8.1,2,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday 24/09/10</td>
<td>Traffic Signs &amp; Signals LPG 1.8.13 Fixed Penalty Notices LPG 1.8.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Classification of Vehicular LPG 1.8.19</td>
<td>Division</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Driving Licences, Insurance &amp; MOT Test Certificates LPG 1.8.8</td>
<td>Division</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Use, Cause &amp; Permit LPG 1.8.20</td>
<td>Division</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vehicle Defect Rectification Scheme 1.8.14</td>
<td>Division</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fixed Penalty Notices LPG 1.8.6</td>
<td>Division</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week</td>
<td>0900 - 1000</td>
<td>1000 - 1100</td>
<td>1100 - 1200</td>
<td>1200 - 1300</td>
<td>1300 - 1400</td>
<td>1400 - 1500</td>
<td>1500 - 1600</td>
<td>1600 - 1700</td>
<td>NOTES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Monday | 27/09/10 | Driver Rider Offences  
LPG 1.8.15 # | Pedestrian Crossing  
LPG 1.8.10 | NIP  
LPG 1.8.14 | Division |
| Tuesday | 28/09/10 | Report for Summons  
LPG 1.8.11 | Disqualified Drivers  
LPG 1.8.3 | Division |
| Wednesday | 29/09/10 | Drink Drive, Powers of Entry & Hospital Procedure  
LPG 1.8.4 | Drink Drive, Powers of Entry & Hospital Procedure  
LPG 1.8.4 | Division |
| Thursday | 30/09/10 | RTC & Driver Obligations  
LPG 1.8.5 | RTC & Driver Obligations  
LPG 1.8.5 | Division |
<p>| Friday | 01/10/10 | Knowledge Check - Traffic | Knowledge Check - Traffic &amp; Debrief | Division |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week 14</th>
<th>0900 - 1000</th>
<th>1000 - 1100</th>
<th>1100 - 1200</th>
<th>1200 - 1300</th>
<th>1300 - 1400</th>
<th>1400 - 1500</th>
<th>1500 - 1600</th>
<th>1600 - 1700</th>
<th>NOTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monday 04/10/10</td>
<td>Traffic Role Play</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday 05/10/10</td>
<td>ANPR Stuart Morgan</td>
<td>Mental Health LPG 1.3.19</td>
<td>Trainer - Dave Edwards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HQ, Classroom 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday 06/10/10</td>
<td></td>
<td>Case File Prep</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HQ, Classroom 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday 07/10/10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Case File Prep</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HQ, Classroom 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday 08/10/10</td>
<td>Court Visit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Intro to PACS</td>
<td>Tutorials</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PDU Manager</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week</td>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Monday 11/10/10</td>
<td>Tuesday 12/10/10</td>
<td>Wednesday 13/10/10</td>
<td>Thursday 14/10/10</td>
<td>Friday 15/10/10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0900-1100</td>
<td>NETCU</td>
<td>Sexual offences (Conf)</td>
<td>Sexual offences (Conf)</td>
<td>Sudden Death</td>
<td>Intro to E SOLAP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1100-1300</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rachael Middleton</td>
<td>PDU Manage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1300-1500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1500-1700</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Terrorism/SB**  
Steve Holmes/Paul Stuart

**Sexual offences (Conf)**
Jackie Bremner
HQ, Classroom 2

**Sexual offences (Conf)**
Jackie Bremner
HQ, Classroom 2

**Sudden Death**  
Rachael Middleton

**Sudden Death**  
David Edwards

**Child Absentees / Vulnerable Persons / Missing from Home**  
LPG 1.3.8

Divisionally Based
Appendix 11: Personal Qualities Practitioner

Practitioner

(Constable and police staff practitioner)

**Serving the public**

Demonstrates a real belief in public service, focusing on what matters to the public and will best serve their interests. Understands the expectations, changing needs and concerns of different communities, and strives to address them. Builds public confidence by talking with people in local communities to explore their viewpoints and break down barriers between them and the police. Understands the impact and benefits of policing for different communities, and identifies the best way to deliver services to them. Works in partnership with other agencies to deliver the best possible overall service to the public.

**Openness to change**

Positive about change, adapting rapidly to different ways of working and putting effort into making them work. Flexible and open to alternative approaches to solving problems. Finds better, more cost-effective ways to do things, making suggestions for change and putting forward ideas for improvement. Takes an innovative and creative approach to solving problems.

**Service delivery**

Understands the organisation's objectives and priorities, and how own work fits into these. Plans and organises tasks effectively, taking a structured and methodical approach to achieving outcomes. Manages multiple tasks effectively by thinking things through in advance, prioritising and managing time well. Focuses on the outcomes to be achieved, working quickly and accurately and seeking guidance when appropriate.

**Professionalism**

Acts with integrity, in line with the values and ethical standards of the Police Service. Takes ownership for resolving problems, demonstrating courage and resilience in dealing with difficult and potentially volatile situations. Acts on own initiative to address issues, showing a strong work ethic and demonstrating extra effort when required. Upholds professional standards, acting honestly and ethically, and challenges unprofessional conduct or discriminatory behaviour. Asks for and acts on feedback, learning from experience and developing
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Decision making</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gathers, verifies and assesses all appropriate and available information to gain an accurate understanding of situations. Considers a range of possible options before making clear, timely, justifiable decisions. Reviews decisions in the light of new information and changing circumstances. Balances risks, costs and benefits, thinking about the wider impact of decisions. Exercises discretion and applies professional judgement, ensuring actions and decisions are proportionate and in the public interest.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Working with others</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Works co-operatively with others to get things done, willingly giving help and support to colleagues. Is approachable, developing positive working relationships. Explains things well, focusing on the key points and talking to people using language they understand. Listens carefully and asks questions to clarify understanding, expressing own views positively and constructively. Persuades people by stressing the benefits of a particular approach, keeps them informed of progress and manages their expectations. Is courteous, polite and considerate, showing empathy and compassion. Deals with people as individuals and addresses their specific needs and concerns. Treats people with respect and dignity, dealing with them fairly and without prejudice regardless of their background or circumstances.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: Skills for Justice, 2016. Policing Professional Framework)
### Appendix 12: Police Action Checklist Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Police Action Checklist Item</th>
<th>Specific Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Safety first</td>
<td>Dealing with disorder and conflict. Demonstrate ability to minimise and deal with aggressive and abusive behaviour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Information management</td>
<td>Utilise PNC Utilise force information management systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Patrol</td>
<td>Demonstrate patrol priorities in accordance with local objectives Demonstrate communication with control rooms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Search</td>
<td>Conduct PACE stop Demonstrate lawful search – person Demonstrate lawful search – premise Demonstrate lawful search - vehicle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Investigation</td>
<td>Utilise CCTV during an investigation Demonstrate initial crime scene management Conduct the initial investigation and report of volume crime, missing persons, domestic incident</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Disposal</td>
<td>Conduct the initial investigation and report of a hate crime, child protection/vulnerable person incident, sudden death Demonstrate initial RTC scene management Interview witness and suspect using PEACE model Demonstrate correct handling of exhibits Provide support and advice to victims and witnesses Respond appropriately to development during an investigation Report offenders for summons Make lawful arrest Convey suspect into custody (in accordance with force procedure)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Custody procedures</td>
<td>Present suspect to custody Complete pre-charge procedures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Finalise investigations</td>
<td>Complete case files</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Road policing</td>
<td>Demonstrate vehicle stop Check driving documents Complete traffic procedures for HO/RT1, FPN, CLE2/6, VDRS Demonstrate correct administration of tests for drink/drugs driving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Property</td>
<td>Utilise property systems</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 13: Definitions

Reasonable Force - Any Person - Section 84, Criminal Law Act 1994
A person may use such force as is reasonable in the circumstances in the prevention of crime, or in effecting or assisting in the lawful arrest of offenders or suspected offenders or of persons unlawfully at large.

Reasonable Force - Constable Only - Section 117, Police & Criminal Evidence Act 1984
Where any provision of this Act -
(a) confers a power on a constable; and
(b) does not provide that the power may only be exercised with the consent of some person, other than a police officer,
the officer may use reasonable force, if necessary, in the exercise of the power.

Burglary - Section 8(1), Theft Act 1968
A person is guilty of burglary if he enters, and remains in, a building or part of a building as a trespasser with intent to steal anything in the building or part of a building or in any of its offices or attempts to effect such entry with intent to steal anything in the building or part of a building or in any of its offices.

OR

Burglary (OK) - Section 9, Theft Act 1968
A person who enters any building or part of a building as a trespasser or attempts to steal anything in the building or part of a building or in any of its offices, shall be guilty of an offence.

Thief - Section 1, Theft Act 1968
A person is guilty of theft if he dishonestly appropriates property belonging to another with the intention of permanently depriving the other of it. And "thief" and "theft" shall be construed accordingly.

State Codes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>CIDNDT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>AVAILRES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>AUDIOFFICE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>REFRSMTCHS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>ENRTOINC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>ATSCNE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>CMTBUTD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>UNAVAIL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>PRSNRSCT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>LCL Talks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>OPTDUTY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>CONFMSG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>CALLBACK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>URGNCALL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>RECEIVED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>GROUNDS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>UNNOTRPL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Phonetic Alphabet

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Bravo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Charlie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Delta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Echo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Foxtrot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Golf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Hotel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>India</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>Juliet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>Kilo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>Lima</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Mike</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>November</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>Oscar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>Papa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>Quebec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>Romeo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>Sierra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>Tango</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U</td>
<td>Uniform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>Victor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
<td>Whiskey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>X-ray</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Yankee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z</td>
<td>Zulu</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 14: Stop and Search

Stop and Search
Section 1 PACE

Powers may be exercised in any place which at the time the power is exercised:

- The public or any section of the public has access, on payment or otherwise, as of right or by virtue of express or implied permission
- OR
- Any place to which people have ready access, but is not a dwelling

If the place is a Garden or Yard or other land

Occupied with and for the purpose of a dwelling the search may not be carried out unless the constable has reasonable grounds for believing:

- In the case of a Person that he
  - Does not reside in the dwelling
  - AND
  - Is not in the place with the express or implied permission of a person who resides there

- In the case of a vehicle
  - That the person in charge of the vehicle
  - That the vehicle

Powers require reasonable suspicion—these cannot be founded on personal factors alone. If reasonable suspicion exists an officer may detain the person in order to search him. He may not be stopped or detained in order to find grounds for a search.
Public Order Act 1986

Sections 5, 4 and 4A

Section 4

A person is guilty of an offence if they use towards another person threatening, abusive or insulting words, actions or behaviour

OR
distributes or displays to another person any writing, sign or other visible representation which is threatening, abusive or insulting...
Section 4

- with intent to cause that person to believe that immediate unlawful violence will be used against them or another, by any person, OR

Section 4

- To provoke the immediate use of unlawful violence by that person or another, OR
Section 4

Summary Offence

6 months imprisonment

---

Threatening, Abusive or Insulting Words or Behaviour

- The terms threatening, abusive or insulting should be given their everyday meaning
- Threatening – includes verbal and physical threats
- Abusive – using degrading or reviling language
- Insulting – scornful, insolent or contemptuous

---

Threatening, Abusive or Insulting Words or Behaviour

- Threatening, abusive or insulting words do NOT lose their character if the person to whom they are addressed, or who witnessed them, did not feel threatened, abused or insulted
- It is the INTENTIONS OF THE SUSPECT that matter – the mental element of this offence

---
Distributes or Displays

- DISTRIBUTES means to spread or disperse
- DISPLAYS means a visual representation

Writing, Sign or Visible Representation

- This includes:
  - Leaflets
  - Graffiti on walls
  - Banners
  - Offensive gestures
  - Offensive badges or T-shirt motifs

Power of Entry

A constable may ENTER and SEARCH any premises for the purpose of ARRESTING a person for an offence under Section 4, Public Order Act 1986

This power of entry exists because the Section 4 offence may be committed in PUBLIC OR PRIVATE
Offences in Private Places
- This offence may be committed in a public or a private place,
- EXCEPT that no offence is committed where the words or behaviour are used, or the writing, sign or other visible representation is distributed or displayed, by a person inside a dwelling and the other person is also inside that or another dwelling.

Racially or Religiously Aggravated Offences
- Section 28 Crime & Disorder Act 1998 sets out certain conditions under which certain public order offences, like certain offences of assault, will be deemed to be racially aggravated, and increases the powers available to courts when punishing racist offenders

Racially or Religiously Aggravated Offences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Offence</th>
<th>Non-Racially Aggravated</th>
<th>Racially Aggravated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Section 4</td>
<td>6 months imprisonment</td>
<td>2 years imprisonment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 4A</td>
<td>6 months imprisonment</td>
<td>3 years imprisonment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 5</td>
<td>Fine</td>
<td>Fine</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>