

THE REALITY OF POLICE PROFESSIONALISM :  
A SOCIOLOGICAL INVESTIGATION INTO  
RECRUITMENT, TRAINING AND PROMOTION  
IN A METROPOLITAN COUNTY POLICE FORCE

by

C. W. HARRISON

A Dissertation submitted in candidacy  
for the Degree of Ph.D.

Centre for Criminological and Socio-Legal Studies  
The University of Sheffield  
Sheffield

March, 1986

**: IMAGING SERVICES NORTH**

Boston Spa, Wetherby

West Yorkshire, LS23 7BQ

[www.bl.uk](http://www.bl.uk)

BRITISH  
LIBRARY

**BEST COPY AVAILABLE.**

**VARIABLE PRINT QUALITY**



THE REALITY OF POLICE PROFESSIONALISM: A SOCIOLOGICAL  
INVESTIGATION INTO RECRUITMENT, TRAINING AND PROMOTION  
IN A METROPOLITAN COUNTY POLICE FORCE

by

C W Harrison

SUMMARY

The aim of this research is to study the meaning given to 'professionalism' by the police themselves by way of an analysis of the police as an occupation and career patterns within it. This will cover recruitment and selection, basic and higher training and promotion.

Specifically this includes an examination of:

- (a) the extent to which the respective processes of formal and informal education contribute to the norms and values prevalent in the police force.
- (b) how these norms and values are made effective (through selection, training, promotion, rewards and punishments etc) at different levels of the police force
- (c) the extent to which the norms and values in the police force are shared both within and between strata
- (d) the relationship of the norms and values in the police to law enforcement

The above is informed by an analysis of the history of the ideas of policing as they exist within the police force and how these are transmitted within the police, which it has been assumed could not be ignored in studying career development within the police organisation.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS . . . . .	1
INTRODUCTION . . . . .	2
CHAPTER	
1    POLICE 'PROFESSIONALISM' IN THE 20th CENTURY . .	8
2    THEORETICAL ORIENTATION . . . . .	36
3    RECRUITMENT . . . . .	60
4    TRAINING . . . . .	103
5    PROMOTION . . . . .	158
6    SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS . . . . .	246
FOOTNOTES . . . . .	264
APPENDIX 1    METHODOLOGY . . . . .	273
APPENDIX 2    QUESTIONNAIRES : Format of Training Courses	281
BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . .	291

Acknowledgments

My thanks are due to Mr. Tony Jefferson who supervised the Home Office linked Ph.D. thesis and without whose efforts this thesis would never have got off the ground. Mr. Jefferson consistently lent support and an example of academic discipline, patience and determination, when mine had nearly gone.

My appreciation is also due to the Social Science Research Council who granted the student the funds in order that this project could begin. I am also indebted to the Home Office and police who granted access and generous co-operation.

Finally I am deeply grateful to all those people who have helped since the early days. I am indebted for the ideas and stimulating conversation which helped embolden the student for the task. In the end however this thesis is a work for which I alone assume responsibility - and that includes the errors.

## INTRODUCTION

At a time of economic crisis when the state is increasingly being drawn into conflict with different social classes the idea that the state has a far more autonomous role in the management of conflict seems more than ever to be the basis of its authority. Such a view implies that in a 'pluralistic' society the state's autonomy from the economically powerful is the basis of its legitimacy, representing as it is held to do the moral values of the people. This implies that liberal consent and popular consensus are important because they are the foundations upon which the cohesion of the state and its legal authority finally depends, (cf., Hall et al., 1978, Ch. 7).

Such a claim to legitimacy would appear to be consistent with claims being made by senior police officers to 'professionalism' at a time of growing economic conflict when the impartiality of the police is increasingly in doubt, (J. Alderson, 1979). The more so since it is at the level of lower ranking police officers that poor standards are responsible for conflict with the public. (1)

The idea of police 'professionalism' therefore assumes that the orientation of senior police officers significantly differs from police subordinates such that senior police officers are properly selected and trained. Paralleling traditional notions of professionalism to be found in the literature on professions such a view implies that senior police officers are the experts who have mastered knowledge of policing and that it is with such 'responsible' supervision that the management of that organisation should rightfully be left. Senior police officers further suggest that they are responsible not only for

maintaining standards of performance but also for generating new knowledge in the field. In return for their monopoly of power police 'professionals' suggest that they will ensure that the police commit themselves to a service ideal. Their activities are not directed towards self gain but towards the interests of the general public.

The implication of the above is that a 'gap' exists between the normative orientation of senior and junior police officers and that panaceas to this 'problem' lie in controlling the output of rank and file officers, whether this is through more education, better training or tighter control over the police officers on the ground. Another source of interest is the implication that subordinate police officers do not automatically translate enacted law into enforcement operations but rather generate problems with the public by their arbitrary acts. The writings of sociologists of varying liberal persuasions are underpinned, if only implicitly at times, with this notion (Rosenberg D, n.d.) (2). Liberal sociologists suggest that such problems as persist in relations between the police and the public emanate from a 'gap' between the poor standards of police subordinates and the 'professionalism' of their senior officers and that if subordinate officers values were aligned to those of their superiors such problems, according to this logic, would subside (Holdaway, 1977; James, 1979; Cain, 1971). However the implication of the work of other criminologists in the U.S.A. undercuts this, though it is acknowledged here that the relevance of studies of the police in North America to the British police is viewed as problematic, (3). Wilson's extended discussion of the determinants of police discretion, the different possibilities different circumstances provide for its control, concludes that departmental styles can be influenced by policy makers (Wilson, 1968) (4). The logic of this sort of discussion is to undercut the notion of an unbridgeable gap between senior officers and their subordinates.

However Marxist influenced criminologists, most notably in the U.S.A, are critical of/

both of the above positions on the grounds that they do not challenge the structure of power and privilege which lies behind the police system but take it for granted (Centre for Research on Criminal Justice, 1977). For the 'radicals' mentioned the proposals offered by liberal reformers are therefore based on an idealistic image of the police system as basically a democratic one. It should be added that, strictly speaking, that this represents a critique not of the substantive work of 'liberal' criminologists but their underlying, basic, assumptions. By contrast 'radicals' see the state as the monolithic product of an elite minority, who, by promoting themselves as disinterested changed the class/occupational culture of subordinate officers thereby engineering police loyalty in the service of business values, (5). Thus the 'radicals' suggest that the state functions as a mere tool for the domination by the dominant class and would thus deny even the possibility of examining the relative autonomy of the police vis-a vis the dominant class. The radicals therefore invert the assumption of police 'professionals' when they imply that it is the standards of senior officers imposed on police subordinates which are the source of problems with the public. It should, perhaps, be added that this tripartite distinction is a heuristic device for highlighting the particular concerns of this study and, therefore, necessarily omits much which, for other purposes, is of value.

This thesis will be concerned to test the competing assertions of police 'professionals' and the 'radicals' by examining the meaning of professionalism to the police themselves. In so doing my own position will be that the above approaches to police professionalism present formulations which tend to obscure more than they reveal about the work the police do and that alternative concepts based on the specific practices of the police should be substituted (6). A different classification of the police will be the result. My formulation situates policework in a general theory of the state whereas police professionals (and the sociology of the professions) have either been confined to middle range theorising and ignored this problem or sought to bridge the gap between jobs and the social/order

order by empirical statements based on implicit and (therefore) ill formulated theories. Radical formulations have asked about professions in the class structure but have presumed the usefulness of the notion of profession itself. That is to say, work like Johnson (Professions and Power, 1979) and its critique by Cain (1979) recognises the need to situate the professions within a social context. Without decrying that work, my own purpose has been to ask a different question i.e. What is the concrete meaning of the term professional as applied to policing. I claim to be able to theorise the relationship between police professionalism and the social structure in a way that opens up new avenues for empirical research. In effect this will mean that I shall seek to demonstrate that the radicals stance is too simple, too reductive for our purposes; since they are unable to explain how the police can appear to be impartial, yet still operate to assist the reproduction of an unequal social order, through, in the case of the police, law. Thus my position is that not only is there no gap between police ranks but more importantly if police behaviour appears to deviate from the 'rhetoric' of police professionals it cannot be assumed by either senior police officers or radical criminologists that it does so despite the law.

With the above in mind this research will cover an empirical analysis of the process of recruitment, basic and higher training and promotion. The work is importantly framed by the social history of the police which cannot be ignored by studying socialisation within a given police organisation. This will mean thinking through some of the findings within a historically informed sociological perspective. Thus my interest will cover the history of the ideas of policing as they exist within the police force and how these are transmitted within the police; how shared expectations become institutionalised and are experienced by later generations as the 'common sense' of the organisation. (7). In short I shall be concerned to examine whether meanings are associated with the police organisation itself, both in terms of the general areas within which its members are supposed to/act



act (e.g. the economy, the law) and of the specialist expectations attached to each office (cf., D. Silverman, 1976).

Chapter One examines the assertions of police professionals that a new level of concern is abroad in police recruitment and training. The above claims having been outlined an analysis of the history of the British police during the 20th century will follow to place the assertions of police professionalism in context. In Chapter Two I examine the work of various liberal sociologists of different persuasions as well as radicals who have made contributions to the debate on police professionalism. I shall then put forward an alternative view which seeks to locate police work within a general theory of the state. In Chapter Three my empirical analysis begins with an examination of the meaning given to professionalism in police recruitment and selection by the police themselves by looking at how police selection works in practice. In Chapter Four I seek to deepen and contrast my analysis of recruitment by way of an examination of police training; particularly since police professionals and the radicals make similar statements about training to those made about recruitment. In Chapter Five I am concerned to advance further the empirical analysis of the contending views of police professionalism by examining the next stage of a police officers career manifest in the process of promotion; particularly since police professionals imply that they differ from many of their subordinates in their enlightened attitude towards the public, an attitude they see as a pre-condition of advancement. This the radicals repeatedly criticise.

In Chapter Six I shall draw together the threads of the above analysis, based on data obtained in a large urban force and regional training centres for the police, having regard to the position of the



professionals and radicals in comparison to my own. This will include a discussion on my findings as to whether police conflict with the public is a matter of informal practices or the level at which authority is exercised; or whether in fact such problems emanate from the nature of the police task itself. Thus, for example, in Britain, MacBarnet (1977) and Jefferson and Grimshaw (1981, 1982, 1984) imply that there is no gap between ranks and that in actuality the common sense views of the police are informed by the dominant ideology, which the law makes possible. The author hopes this account will contribute to the ongoing study of the British police begun by the above.

CHAPTER ONE

POLICE 'PROFESSIONALISM' IN THE 20TH CENTURY

This thesis is concerned with the meaning of police professionalism which some senior police officers appear to be claiming as a panacea for poor standards among some police subordinates, held responsible for much conflict between the police and the public. This is to say that in what follows I shall begin by outlining the broad claims of police professionals. Whilst police professionalism embraces a diversity of views on particular matters (c.f. the different emphasis apparent in say the philosophy of John Alderson compared with say James Anderton), there is no evidence suggesting a marked difference on this particular question. The broad suggestion is that though many high ranking police officers have now adopted an enlightened stance towards policing, such problems as persist in relations between the police and the public tend to emanate from the poor standards of a minority of police subordinates, which modern police recruitment and selection, as well as basic training championed by police professionals, is seeking to resolve. When examples of the above assertions have been given below my aim will be to examine the efficacy of the claims made by comparing them with the history of police professionalism during the 20th century.

With the above in mind I begin by outlining some of the major notions of police leaders about police professionalism and the management of policing, central to which appears to be the claim that the police are an independent agency which it is the role of police professionals to ensure. In conjunction with this, police professionals also suggest that police independence can only be ensured provided the police remain impartial. As one exponent of this position puts it, (1)

"If their independence is to be preserved the police themselves must ensure that they cannot be justly accused of showing favour to any one section of the community."

According to the above the independence of the police can only be ensured providing the police remain impartial. Moreover it is further suggested by police professionals that impartiality is necessary to ensure legal equality, which the police have an ethical and legal duty to ensure.

"So far as equality is concerned the police have a paramount ethical and legal duty to ensure that enforcement or non enforcement of the law is carried out impartially and equally without regard for social standing, race, creed, religion, colour or class. Police in superior systems will understand this and act accordingly but inferior police will be partial and show favouritism towards those of influence, either political or social or even economic, and will neglect the less able and less influential and certainly the people at the bottom of the pile ."

For police professionals ensuring impartial policing requires the right quality of officer which entails a concern with recruitment and selection. This entails precautions in selection to identify the law abiding and 'well balanced', while eliminating the unlawful, biased, violent or timid.<sup>3</sup>

"The police must take their own precautions and this begins with selection. Considerable care has to be (and in Britain is) taken in inquiries into the antecedent history of potential recruits. The necessary judgement of character and its ability to stand up to the hurly burly of police-work and the temptations put in the way of the police has to be taken into account at this stage. Only high quality officers properly trained should be included in selection procedures."

An important pre-condition of police impartiality is the recruitment and selection of the right quality of officer. Furthermore it is suggested below that quality invariably means better educated.<sup>4</sup>

"There is of course one vital pre-condition to any raising of levels and understanding in police and that is the recruitment of young men and women with the necessary academic achievement and learning potential."

Police professionals imply that high quality is associated with better education. Furthermore it is also implied that once the right quality of officer has been selected attention needs to be paid to training.<sup>5</sup>

"If the police are to play an expanding role, at least in quality, the training of officers as it stands today will need to be questioned."

In addition to recruitment and selection then attention needs to be paid to basic training which is the institutional site for stressing ethical concepts of police behaviour.<sup>6</sup>

"The basic training of all officers should stress ethical concepts of police behaviour being concerned as this is with the exercise of power and its application, moral as well as legal principles should bind the recruit to the task."

An important pre-condition of police impartiality is the recruitment and selection of better personnel as well as improved training which it is the role of police professionals to ensure.<sup>7</sup>

"To give the public opportunity to satisfy itself of our willingness to be accountable and the effectiveness of our collective measures."

Hence for police professionals police accountability means that police must strengthen public trust in them by maintaining impartiality by recruiting better personnel and improved training.

In what follows then I shall be concerned to examine the validity of the assertions outlined above by locating such claims in an analysis of the history of the British police during the 20th century; where ongoing police problems with the public are punctuated with claims to reform. To anticipate; many of the attempts to 'improve' such relations focus on public unrest at police practices and an apparent failure to control unlawful police behaviour. The solutions to this since 1917 to the present day have often been held by police professionals to consist of improved recruitment, selection and training. This assumes that the orientation of police professionals is significantly different from that of their subordinates such that police leaders are properly selected and trained; yet all of the claims made by police professionals to reform the police fail to explain why such attempts are subverted in reality. Indeed what we observe during the development of the police in the 20th century is not only a recurring concern with the standards

of the police rank and file but also with police leaders. Early frustrations at a local level resulted in central initiatives involving a recurring interest in gaining not only better educated police recruits and improving training but also better leaders. Thus the claim by some police professionals that ongoing problems between the police and the public emanate from a 'gap' between the poor standards of some subordinates and those of their senior officers is seen by some British criminologists to be an assumption which ignores the orientation of police leaders. (8).

Given the implication that the above issues are manifest in the process of police development my aim now shall be to examine the efficacy of the claims cited through an episodic look at the history of the British police during the 20th century. I begin with the condition of the police at the turn of the century.

Given the widespread discontent prevailing at the turn of the century it should not be surprising that the police were far from isolated from social relations they were employed to control, though their loyalty appears to have generally been taken for granted. The average constable, paid little more than an agricultural labourer in the 1850's became the equal of a skilled worker in the 1890's and by the beginning of the century a policeman had a secure job, a faint chance of a pension and paid holidays and sick leave. But declines also occurred when inflation eroded the value of police pay, exacerbating basic unrest associated with conditions.

The tensions developing in the police culminated in the police strikes. In 1872 and 1890 minor strikes occurred in the Metropolitan Police which warned the authorities that all was not well. To the police who complained of long hours and poor conditions trade unionism at that time appears to have been appealing. The strike of 1872 was primarily over

the right to confer over their grievances which was being denied by the authorities. This was prominent again in the strike in the Metropolitan area in 1890, but at the time of the First World War more general conditions of service were at issue. In the years immediately before the First World War the demand for the right to confer, which meant combining in a trade union, was still being refused by the government locked in troubles with strikers. It seems to have been the worst time in the view of the government to run risks with the loyalty of the police.

However the police refused to accept that they should be excluded from collective bargaining. During the year their discontent increased. Apparently angered by inflation, the dismissal of an officer for taking part in union activities and the silence of the government to their demands, a nationwide police strike ensued just before the end of the First World War. The upshot of this was that the government was unprepared. Conscious of the implications of the recent Russian Revolution and preoccupied with the War effort the government conceded an immediate increase in pay but not unionism. But the police returned to work.

Discontent appears to have remained with some officers, particularly the government's failure to acknowledge a police union. With this in mind in 1919 some of the police struck again but they appear to have lacked the active support of the majority of their colleagues who were apparently grateful for the financial award promised by the authorities. Thus 2,364 strikers were immediately sacked and never reinstated. The promised pay rise was rushed out of the Desborough Committee on the Police Service, set up in 1918 to look into certain questions of

recruitment, organisation, pay, housing and allowances. (10). More importantly for us, since discontent in the police at this time is not our present concern, is the identification by the Desborough Committee of a contributory factor leading to the strikes; i.e. a falling off in educational standards in men coming forward as recruits for some years before the war. The remedy to this was seen by the Committee as compulsory training similar to that obtaining in the army. This it was held should be combined with learning law and England's history and constitution. In conjunction with this the Committee was concerned that by 1919 policework seemed to be more demanding than ever before requiring higher qualifications. As a consequence they were in no doubt that the police were suffering from their lowly origin since there was no comparison between what was expected of policemen in 1919 and policemen of old.

Accepting the logic of this, the Committee recommended that the pay and conditions of service of all police forces should be improved, standardised and placed under the control of the Home Secretary. The Committee was therefore dismayed that there existed no common standards, no direction from the centre and no special police department at the Home Office. They therefore recommended an integrated system, rather than a collection of separate forces each concerned with its merely local requirements and personnel. This should include raising the standards of the police to a professional level; improved and more systematic arrangements for training, a uniformed discipline code and the transfer of powers of appointment, promotion and discipline in borough forces from the Watch Committee to the Chief Constable. (11).

The Desborough Committee was clear that channels of communication between the Home Office and all ranks of the force should be established



but it left the details to be negotiated after it had reported. As a result the Police Council and the police Federation was set up under the Police Act, 1919. The same Act prohibited the organisation of a trade union in the police and laid down heavy penalties for anyone who sought to raise disaffection in their ranks. The Police Federation was expressly forbidden to associate with the T.U.C. or to discuss questions of discipline or promotion.

The new developments gave greater powers to the Home Office to enforce uniform standards. Local differences appear to have remained but the national framework of police administration was no longer designed to encourage them. Thus between the wars the police consolidated their internal procedures and practices. Uniform standards for recruitment and conditions of service were formalised under Home Office supervision in over 200 police forces.

Between the wars also public complaints of corrupt and oppressive police conduct led to the appointment of a Royal Commission on the Police in 1929 concerned to inquire into illegal police practices. (12). The Commission's terms of reference covered the administration of the Judges Rules, a code to regulate the conduct of police interrogation arising from public complaints at police methods in 1912 and subsequently modified and amplified by administrative directions from the Home Office made with the approval of the Lord Chief Justice. The

The Commission remarked;<sup>13</sup>

"The police in exercising their functions are to a peculiar degree dependent upon the goodwill of the general public and the utmost discretion must be exercised by them to avoid overstepping the limited powers which they possess. A proper and mutual understanding between the police and the public is essential for the maintenance of law and order."

Yet something was wrong. Though the Royal Commission of 1929 recognised the importance of establishing a warm relationship it was unable to establish how it was to be achieved. Public opinion condemned the police and by 1931 morale in the Metropolitan Police was low.

With a view to instilling discipline the government appointed Lord Trenchard who became Commissioner in 1931. More importantly and at variance with the assumptions of police professionals who see the police rank and file as primarily responsible for police problems with the public, Trenchard decided that one of the main troubles was a lack of effective leadership. The police were paying the penalty for keeping faith for 100 years with Sir Robert Peel's principle that vacancies in the higher ranks should be filled from below. The urgent need in Trenchard's view was for 'officer material' and the result was the establishment, in 1934, of the Hendon Metropolitan Police College. The first course lasted for twelve months but by 1938 the length had been increased to two years. Though the scheme went a long way towards anticipating the establishment of a National Police College in 1947, the value of the Trenchard scheme was never really tested as it was closed at the outbreak of war. At the time the Home Office had reservations, fearing it would divide the Metropolitan Police into officers and other ranks. The Police Federation attacked the scheme as elitist and several Labour MPs denounced Trenchard's reforms as class measures and militarism.

Nevertheless it seems that by the end of the thirties most forces

were convinced of the need for some training to be undertaken on a co-operative basis for all ranks. Many appear to have developed their own arrangements since a national framework had still not been established. The groundwork for the development of standardised regional training arrangements and the establishment of a national police college was thus laid in the inter war years, the rest was delayed until 1947.

Recruitment to the police was suspended during the war and in order to train the abnormally high intake of recruits in the immediate post war period a temporary training centre was set up in each of the eight districts covered by the District Conferences of Chief Constables, with a parallel establishment for the Metropolitan Police at Hendon.<sup>14</sup> The Post War Committee of 1944, set up by the Home Secretary, (consisting of Chief Constables and representative of the Home Office) recommended that these arrangements should become permanent. This was an advance on earlier attitudes towards the systematic training of the police. Pre war arrangements were haphazard; the Desborough Committee recommended the appointment of a training officer to each force, but many of the smaller forces were unable to spare a policeman solely for this duty and co-operative arrangements were common. Immediately before the war about forty forces maintained training schools, the size of which varied from force to force and most recruits attended one of these schools for about three months. Few were residential and the method and quality of training varied widely. In addition four Detective Training Schools were established before the war. They reopened soon afterwards.

Thus the establishment after the war of eight district training centres amounted to a fresh start.<sup>15</sup> They were provided by the Home

Office under common service arrangements and each was managed by a committee representing the Police Authorities in the catchment area.<sup>16</sup> A committee of Chief Constables recommended the appointment of the Commandant and other senior officers and approved the syllabus of instruction. These arrangements have continued until quite recently. A general oversight of all the arrangements is maintained by the Central Conference of Chief Constables. For much of this post war period recruits attended an initial course of 13 weeks, intended to give them all round instruction in the duties of a police officer. In addition a recruit's training is continued in the home force, complemented until recently by two returns to the training centre; for two weeks at the end of the first year and again at the end of the probationary period of two years. Specialist Training (for example in criminal investigation or driving) is given by schools maintained by a few of the larger forces.

However the ending of war saw a revival of interest in the standards and training of police subordinates and also in the quality of police leaders. Hence the issue of higher police training was revived in the Report in 1947 of the Committee on Higher Training for the Police Service in England and Wales, which recommended that further provision was needed for the higher and specialist training of the police, modelled on Sandhurst, Dartmouth, Woolwich and Cranwell for military officers.<sup>17</sup> They recommended the establishment of a police college for men destined for high rank. This, unlike the Trenchard scheme, was to be the first national as opposed to regional venture. In June, 1948 the college opened at Ryton-on-Dunsmore, Warwickshire and moved to Bramshill House, Hartley Witney in 1960.

The above events appear to have emerged at a time which once

again gave rise to growing concern about police morale and with it the issue of their standards and efficiency. Once again the police emerged from a major war to find the purchasing power of their pay reduced in comparison to other workers. It seems that as the 1940s wore on there arose considerable discontent in the police service and a growing problem of recruitment, premature wastage and standards. Faced with mounting discontent in the police, an emerging worry over rising crime and traffic, criticism in parliament and a series of problems of inadequate recruitment the government instituted an independent review in May, 1948 under the Chairmanship of Lord Oaksey.<sup>18</sup> The Oaksey Committee commented that the police service depends for its reputation and efficiency upon the character and ability of the ordinary constables who walk the beat. No matter how brilliantly qualified a cadre of officers produced at the police college might be, this could be no compensation for any falling off in the quality of the constable.

The Oaksey Committee regarded the rate of resignations as serious and the retention of serving policemen, especially in the middle years of their service, as the crux of the matter. Moreover, increases in rates of pay introduced in 1946 and higher levels of rent allowances seem to have had no significant effect upon rates of recruiting and resignations. The Committee noted the police appeared to have great difficulty in keeping recruits. Between 1927 and 1939 over one third of police officers withdrew prematurely. But Oaksey, while interested in falling police standards, refused to follow the example of Desborough in 1919 and give the police any great advantage compared to the industrial average. This was partly due to the government's first pay freeze which coincided with the Committee's meetings. Oaksey also attached great importance to the allowances and other hidden benefits of police work, especially the pension. Part II of the Report turned its attention to the matter of police discontent and rank and file

militancy. While Oaksey recommended some considerable advances in the Police Federations status as a bargaining body with proper negotiating machinery, it's power was still to be considerably restricted in comparison with other trade unions. Thus their report rejected the Federation on the grounds that this would introduce a disruptive influence into the service.

The police for their part continued to be dissatisfied with their lot. There was increasing concern among the police and the authorities over rising crime and public disorder. What was subsequently to surface was a growing concern in the press about the state of relations between the police and the public. In conjunction with the latter was a series of incidents involving the state of relations between the police and the public. These also cast doubt on the adequacy of the means of bringing the police to account and on the validity of some long held assumptions about the relations between Chief Constables and Police Authorities. Associated with the above there was a growing sense of frustration among members of parliament at their inability to raise on the floor of the House of Commons matters concerning provincial police forces. Last and more importantly perhaps the problems alluded to with the police at this time referred to inadequate police leaders rather than their subordinates, a concern which begins to question the position of police professionals as to the root of the policing problem being at the base rather than the apex.

Thus the first of the incidents referred to occurred in 1956, when disciplinary action was taken against the Chief Constable of Cardiganshire following allegations that his force was not being properly administered. In the following year criminal proceedings were taken against the Chief Constable of Brighton and senior members of his force. Soon afterwards the then Chief Constable of Worcester was convicted of

fraud and sentenced to imprisonment. Then in 1957 allegations were made in parliament that a boy in the Scottish town of Thurso had been assaulted by police and that the complaint had not been properly investigated. Then came yet another incident resulting in the suspension of the Chief Constable of Nottingham by the Watch Committee. The Home Secretary subsequently reversed this decision and reinstated the Chief Constable. But the incident had focussed attention on the problems of police accountability. These issues shook public confidence in police accountability, their constitutional position in the State and the adequacy of dealing with complaints. This in turn included renewed interest in the standards of recruits, training, discipline, leadership and organisation. As a consequence in 1959 there was set up a Royal Commission on the police which published its final report in 1962. (19).

Though the Commission was primarily concerned with public complaints and thereby the nature of police accountability - rationalised via the Police Act, 1964 by shifting the balance of power in favour of Chief Constables and the Home Secretary while still retaining a tripartite structure - the standards of police personnel were also under review. The police, the Commission held, were not only failing to attract an adequate number of efficient policemen but also sufficient young men of such ability and educational attainments as would fit them in due course to occupy the highest posts in the service. On the one hand therefore the Commission recommended the introduction of a standard test for all recruits throughout the country while on the other hand the Commission turned its attention to the need to recruit and train better educated people for the role of future

leaders. In so doing the Commission alluded to a remedy proposed in a Report on Police Training in England and Wales published in 1961. They endorsed the recommendation of one course at the police college for sergeants and one for inspectors and above lasting six and three months respectively; as well as a special course for constables who would be promotable to sergeants at the end.<sup>20</sup> Thus the Commission echoed some of the suggestions made in the 1920's, and particularly the opinions of Trenchard in 1932 in as much as current problems between the police and the public, including the issue of police efficiency, appear to have been seen as importantly influenced by the police failing to attract and rapidly promote better educated personnel. Hence it appears that the rationale associated with the above recommendations was the assertion that it is;<sup>21</sup>

"important that police should be seen to offer attractive prospects to recruits of good quality and to ensure that appointments to the highest posts in the police are made from those who by training and experience are best qualified to hold them."

In addition since the Commission were also concerned with police relations with the public generally they recommended greater efforts be made in training police in public relations such as police visiting schools. The Commission also sought to enhance relations with the public by appointing more special constables and appointing solicitors to prosecute offenders; roles which if continued to be performed by police might damage their image.

Some eighteen months after the Royal Commission reported the government introduced its Police Bill in November, 1963, which embodied many of the matters already mentioned above. This not only included strengthening the powers of the Home Secretary to co-ordinate, and, when necessary, amalgamate police forces, but also the Bill gave



statutory recognition to the police college and district police training centres developed in the past decades. Moreover the Bill also included proposals for dealing with complaints against the police by empowering a chief officer of police to call upon an officer of another force to investigate complaints, with the proviso that the Home Secretary could ensure that this was done.

Though many of the above matters raised by the Royal Commission and incorporated in the Police Bill subsequently became law in the form of the Police Act, 1964 other issues raised by the Royal Commission were not so incorporated but nevertheless seem to have recurred as issues in policing and worked their way through to police policy.<sup>22</sup> Consequently in 1963 the Police Council on Higher Police Training recommended a six months course at the Police College for inspectors and above, while Working Parties on Police Manpower, Equipment and Efficiency in 1967 also examined the standards of police personnel.<sup>23</sup> In conjunction with this the police were seen by the Royal Commission to be short of men, equipment and buildings. Police pay at a time of rising national wages was constantly under discussion. Moreover at a time perceived by the police and the Commission to be one of growing pressure on the police, increases in manpower alone seems to have been regarded as insufficient to combat crime. In the interests of efficiency greater specialisation, better equipment, training and larger units of operation were all to the fore in the Commission's Report. As a result, the Working Parties of 1967 sought a more efficient system of policing, closer contact with the public, a better flow of information to the centre, a more 'interesting' job for the ordinary policeman than traditional beat patrolling had been able to offer, and a significant saving in manpower.

More importantly however was the fact that yet again the issue of

the standards of police personnel was revived, as well as the impartiality of men recruited, and, with this, the quality of future leaders. As a result the conclusions of the Working Party on Manpower included the suggestion that police could ameliorate their personnel problems by modifying their physical requirements for recruits to attract the better educated. In addition the Working Party on Efficiency included the suggestion that as far as management problems were concerned subordinate training during the officers probationary period should be reviewed, while higher training should include greater collaboration with University Management Centres at a local level.

Also concerned with falling standards at a time of rising affluence and crime the Working Party on Recruitment of People with Higher Educational Qualifications in 1967 held, firstly, that better people are attracted by higher pay, secondly, that promotion should be more easily available, and thirdly, that a special course at the police college could accelerate this possibility without the necessity to sit internalexams for inspector. And last, that up to 20 graduates a year should be selected nationally by a procedure similar to the existing interview for the special course so that two years service on the beat would suffice, provided they passed the sergeants exam.<sup>24</sup> Nevertheless the findings of the Royal Commission and the initiatives which appear to have flowed from it, particularly continued arrangements for the investigation of complaints against the police by the police, were met with scepticism in some quarters. Problems in the relations between the police and the public continued and there was a substantial body of opinion, reflected in the press and in parliament, which held that any system under which the police continued to be judges of their own cause was intrinsically defective. Moreover the above view gained

support from the handling of a case in Sheffield in which two policemen were found guilty of seriously assaulting prisoners in their custody. The officers were dismissed and appealed to the Home Secretary against their punishment. A subsequent inquiry established beyond doubt not only that they had been guilty of violence but that the inquiry into the allegations against them, which had been conducted by senior members of the force, had not uncovered the truth. In the event the Chief Constable and other members of the force resigned. Thus once again the suggestion made by some senior police officers at the outset of this chapter that a 'gap' exists between the 'professional' standards of senior police officers and the standards of their subordinates appears to be subverted by instances of public dissatisfaction with the conduct of very senior police officer as well. In the wake of the above events, inquiries into the way in which the police had investigated several specific complaints followed, and this provided further material for public debate of the way in which complaints were handled.

The first change was introduced in the Metropolitan Police by Sir Robert Mark after he became Commissioner in 1972. Dealing in the need to promote public confidence in the force he subsequently wrote,<sup>25</sup>

"Our effectiveness depends greatly on the extent to which we can achieve the trust of the courts, the press and the public. This in turn depends on our willingness to be accountable and to deal effectively with our own wrong doers. It is essential also that this willingness be made clear to the public."

Consequently the Commissioner set up a new branch, A10, to deal specifically with complaints and placed it under the direct control of the Deputy Commissioner. He also integrated the C.I.D. with the uniformed divisions, seeing job rotation as a panacea to alleged

illegitimate police behaviour.

However, these measures in London were followed by further complaints about the police method of handling complaints and a Home Office working party, comprising police authorities and representatives of all ranks of the police was set up as a consequence. The result of this was a Police Bill introduced into the House of Commons at the end of 1975. It provided for a Police Complaints Board to which Chief Constables would be required to send complaints unless investigation had resulted in disciplinary or (following reference to the Director of Public Prosecutions) criminal proceedings. The board would have power to order a Chief Constable to prefer disciplinary charges, or it could direct that they should be determined by a tribunal consisting of the Chief Constable and two members of the board. Against opposition from the Police Federation, the Bill became law in the form of the Police Act, 1976.

For all this against a backdrop of student movements, the anti-Vietnam campaigns and growing black protest, relations with the public continued to worry the police;<sup>26</sup>

"National prosperity and improved social conditions had, contrary to earlier assumptions, led to a situation in which crime appeared to flourish. ... In some areas the streets seemed to become almost as unsafe as they had been in the eighteenth century."

These clashes with the public, many of whom were young people, also added to the deterioration in relations between the police and the public as well as criticism of the police in the press.

As a consequence of growing tension, particularly amongst black people, the Select Committee on Race Relations and Police Immigrant Relations of 1970-2, while identifying the cause of unrest as a lack of 'amenities' in the inner city area concluded that the solution lay partly with community leaders who could do more to build good

communications between the authorities and the black community, but more importantly they advised that better training for the police lower ranks could overcome police misunderstanding responsible for illegitimate police practices.<sup>27</sup> This programme of education included the issue of a booklet to all police officers about the backgrounds of immigrant communities, the reasons why they came to this country, their cultures, religions and attitudes and an outline of immigrant laws.

In the interests of equality before the law it was the view of the Select Committee that all of this should include a more flexible type of training and keeping officers up to date at all stages of their careers. Not only was there an apparent need for 'attitude' training for the rank and file but in order that police represent the community as a whole then recruitment of coloured police officers to the force, to the Special Constabulary and as traffic wardens should be encouraged. To overcome distortion due to poor communications special merit and allowances were recommended to those officers becoming proficient in Asian languages and all forces whose members were likely to have contact with Asians should make provision for all officers to learn a few simple words of Hindi and Urdu. The committee also recommended that police forces should seek the co-operation of community relations councils and immigrant organisations in drawing up lists of official interpreters.

Also in the interests of bridging the gap between the police and minorities all police forces were advised by the Committee to immediately make widely available 'clear' concise pamphlets in English and Asian languages about the police role and functions. This it was held should include information about making complaints against the police and the equal rights of blacks on arrest or at a police station, in appropriate languages.

The Committee thus saw the key to the public complaints about the police in a similar way to public inquiries before them in the illegitimate practices of junior police officers, as well as misunderstanding on both sides due to differences in outlook, culture, language and the like requiring better training and communications.

In conjunction with the above were further developments arising from public discontent with the police in the form of a Working Party set up in 1970 to review the training given to the police during the first two years of service. This resulted in Home Office Circular No.94 via the Report of the Police Training Council, 1973. They recommended a pilot training programme based on a radically different curriculum. Henceforth it was held desirable attitudes should be inculcated in recruits geared to the practical demands of their future job of operational beat duties. This in turn would be aimed to build up a recruit's self confidence and practical 'common-sense' in a way that should enable him or her to deal properly with members of the public. In sum, the course would give every recruit a social understanding of the role of the police in British Society. The result of the above was the drawing up of a job specification by a study of the knowledge, skills and attitudes required. For this purpose there followed a programme of fieldwork involving interviews with probationary constables and supervisors. From this the consultants employed in the study deduced a scheme of priorities; present training, the Home Office Circular points out, was found to be seriously inadequate. This study which took twelve months also included senior police officers and training centre commandants.

As a result the Committee's conclusions, which included the recommendation that basic training courses should be shortened to ten weeks from thirteen, returned as those before them to the issue of

police impartiality. In so doing the Committee stressed that in future more attention should be given in police training to police/public relations rather than a detailed knowledge of law and militarism. These recommendations were not unopposed. The military content was held to be important by Senior Police Officers on the Committee, for tradition, smartness and popularity with recruits.

This report was soon followed by that of the Working Party on Police Probationer Training with a similar theme. Given the logic that poor relationships with the public rested on the standards of subordinates, this working party recommended a more intimate relationship in police training, lacking in the past. To this end it was asserted that tutorials be introduced together with easier multi choice questions in exams and questionnaires for student feedback. In conjunction with this the committee also recommended smaller classes and greater allowances for revision in police time. All this was to be directed to breaking down rigid attitudes in the interests of impartial instruction. The Regional Training Centres were now to encourage discussion groups and project work in place of pendentism and militarism. Finally, with such problems in mind, it was asserted that mixing a wide range of Instructors was beneficial to enriching experience, improving training and great participation.

A similar review led to the introduction of new courses of three weeks duration for training newly promoted inspectors. Again a survey was mounted by a research team of inspectors' duties and their training needs and the new arrangements were brought into operation in 1976. These arrangements involved the decentralisation of inspector training from the police college to a local level. In an attempt to give every inspector the same training as that formerly enjoyed by a few selected to attend Bramshill Police College, regional

training centres were established; considerable emphasis was placed on a more sensitive style of management, evidenced by the addition of the human sciences laid down in the curriculum.

For all that, parallel to these developments, by 1970 discontent in the police over rising crime, public disorder, poor police recruitment, pay and high wastage was considerably heightened. Consequently it was during this period that the Expenditure Committee on Police Recruitment and Wastage was initiated.<sup>28</sup> The Committee reported in 1975 when unemployment was rising and police recruitment improving, but the Police Federation, representing the lower ranks of the police, was exerting increasing demands for the police as morally justified by the growing danger and difficulty of policework and resentment at the efforts of liberalising legal reforms of politicians. The Committee noted that police pay was under review and 16.7 per cent had already been granted. However, since the Committee still viewed police recruitment as giving cause for concern, the government accepted the Committee's recommendation that the armed forces experience in recruitment could prove valuable in the field of police recruitment. Consequently this was followed by advertising campaigns such as 'The Police is one of the very few Professions'.

More importantly however, like other inquiries before them, the Committee also addressed the issue of the standards of police leaders and in so doing once again problematises the suggestion of a 'gap' existing between higher and lower ranks in the police implied by police professionals. Thus given the authorities recurring concern with public discontent with police inability to police themselves, the Committee recommended training police leaders to represent a better image of the police on television. In conjunction with this the



Committee also stated that more vigorous efforts should be made in the interests of impartial leadership to recruit graduates. To this end the graduate entry scheme, introduced in 1968, should continue to expand. It was also stated that graduates entering the police should be offered better pay and the minimum age on entry should be lowered from 19 to 18.5 years to boost recruitment, particularly among the better educated.

For all that police problems with the public continued to be punctuated with familiar themes. Against a backdrop of economic crisis, labour discontent and the authorities concern over law and order, particularly in the inner city areas, continued relations between the police and people in such areas appears to have taken a decisive turn for the worse. This involved football fans as well as black youth objecting to police 'brutality' and stop and search methods, and to unnecessary detention and interrogation. One consequence of this was the Royal Commission, 1977, on Criminal Procedure (which influenced the enactment of the Police and Criminal Evidence Act, 1984). The Commission's interests once more included suggestions that the rank and file of the police were arbitrarily dealing with people. The Commission's proposed sanctions were a combination of better record keeping, more vigilant internal discipline, the automatic exclusion of evidence obtained through violence, or inhuman or degrading treatment and warnings to the jury on relying on other evidence obtained in breach of the Judges' Rules.<sup>29</sup>

However amid rising unemployment the above developments were soon followed by further well publicised events and allegations of illegal police behaviour involving rioting of ethnic groups in Bristol and later, not for the first time, Brixton. In Bristol in face of widespread black anger, riot and looting, the police withdrew. Similar

instances occurred as well in Brixton, Manchester and Liverpool though without police withdrawing. The Brixton incident resulted in the Scarman inquiry. Widespread allegations of police abuse, particularly due to young inexperienced, as opposed to older, officers acting illegally, were alleged. As a consequence police managers at the Scarman inquiry continue to hold that poor recruits and training contributed to the above events. As one journalist commented on the evidence given to the Scarman inquiry by the Police Superintendents' Association,<sup>30</sup>

"Most police officers who have daily contact with the community are 'ill prepared' to deal with the problems they face, says the Police Superintendents' Association, 'It is no wonder that mistakes are made through ignorance and lack of confidence' ... 'in addition to attitudes and deployment, most important in our view is the training - or lack of it - afforded to police officers', says the Association. ... 'It has been the considered and often expressed view of this Association that the vast majority of officers who have daily contact with the community are ill prepared to deal with the many and varied problems they will encounter. After only 10 or 12 weeks from being an electrician, schoolteacher, plumber, clerk or whatever, he is expected to act, often alone, and make decisions of considerable importance to individuals' ... The Association says this could have been a contributory factor in the riots and adds that it is essential for police training to be improved. 'Not only the initial training, but the on the job instruction which in itself, will shield the raw recruit from too many difficulties early in his service' it adds."

Once more then yet another inquiry into the police included in its conclusions that relations between the police and the public had been exacerbated by the standards of subordinate police officers at variance with the ethos of their leaders.<sup>31</sup> Thus the Scarman Report, 1981 tended to reject criticism of senior police officers seeing the racial prejudice, lack of discretion, inflexibility and harrassment on the part of constables and their immediate supervisors as partly to blame for problems with the immigrant community. Consequently Lord Scarman recommended that the police should recruit more immigrants

and also employ more scientific methods in recruiting to improve standards and screen out prejudice. Furthermore Scarman also recommended that the training of officers should include more community relations and awareness of ethnic groups as well as attaching new officers to more experienced men to learn from them.

However, at the same time as relations between the police and the public were deteriorating in the late 1970's the Commissioner of the Metropolitan Police at that time, David Macnee, himself responded to criticism by commissioning the Policy Studies Institute in 1979 to examine relations between the police and public in London. Here too, the area of recruitment, selection and training were included in the study as well as matters involving career development such as promotion. Moreover this research which was published in 1983 partly echoes the suggestions mentioned earlier on recruitment and training of subordinates seeing the writing ability of young recruits as suspect and suggesting that officers recruited may be too young. In addition however, it also seems to have been suggested that those engaged in recruiting were not only failing to conform to the Sexual Equality Act but also lacking enough 'facts' to make an unbiased selection of recruits which the approach taken by the study was designed to ameliorate. Secondly, basic training was also criticised since the researchers were of the opinion that basic training was not integrated with actual police work and that this was more important than the content and methods of the initial course. In sum then, one element of the Policy Studies Research amounts to the suggestion that the police have failed to systematise their collective experience; this was typified for the researchers by their observation that little recognition is given to practical experience in police promotion in the Metropolitan Police. For them subordinate discontent derives in part from a failure of senior officers to link performance with rewards.<sup>32</sup>

In addition to the above it appears that accepting Lord Scarman's suggestion that a gap exists between the subculture of subordinate police ranks and their senior officers which contributed to recent conflict, senior officers (in the Metropolitan Police) have recently asserted once again that recruits should be given more community relations training. This has achieved concrete expression via the promotion of further research into this area, which is being conducted through the Police Foundation.<sup>33</sup> The interim findings of the researchers appear to suggest that more human awareness training should be introduced in the basic training curriculum of recruits for the Metropolitan Police, a shortage of which appears to be seen once again as an important contributory factor to the creation of a gap between subordinate officers and the aims of their superiors which lead to recurring problems with the public.

In sum then, throughout the 20th century the authorities and many senior police officers have recurrently implied that a gap exists between the standards of senior police officers and those of their subordinates held responsible for problems with the public. Contrary to the view of police professionals however the above review also instances complaints which suggest that far from police problems emanating from a gap between divergent police subcultures, both senior and junior police officers share a similar perspective and that actually the process of interaction between the views held by all police officers and the law accounts ultimately for how police behave. As one ex police officer puts the issue when writing to the national press on the Report of the Royal Commission on Police Powers mentioned above;<sup>34</sup>

"As a former police officer I have been following with interest the various articles and comments about the Report on Police Powers, the Criminal Attempts Bill and other statutes. It comes clear to me that many pressure groups and interested parties are missing the essential point, namely; 'If an officer thinks you are guilty or

at it, then he'll find something to charge you with' ... This great furor about 'cus' is wasted energy because under Section 2, Criminal Law Act, 1967 a constable may arrest any person ... he suspects to be about to commit an arrestable offence ... Whether or not certain powers exist the police stop and search people for offensive weapons, they set up road blocks, and no doubt many readers have been stopped in such a way ... believe me from experience there is a statute to fit almost any situation encountered by the police ... More concern should be devoted to the constable ... ensuring he is possessed of a sense of fair play. The latter can only be instilled by the constables' teachers and their senior officers and in my humble opinion that is where the problem lies ... Why aren't the senior officers succeeding in this matter?"

According to the above then while police professionals continue to maintain that police problems with the public tend to emanate from the standards of some police subordinates, the above writer raises the issue of the law as well as police organisation and policy. This is to say that if the law on criminal procedure does not set a rigid standard of legality from which police deviate but provides a licence to ignore it, then this may raise some fundamental questions about the ideology and structure of law inhibiting reform, such that the type of personnel involved in the police may make little difference. This then sets the scene for what follows where I shall be concerned to examine the competing assertions of police professionals and their opponents beginning with a review of the sociological literature applicable to police professionalism.

CHAPTER TWO

THEORETICAL ORIENTATION

This chapter will be concerned to develop further the historical examination of police professionalism outlined in Chapter One by means of a review of the sociological literature on the police relevant to the debate on police professionalism. This review will be conducted using 3 ideal types, the better to highlight my central concerns, rather than to exhaustively examine the literature. The first type includes those sociologists whose work can be said, broadly, to locate recurring police problems with the public in the orientation of the rank and file; who suggest that such problems as persist in relations between the police and the public tend to emanate from a 'gap' between the poor standards of police subordinates and the professionalism of their senior officers. According to this view the 'gap' mentioned is due to the subculture of the police rank and file at odds with the standards of their senior officers.

Secondly, I shall review the counter-type which includes the work of those scholars who suggest that there is no gap between senior police officers and their subordinates. According to this view the activities of subordinate police officers in different geographical areas is subject to the imposition of different policies of senior officers, the product of the political complexion of the respective communities being policed. Third, there is the view that is critical of both of the above. This includes the work of the radical criminologists for whom the police can never represent consensus in a class society in which the state is seen unambiguously as a weapon wielded by the powerful. The state is thus perceived as an organ of class rule. An organ for the oppression of one class by another.

When the above review has been completed my aim shall be to suggest that all of the above positions though dominant in current

debates on policing advance a view of professionalism inadequate for an analysis of the specific practices of the police in relation to the social structure because they lack a sufficient concept of the state. First then I shall suggest that an analysis of the relationship between senior police officers and the law is needed which may reveal that discrimination is embedded in the 'objective' rationality of the state in class society, which makes possible the acceptance of certain 'rationalisations' which are a pre-condition of becoming a successful police officer. Secondly and connected to the above, such an analysis could also reveal that there is no significant difference in the rationale of the division of labour between senior and junior police officers which could explain police conflict with the public; and that in actuality there is a high degree of consonance between the rationality of the law and the reasoning of both senior and junior police officers, which those seeking to 'reform' the police do not understand.

The work of Maureen Cain is an early example of empirical research on the police in England and Wales, (1). She was interested in the determinants of police behaviour. She compared beat work in rural communities with that in the city. As a result Cain concluded that in rural areas the community tended to define the officers role but in urban areas the police rank and file tended to exert this influence. Hence (M. E. Cain, 1971, P.95):

"Policemen, or uniformed beat men at least, emerge from this analysis as part of a highly integrated group which has built up a considerable number of shared definitions of situations and standards of behaviour and which has mechanisms whereby it can resist change and indoctrinate new recruits... it is certain that the police control very closely the ways in which the 'rough' are defined; and this inhibits exploration which could break down the stereotype..."

Hence the situation defined by Cain is of a highly integrated



group informally resisting senior officers. The power of the colleague group stemmed from its control over the channels of upward communication. Tasks in the main were not delegated downwards but initiated by patrolmen. Finally, Cain writes of the rank and file 'subculture' (M.E. Cain, 1971, p.93).

"Given that the interpersonal relationships with the public constitutes a set of craft skills rather than universally applicable principles the recruit can pick up tips about his work only by watching his older colleagues ... Initiation of recruits into the various malpractices was a gradual affair."

But Cain speculated that the introduction of technology into the police may have undermined her thesis of a deviant subordinate subculture by facilitating greater central control. These comments on technology have been refuted more recently in England by Holdaway who writes of the continued cultural gap between senior officers and lower ranks, in spite of technological change (S. Holdaway, 1979, p.7).

"The continuing problem for the senior officer is how to attempt to control the lower ranks as far as possible ... Professionalism is the organisational reality of senior and chief officers, it clashes with the highly practical and contingent definitions of lower ranks."

In an earlier work, in elaborating on this cultural gap, Holdaway distinguishes between managerial professionalism and practical professionalism (S. Holdaway, 1977). The former is represented by community relations, training and the policy statements of the police high command. This, according to Holdaway, is the public face of policing nurtured by senior officers and Home Office. But Holdaway also maintains there is practical professionalism which remains a series of subcultural hedonistic activities and values practiced by lower ranks. This includes the rise of the 'car cult' as well as communications, which has increased the hedonistic activities of rank and file officers. Holdaway sees foot patrols and panda car drivers

practicing practical professionalism of real police work. According to Holdaway such specialisation restricts links between the police and the community and prevents the development of a more accountable or sensitive police service. Both aspects permit the continuance of autonomy in the lower ranks of the police.

Also focussing on the determinants of the behaviour of the lower ranks of the police and by implication of a gap between the ranks, Chatterton refers to the overwhelming desire of the policeman to avoid 'trouble' in respect of relationships between the police and various audiences. As Chatterton points out; the uniformed policeman (or his C.I.D. equivalent) can never be sure that any action he takes will prove to be 'trouble free'. This stems in part from the fact that he can rarely be certain that he has correctly assessed the circumstances of an incident and the parties to it (M.R. Chatterton, 1976, P.116).

"it is this combination of factors which motivates policemen in the lower echelons to attempt to control the information about themselves which passes up the communications system to their superiors...Only information which cannot damage their reputation is allowed to reach the higher echelons."

A similar focus on a 'gap' between senior officers and lower ranks due to differences in culture is also apparent in other works on the police, particularly in the U.S.A. Thus Neiderhoffer and Blumberg write of the cynicism and resentment of police patrolmen in the U.S.A. towards their 'better educated' professionalising senior officers (A. Neiderhoffer and A.S. Blumberg, 1973, P11). While Skolnick in an early work writes of the resentment of lower ranks towards community relations programmes, seeing the efforts of their Chief and the newly established Police Community Relations Unit as social work undercutting their basic conception of the police role as strong, aggressive, masculine hunters (J. Skolnick, 1968, PP 3-28).

Werthman and Piliavin focus on the subcultural influences effecting lower ranks in the police in the U.S.A. (C. Werthman and I. Piliavin, 1967). They claim that patrolmen employ a method of pragmatic induction; accepting that more crimes are committed in the poorer sections of town than in wealthier areas the police divide the population and physical territory under observation into a variety of categories. They make some initial assumptions about the moral character of the people and places in these categories and then focus attention on those categories of persons and places felt to have the shadiest moral characters.

In sum therefore the literature reviewed so far tends to locate the source of recurring police problems with the public in the form of a subordinate subculture deviating from the law and police managers. They tend to reduce police behaviour to the values of subordinates. In so doing police behaviour is seen in isolation from wider influences. Such researchers and police managers therefore presume that a difference exists between the values of their senior officers and society. It should of course be added, by way of a reminder, that this has not been an exhaustive but simply an indicative review. Others, such as Manning and Chatterton have produced work broadly within this tradition. Moreover, it should not be forgotten that the work has been reviewed selectively, for a particular purpose i.e. in terms of its 'logic' on the question of the 'gap' or otherwise between ranks. This has meant bypassing other aspects of their work.

The next section of my review is concerned to develop the issues raised above, particularly the suggestion of a 'gap' between ranks. This means those researchers on the police who have problematised the assumption of the above writers and the idea of an inter-rank gap. They see police behaviour towards different social audiences as a consequence of the imposition of the policy of senior officers towards such groups.

James Q. Wilson suggests that police activity is related less to the individual characteristics of patrolmen or detectives than to police policy. According to his research police do act differently under different regimes (J.Q. Wilson, 1968). Wilson conceptualises three major styles of policework and illustrates them by a comparison of eight departments. The three major styles of performance are the service role, the watchmans role and the legalistic role, which embody different organisational roles and responses. Moreover, according to Wilson the styles mentioned correspond to different communities which tend to be populated by different social classes, the divergent political complexions of which create different problems for the police.

In sum, Wilson shows that in working class areas the style of police performance was watchman type, where police policy tended to be personal rather than impersonal, concerned with maintaining the officers self respect and not being taken in. Such a managerial attitude by senior officers encouraged patrolmen to take class differences into account both in enforcing the law and addressing the citizen and was predominant in the inner city. On the other hand in homogeneous middle class areas, the police style of performance was service type, i.e. the police intervened frequently on an informal basis. According to Wilson, in a homogeneous middle class suburb there is relatively little disorder; consequently the police rarely need intervene in situations of high conflict, and thus rarely need become parties to conflict. When the chief law enforcement problem involves burglary and larceny rather than street crimes the police need not practice aggressive preventive patrol or otherwise keep persons on the streets under surveillance; accordingly it is rare for suburban residents walking the streets at night to feel harassed. A socially homogeneous middle class area provides the police with

relative unambiguous cues as to who should be regarded as a 'suspicious' person and thus who should be made the object of police attention. Teenagers hanging around a suburban ice cream parlour late at night or blacks in the back alley of an all white residential community would be viewed suspiciously by the police and community alike. In such communities the middle class character of the area made the suppression of illegal enterprises easy, freeing the police to concentrate on managing traffic, regulating juveniles and providing services. In short, in communities which are small, homogeneous, middle class and co-operative the police see their chief responsibility as maintaining respect for their position by protecting the property and tranquility of middle class suburbanites against the minor and occasional threats posed both by unruly teenagers and outsiders.

Finally, Wilson identified a legalistic style of policing, the product of areas with a history of political activism over inequality of opportunity by blacks in the civil rights movement or the anti Vietnam campaigns. This included other groups who protested over rising crime and public disorder where a dominant middle class segment of such communities combined with city and police managers to resolve community division via police professionalism. Thus outbursts of public protest resulted in police 'reform' where police administrators used such control as they had over patrolmen's behaviour to induce them to handle common place situations impersonally; as if there were a single standard of community conduct rather than divisions of opportunity due to race or class. This included putting patrolmen under pressure to 'produce', backed by a concern for better recruits, training and leaders in the interests of equal treatment before the law.

Unlike the positions mentioned in the first section therefore

which suggest that the subculture of the rank and file is at odds with senior officers standards, Wilson's study shows that there is no gap in the orientation of senior and junior police officers. On the contrary, Wilson's analysis suggests that the activities of subordinate officers in different areas is subject to the imposition of different policies, the product of the political complexion of the respective communities being policed.

However, in opposition to both of the above positions radical criminologists in the U.S.A. suggest that such theorists as those cited fail to attack the dominant paradigm of consensus which police claim they represent (Centre for Research on Criminal Justice, 1975). According to the North American radicals the proposals offered by the above liberal writers are based on an image of the political system as a basically democratic one. Thus the radicals criticism is that liberals argue that people must take advantage of the political processes available to them to bring about change; better educated administrators and better trained personnel will bring about better or more efficient, more responsive institutions. For the North American radicals however this picture ignores the resistance of the ruling class in capitalist society. Although many of the reforms suggested are fundamentally humane ones, by themselves they do not offer any hope for significantly changing the way the police behave. First, they are not designed to challenge the larger and more basic questions of who runs the police and to what ends - and therefore, even if they work, they do so only on the level of toning down some of the worst abuses of the existing police system. Second, such reforms often don't work effectively even on their own limited terms. This, again, is because they are based on an inadequate understanding of the realities of class, race and power in capitalist society. If police abuses did

come mainly from the problems of police responses and the police subculture, then such measures might accomplish a lot. But police abuses are more correctly seen as part of a deeper pattern of repressive police control that is tied closely to the most basic needs of the corporate economy.

The radicals at the Centre for Research on Criminal Justice, in whose work this argument is prominent, also write of the 'impartiality' of the police professionalising movement in the U.S.A. (1975, PP.36-41):

" A main function of the ideology of professionalism was to change the class composition and community ties of the... police...through such measures the professionals hoped to minimise the traditional problem of police loyalty and to develop a force that would be more predictably responsive to the needs of the wealthy and respectable. It was basically an attempt to streamline police organisation and practices in the service of class interests and business values. The progressives promoted themselves as disinterested reformers whose goal was to turn the police into a technically proficient 'neutral' agency of social service. But their definition of political neutrality and of social service meant stabilising the existing political and economic structure through efficient engineering of social conflict."

The above tendency thus implies that the state is an instrument of other members of the state elite in general and political executive in particular. Professionalism, for example, is seen by the radicals to insulate the police from popular control and mystifies their job by promoting law enforcement as an activity best handled by 'neutral experts' who understand the science of public order. As far as the radicals are concerned increased police isolation, mystified authority and improved efficiency actually facilitate the apparatus of repression (Research on Criminal Justice, 1975, P.188).

Thus the radicals in their opposition to police



professionalism and liberal sociologists see the state as bent on a path of repression and restriction of individual 'rights', which the police, by their 'false consciousness', are given to support. As a result the radicals seem unable to explain the support for the law to which working class people often subscribe or how and why the law can and does sometimes intervene against the overt interests of a particular ruling class fraction. In the light of much conformity then the radicals are left to resort to explanations of working class behaviour stressing corrupt leadership, false ideas and oversocialisation, which is the precise counterpart of the notion of bad company, corruption and undersocialisation, attributed to police subordinates (2).

I therefore propose that to attack a theoretical position to which one is opposed often tends towards the erection of an alternative position which is merely an inversion of ones opponents. To avoid this failure it is necessary to extract the kernel of the above arguments in order to transcend them, encompassing all their data while moving to a more adequate position. In so doing my argument is that the radicals have failed to theorise adequately the specific practices of the police in relation to the social structure. This failure results from a lack of a sufficient concept of the state.

Given the inadequacies of the radicals position, which is unable to explain how the police can appear to be impartial yet still operate to assist the reproduction of an unequal social order, I shall argue that the need now is to attend to the complexity of the state, especially the specific structures through which it operates. For the police, given their mandate and their structure of accountability, this means law. (c.f. Jefferson & Grimshaw, 1984).

However, the class character of the law, the class administration



of justice, the cultivation of both with the objective requirements of capital, the distribution of property and the 'education' of the subordinate classes via the law are complex matters (S. Hall et al, 1978, p.194).

"The eighteenth century complex, in which the law played so open a role, is profoundly modified in succeeding centuries."

Thus the law became more impartial, less arbitrary, more autonomous. And this transition, 'the conquest of violence', was such that the working classes were subjugated to industrial discipline and policing today tends to 'normally' be confined to minorities, youth and the unemployed. As a result, the state does appear to be separated from politics and rationalisation divorced from the issue of democracy. In conjunction with this, the automisation of the state entailed a more rigorous application of the rule of law and the 'separation of powers'. This means that police conflict with the public does appear to be a product of irrational personalities in a value free state. But this problem can only be addressed (S. Hall et al, 1978, p.193)

"... when set within the framework of the transformation of the model of capital, as the regime of industrial capital gradually wins out over landed capital, transforming everything in its wake, including that to which the role and position of the law must be directly referred; the nature and position of the capitalist state itself, as the organising centre of a new set of ruling class alliances."

However, while such developments obscured the class nature of the law and its practices, it at the same time secured a real measure of justice for the poor while dividing juridical practice from the executive. Thus it was that working class agitation contributed to the extension of the rule of law, the freedom of speech and assembly, the right to strike and to organise in the workplace, as the working

classes own victories, not simply as concessions from the propertied classes. Such events, though won only as a consequence of continuous struggle at key moments, appear today to have involved man's ascent through 'rationality' to 'freedom'; smoothed out they contribute to the myth of the civilising advance of the law and its educative role in the 'conquest of violence'.

However, the idea that legal norms and rules in a bourgeois society will reflect and support bourgeois economic relations, or that, in class societies, the law will be an instrument for class domination, may provide the first basic step in such a theory, but it remains too general, too abstract, too reductive, too sketchy and epochal in form to be of much service. This means that the crucial problem of this analysis of the state is how to understand the nature of the 'uneven' correspondence between legal relations and other levels of the social formation; how to comprehend that the state can serve the 'supremacy'

of this or that class in the last resort while assuming the appearance of an independent power, the universal will. Thus Marx and Engels stress that those who rule (K. Marx, F. Engels, 1965)

"Besides having to constitute their power in the form of the state have to give their will ... a universal expression as the will of the state, as law." 3

This means that the state is not independent of the class struggle but it comes to be the structure which enables a ruling class alliance to give its ideas the form of universality, and represent them as the only rational, universally valid ones. Thus the state is the product of class antagonisms, and perpetuates a class order, by appearing to moderate the class struggle. Its determinism in the last instance is exercised through its 'relative autonomy'. In a sense therefore appearances are false not because they do not exist but because they invite us to mistake surface effects for real relations. As Hall et al write (1978, p.198)

"Thus the unequal exchange of capital with labour power in the sphere of capitalist production appears as - is transformed into - the 'equal exchange' of commodities at their value in the sphere of exchange. Thus the unequal extraction of surplus value in production appears as a fair days work at the level of the wage contract. So also the 'reproduction' work which the capitalist state performs on behalf of capital, assumes the appearance of the class neutrality of the state - standing above the class struggle and moderating it - at the political juridical level."

Consequently, since market relations of unequal exchange are lived as relations of equality, the state/law appears 'autonomous' of particular class interests. Thus parliament and law embody the 'general interest', 'universal rights' and obligations. But it is precisely the form (particularly after a certain stage in the development of the capitalist mode of production) where particular class interests can be served as general interests.

Thus the conditions for capitalist production and reproduction of its social relations must be articulated through all the levels of the social formation; economic, political and ideological. Thus, for example, a society based on private capital and 'free' labour in the economic sphere requires legal relations founded on private property and contract. In sum it requires a legal code in which these economic motives can assume the form of juridical motives backed by sanctions; a juridical apparatus which can give the economic relation a legal expression and sanction.

In addition, while capitalist relations consist of exchange of capital against labour power and the extraction of surplus value there is also the necessity for labour's physical reproduction. The site of this side of the physical and cultural reproduction is performed within the sphere of consumption of the family. In conjunction with this the knowledge and skills which capitalist production requires is furnished by the capitalist state. Thus it is that the social reproduction necessary for capitalist production is sustained in the apparently 'neutral' unproductive spheres of the capitalist state through the distinct sphere of the education system. Moreover labour must also be tutored to the rules of the established order by class domination. This task of 'ideological' conformity is increasingly the work of the cultural apparatuses, over which the state comes to exert an increasing organisational sway. And in as much as social classes contend over this process of social reproduction, then the class struggle is present in all the domains of civil society and the state. Thus the state is the official resume of society, its conflicts, needs and interests.

This includes not only disciplining the workers through law but leadership, 'education' and consent. As a consequence the state enforces

its authority through both types of domination exemplified by law and parliamentary democracy, and thereby the integration of the population into the rationale of capitalism. These were the essential pre conditions for the exercise of what Gramsci called hegemony

(A. Gramsci, 1971, pp.181-2)

"Through the state a particular combination of class fractions - an historical bloc - was able to propogate itself throughout society - bringing about not only a unison of economic and political aims, but also intellectual and moral unity, posing all the questions around which the struggle rages, not in a corporate but on a universal plain and thus creating the hegemony of a fundamental social group over a series of subordinate groups." 4

Given however that there is no such simple or homogeneous formation as a or the ruling class, under different historical conditions the objective interests of such a fundamental class in production can only be realised through the political and ideological leadership of a particular fraction. It is thus clear that the state is of crucial importance in the formation of the ruling alliances, thereby forming the basis of a bloc which could extend its authority over the whole ensemble. If authority was to be achieved without rupturing the unity of capitalist society and without the transparent use of violence then certain expenses may be incurred by the dominant class. As a consequence only the state can when necessary impose these political costs on narrower ruling class interests. This entails that by means of cultural, political and - in the last instance - economic integration, the state cements the loyalty of subaltern groups to the ruling alliance.

Thus in and through political representation, the play of public opinion, there is room for the formal representation of the interests of subordinate groups within the complex of the state; by these means their loyalty and consent can be cemented to the hegemonic fraction.

Similarly the rule of law established that equality of all citizens, giving the law an autonomous position, while enabling it to perform certain critical tasks, within the legally established framework of hegemonic class power.

The relative independence of the state (the 'relative autonomy' of the political from the economic) is, in capitalist societies, the necessary condition for this task of cohesion and unity. For this reason, the view of the capitalist state as the executive committee of the ruling class is inadequate for while it points to the essential class nature of the state it obscures what is specific to the state under capitalism - the basis of its independence. The reading of the political level of the state as always expressive of the productive forces or of one ruling class fraction obscures the fact that a fundamental class can exercise power through the mediation, at the political level, of a ruling or governing class fraction different from itself. Hence capital itself comes to require a strong interventionist state, capable of functioning as the ideal total capitalist, serving the interests of the protection, consolidation and expansion of the capitalist mode of production as a whole, over and against the conflicting interests of the many capitals.

Thus through the political and juridical sides of its activity, the state secures a certain kind of political order; enforces a certain type of legal order, maintains a kind of social order in the service of capital. But one effect of erecting a complex of state apparatuses in this way is to render the economic aspects of class relations invisible. For not only are the classes represented politically as if composed only of individual citizens but the rule of law interpolates individuals, not as class v class but as private, free, equal citizens, giving the law an autonomous position. Simultaneously the law facilitates the

performance of certain critical tasks within the legally established framework of ruling class power. In so doing the relative independence of the state acts as a precondition in capitalist society for the tasks outlined of cohesion and unity. This in turn constitutes a relation of individuals as legal, political citizens of which the state is the universal expression - an 'objective fact' outside of man - to which all 'normal' men conform. The political-juridical domain establishes the central points of reference for other public ideologies; the language of liberties, equality, rights, duties and the rule of law, the legal state, the nation, individuals/persons, the general will. In sum all the catchwords of bourgeois ideology under which bourgeois class exploitation became paramount.

So it was that the expansion of the franchise to working class people was merely an expansion of the legitimacy of the corporate, capitalist state; that by this expansion the state came to rely on consent as a means to coercion and obedience. A parliament and state well established before the late organisation of the working class vote, which legislates on behalf of the people who accept responsibility for decision which they have not made.

But this does not imply an identity between the state and the needs of capital. As suggested above, the law is propelled by the development of the political and more democratic class culture to appear more independent and act up to its ideals.

Thus by operating strictly within judicial logic, juridical norms of evidence and proof, the law constantly brackets out those aspects of class relations which destroy it's equilibrium and impartiality in practice (5). It equalises in the form of the law things which cannot be equal. Thus though the legal rules do not create the social relations that make up capitalist society by stating them as principles and by enforcing them, the law operates not only to reinforce these relations but to legitimise them in their existing form. It's rule stands for social order and such an order requires police who will obey it. (cf., C D Shearing, 1981).

Given the above analysis of the state, Doreen McBarnet's research of the police illustrates not only that there is no gap between police ranks but more importantly that if police behaviour appears to deviate from the rhetoric of police professionalism it cannot be assumed by radical criminologists that it does so despite the law (6). Hence McBarnet illuminates how the law allows for police behaviour, which hitherto has been regarded by both the authorities and sociologists as a separate subculture. To this end McBarnet observed court proceedings and studied police records in the United Kingdom. This is followed in McBarnet's research by a documentation of police behaviour acceptable in law combined with an analysis of the law itself and judicial decisions concerning police action, especially arrest behaviour. In this way McBarnet sought to uncover the relationship between police, law, courts and state.

Consequently McBarnet criticises commentators on policing, such as those reviewed in the first two sections, pointing to the way such studies ignore the law and thereby the state. In so doing such people have tended to treat the notion of legality as unproblematic because they are largely irrelevant in practice. This means



that both police professionals and sociologists of the police have tended to focus on the law in action - how the police do behave - rather than the law in the books; how they should. The consequence of this has been that the dominant approach of such people towards the police is via the discretionary and discriminatory side of the policeman's role. For example; how the police come to select for arrest particular individuals who tend to be male rather than female, working class rather than middle class, black rather than white (D. McBarnet, 1979).

As a result, the authorities in the shape of recurring Royal Commissions throughout the 20th century, as well as some police managers and sociologists today, repeatedly seek to 'explain' police problems with the public in terms of non legal influences on police officers; colleagues; bureaucratic demands; and informal interactions - police interpretations of behaviour, stereotyping, perceived lack of deference, all of which spark off hostility on both sides. But according to McBarnet (McBarnet, 1979, p.39)

"There is a gap between the rhetoric of legality and the actuality of law in both the procedures laid down and the reasoning behind them. Legality requires equality; the law discriminates against the homeless and jobless. Legality requires that officials be governed by law; the law is made on post hoc decisions. Legality requires each case be judged on its own facts; the law makes previous convictions grounds for defining behaviour as an offence. Legality requires incriminating evidence as the basis for arrest and search; the law allows arrest and search in order to establish it. Legality embodies individual civil rights against public or state interests; the law makes state and public interests a justification for ignoring civil rights."

This means that any alleged gap between how the police should behave and how they do is not simply a by product of poor recruits or training or the selection of senior officers creating a gap between ranks. Nor is it a simplistic product of a number of 'undersocialised' police subordinates or an elite conspiracy in the police, the

administrators of 'justice'; it exists in the law as defined in court decisions by the judicial and political elites of the state. The so called deviant occupational subcultures, repeatedly defined, is made possible in the law itself, which the police impose via the scrutiny of recruits and the processes of training and promotion.

Van Maanen, who studied police recruitment, selection and training, in the U.S.A. shows the desire on the part of recruits for identity with the organisation and its goals (J. Van Maanen, 1973). According to him the recruits he studied sought security, salary and work perceived by them as socially prestigious. The recruits had high expectations of community service, adventure, a lack of routine and entry into an 'elite' organisation. The recruits' view of the police was compounded by thorough screening, involving extensive inquiries into the recruits background and character. This was a dominant aspect of the initial socialisation process. Thus in the early stages a recruit is made to feel as if he were important and valued by the organisation. Hence most police officers have not chosen their careers casually. They enter the department with a high degree of normative identification with what they perceive to be the goals and values of the organisation.<sup>7</sup>

However, for most recruits the first real contact with the police 'subculture' occurs at the training school where the recruit is introduced to harsh and often 'arbitrary' discipline of the organisation. Absolute obedience to departmental rules, rigorous physical training, dull lectures devoted to various 'technical' aspects of the occupation and a ritualistic concern for detail characterise the training school. To this end the training staff actively promotes solidarity through the use of group rewards and punishments. The training school thus impresses upon the recruit that he/she must now identify with a new

group, his/her fellow officers, resulting in a scaling down of high but 'unrealistic' attitudes about the police. In conclusion Van Maanen writes of the outcome of this metamorphosis that

"After a short time on the job, the only activity in which patrolmen perceive any substantial likelihood of receiving valued rewards is through their field investigation activities - defined as those activities which may result in arrest - service and administrative activities - which account for the largest amount...of working time - were viewed in this final perspective as areas in which effort was least likely to lead to favourable rewards."

(J. Van Maanen, 1975)

I therefore propose that the conflict which exists historically between the police and the public cannot be understood without an understanding of the state, as well as the organisational and cultural context of action. Hence the behaviour of the police identified earlier in this literature review is not opposed to law. As we have seen this repeatedly results in Royal Commissions and public inquiries concerning alleged illegal behaviour by police, the key to which is seen as better recruits, training and leadership. In short better state personnel in the interests of impartial enforcement of the law.

As a consequence the matters to which I have referred, particularly in the post war years, did not take place in a vacuum. For it is at moments of economic crisis such as during the recession of the late 19th century, 1914-18, 1929 and, particularly for my purposes, growing hostility in the inner cities of Britain during the last 20 years, that the notion of reforming the state by recruiting, selecting and training 'better' police personnel comes to the fore; because with a crisis of hegemony the 'impartiality' of the police and the nature of their 'accountability' is in doubt.

The above analysis therefore suggests that far from police problems resting upon the behaviour of divergent police subcultures

both senior and subordinate officers may share a similar perspective. In other words there will be no significant difference in the rationale of the division of labour between senior and junior police officers which could 'explain' police conflict with the public. Secondly, as a consequence of the above, whereas successive police policies have been aimed to 'reform' the perspectives of lower ranks and thereby future leaders, in actuality discrimination may be embedded in the 'objective' rationality of the class state, which insinuates that acceptance of certain 'rationalisations', already alluded to in this review, is both a condition of the relative autonomy of the police organisation and of becoming a successful police officer. Third, legal rationality, may entail explanations and ideologies of crime such that the police, believing state rationality to be 'value free', condemn any discontinuity between 'useful' means and ends thereby perpetuating the existing hierarchy of 'credibility' while discrediting the 'useless'. (8). Briefly implicated in such reasoning, amounting to a division of the social world, may be notions of respectability, thrift and hard work, allied to discipline and competitive success upon which the 'natural social hierarchy is based.

In contrast to this may be seen scroungers, the poor, the unemployed, the feckless, youth, students and blacks whose 'indiscipline' threatens such community order; exemplified by orthodoxy in habits, 'the family, class community and church. The police therefore may defer to the successful while looking down on the 'rough' and others whose actions corrupt the innocent or ignorant, or, 'subverts the 'common values' of the normal, enjoying their well deserved happiness.

Accepting the logic of this then the police could be expected to regard as abnormal those persons who are out of place, out of time

out of mind or out of order.<sup>9</sup> This is to say in the 'wrong' area, out of 'work', protesting against the police and being black. Confronted with 'rough' districts or such an 'enemy', vigilance, secrecy, suspicion and violence may be the conclusion of such reasoning under law. This may include a notion that such people 'have no rights'. So not being taken in and not taking any 'crap' may also be justified by legal reasoning, which people who complain of police conduct, advocating neutral professionalism, 'do not understand'. But these remain unexplored assumptions so the issue remains an empirical one.

In what follows therefore I shall be concerned to examine these issues and thereby the recurring claims of certain members of police management and the 'establishment' to have 'professionalised' the police. This will entail an analysis of the suggestion that today the police are attentive to 'informal' and 'subjective' influences in police and community alike; that a new level of tolerance is abroad via police recruitment, training and promotion, in which I have both participated and subjected 'gatekeepers' in these areas to systematic inquiry. On the other hand, I shall also be concerned to examine the assertions of the radical criminologists cited who imply that the professionalism of police leaders amounts to a legitimating myth; the idea that police leaders differ from their subordinates whom they are engineering in the interests of business values.

With these thoughts in mind, it is with the problems of recruitment of police to which I turn in Chapter Three.

CHAPTER THREE

RECRUITING

This chapter will begin to empirically examine the arguments about the meaning of police professionalism outlined in the previous chapters, commencing with the area of police recruitment and selection. To this end a reiteration of the contending positions of police professionals and the so called radical critics of police professionalism seems appropriate, in order that my method and purpose is quite clear. With this in mind I begin with police professionals.<sup>1</sup>

According to police professionals, it is at the level of lower ranking police officers that poor standards are responsible for conflict with the public. Thus police professionals contend that the police must take their own precautions and this begins with selection. Considerable care has to be (and in Britain is) taken in inquiries into the antecedent history of potential recruits. The necessary judgement of character and its ability to stand up to the hurly burly of police work and the temptations put in the way of the police has to be taken into account at this stage.

Police professionals further insist that only high quality officers properly trained should be involved in selection procedures. One vital pre-condition to any raising of levels of learning and understanding in the police is the recruitment of a representative section of young men and women with the necessary academic achievement and learning potential. Moreover, police professionals claim that in a ruthless authoritarian regime the police task of being merely repressive would appeal to different types of personnel than those the police are accustomed to recruiting today. Being more like an occupying army than a 'democratic' type British police force the officers in an authoritarian regime would require training that follows military lines. Police would be

separated from the community and deliberately so. For police professionals, that kind of police style would probably require officer elites and non commissioned officers and men as in the army.

Police professionals claim that the high standard of learning potential required by the present superior democratic police is of a very different nature. Though constables of the past have had difficulties in coping with diversity, today better standards of recruitment are seeking to remedy such problems and this means that the accent is on quality rather than quantity.<sup>2</sup>

However, as far as radical criminologists are concerned despite appearances to the contrary the political influence of the powerful members of society on the police is much closer than admitted by police professionals.<sup>3</sup> Hence their critique of police professionalism is one which involves a schema of the State as a tool or instrument of the dominant classes. In particular this schema leads to the conception of the state as agent of the monopolies in State monopoly capitalism, a relation understood as a 'conspiracy', the product of the dominant classes, which uses personal contacts to place the state in the hands of a small group of monopolists. The state is seen as the monolithic product of an elite minority, who, by promoting themselves as disinterested, changed the class/occupational subculture of subordinate officers, thereby 'engineering' police loyalty in the service of business values. Through such measures the radicals contend that police professionals hope to minimise the traditional problem of police loyalty and to develop a force that would be more predictably responsive to the needs of the wealthy and respectable.

In sum then, since police professionals see police subordinates



creating conflict with the public and their critics see senior officers as the problem, it is to test these assumptions in the area of police recruitment and selection where I shall begin. With this objective in mind, I shall examine the sociological meaning given to professional police recruitment by the police themselves.

Consequently, my aim in the first instance shall be to establish the broad areas of concern in police recruiting, as defined by the Police Recruiting Officer responsible for vetting. This should produce several key themes with which to begin inquiries into the nature of discretion employed by decision makers on recruiting boards. As there is only one force Recruiting Officer, these themes are inevitably based on a single interview. However, as I hope to show, the themes are consonant with the reasoning employed by others involved in the selection process. After, I shall seek to understand selection outcomes by reference to the practical reasoning of senior officers engaged in selection, in order to see how selection works in practice. More specifically, I shall be concerned with the attribution of motives and qualities to others on the basis of the interview. Such a concern eventually entails a reconstruction based on what for interviewers are the crucial questions and how do they attend to such matters as the candidate's family, education, appearance and bearing.

To a lesser extent, I shall also be concerned with in what ways do the candidates 'negotiate' the questions asked? Which means is there such a thing as a right or wrong answer? More than this selection is an activity in accordance with a purpose and to this end I shall seek to specify clearly the assumptions involved in locating the right kind of recruits. But, unlike police professionals and their radical critics mentioned earlier, at this stage we have no warrant to claim to know how this works in police recruiting in practice; what police professionals mean by 'impartial' selection, or, whether the critics cited are correct when suggesting that a 'sophisticated' form of discrimination exists among police managers who

select recruits. Finally, the chapter will conclude with the treatment of several applicants before recruitment boards in an endeavour to uncover what constitutes success and failure in getting into the police.

Before any of this however, some groundwork may help to familiarise the reader with the typical procedure applicants for the police must initially follow before reaching a board interview for selection to the police. Moreover, since the police publicise widely the attractions of a police career, including a general description of recruiting procedure, this format seems an appropriate point of empirical departure with which to begin to compare publicised claims on police recruiting with how this process works in practice.<sup>4</sup>

There are now forty three police forces in England and Wales to which the police seek to attract recruits. In the case of Constables, with which I shall be concerned in this chapter, recruits are usually between the ages of 18.5 and 30 years.<sup>5</sup> In addition, since people wishing to join the police are free to apply to any force, the police advertise at both a local and national level. In the case of the large urban force in which this research was conducted, this includes the use of an advertising agency, posters, the local press and brochures sent out to applicants. The Home Office (Police Department) which dictates recruitment policy, advertises at a national level, emphasising forces short of officers and also acts as a clearing house, processing inquiries, forwarding them when necessary to provincial forces and issuing its own brochures.

More specifically, if an applicant for the police within a given area shows a written or verbal interest in joining a police force, whether via the local police station, the Force Recruiting Department at Police Headquarters or via the Home Office, all such inquiries are

funnelled to the Recruiting Officer of the force in which interest has been expressed. Secondly, this will eventually result in such an applicant receiving a preliminary application form asking for brief details. Third, providing nothing of a serious illegal nature is disclosed at this stage which would prejudice the application, the applicant is asked to attend the Force Recruiting Office at Police Headquarters for both a medical and educational examination in general subjects; though certain people are exempted from the educational examination if they hold at least 4 'O' levels or C.S.E. grade 1 equivalent, two of which must include English Language and Maths. The educational examination, which lasts 2½ hours, has a pass mark which can be varied by individual Chief Constables, according to local conditions and this force has recently raised it to 100 out of 200 as opposed to 65 out of 200 being the minimum laid down by the Home Office. The basis of the examination involves one arithmetic paper "which demands no more knowledge than percentages, averages are included. But the other four papers are English or variations upon."<sup>6</sup> It is at this stage that an applicant is asked to complete a second more detailed form.

Given successful completion of the above a candidate is then subjected to vetting by the Force Recruiting Office and the themes involved at this stage I shall shortly endeavour to make clear. But suffice it to say, before moving to the research findings, that when the vetting process is over arrangements are made for applicants to attend an interview board, held bi-weekly at Police Headquarters. The board, which usually consists of a Chief Superintendent assisted by a Chief Inspector both visiting on a rota basis, aided by the relevant written information, sets about interviewing about seven applicants per day. Sometimes, in exceptional circumstances, two boards may sit

simultaneously, each located near to the Recruitment Office. In sum then those applying for the police are subject first to a home visit, may also be questioned on any obvious anomalies by the Force Recruitment Officer, and usually have their application decided by an interview with a Selection Board. But if an applicant fails at the board they are free to apply again, say in six months to a year, or to apply immediately to another force, in which case their failure to gain entry to this force would be noted. So much for stated procedure.

#### Overview of Recruitment Officer

The material which follows was gathered from those concerned with vetting applicants for the police, beginning with the Force Recruitment Officer. Thus I now produce the results of my interview with the Force Recruitment Officer, responsible as he also is for a degree of police/public relation while simultaneously manning the outer boundaries of the Recruitment Department, in which those senior officers appointed as interviewers later decide who gets into the police. With this in mind, after an applicant for the police has taken the entrance examination and completed a second more detailed application form, the Recruitment Officer's interest quickens. As soon as the second application form is received 'character' inquiries commence in earnest and this includes a Home Visit as well as an interview, which the Force Recruitment Officer says<sup>7</sup>

"Takes the form of an Inspector visiting the applicant in his home surroundings and passing comment as to suitability. ... The applicant's wife or parents are also seen and any details which may be of interest in assessing their suitability for the police force are recorded. That includes brothers, sister, convictions against any of them, ... one cannot be too careful. He interviews mother and father and anybody else that may be in the house ... see what sort of conditions the man lives in. ... If he is living under rough conditions, then it is quite possible that this would be reflected in

in his service as a police officer and in his bearing and attitudes towards members of the public.

Thus one concern of the Force Recruiting Officer is with the standards and morality of a candidate's family to be investigated by an Inspector visiting their home and reporting back.<sup>8</sup> In conjunction with this the Force Recruitment Officer presents the police as in need of recruits who are 'respectable' rather than 'rough' or immoral, since the latter are seen as likely to threaten police relations with the public.<sup>9</sup> For in the Recruitment Officer's view

"When an applicant is, to use the phrase, 'shacking up' with somebody or other, then it is invariably known by the neighbours. Now, if that man or woman is accepted into the police force what do the public immediately think of the morality of the police force in accepting these people. The applicant themselves have not got the necessary stabilised life form. ... The neighbour immediately thinks that the Police force ... in the worst possible terms ... You've damaged public relations. That's it ... Apart from any Social Security frauds that may be going on. It may be the case, although it's rarely the case, put him before the board, and let them decide on the circumstances."

The Force Recruitment Officer thus emphasises that in his view the police are interested in recruiting those people whose respect for upright decent conduct is such that they are likely to support conventional morality, to which a rough, permissive and criminal way of life are all seen to be opposed. Thus the above entails evident anxiety by the Recruitment Officer that since the police are liable to suspicion, the conduct of one officer can bring the entire organisation under suspicion. He further suggests that in order to prevent people entering the police who are likely to damage public relations the police must take preventive measures which apparently not only includes a preference for people who are from a conventional family, but also those applicants of a conventional appearance.

"I mean it really is undesirable to have people joining the job with earrings. Applicants joining the job, male

applicants, earrings and extensive tattoos, this is another point ... A lot of youngsters these days have 'love' and 'hate' tattooed across their fingers. Is that the sort of image that the public want of the police force? This sort of thing appearance wise."

According to the Recruitment Officer, the police seek to recruit people whose ability to keep up appearances is such that it will be the sort of image that he believes the public want of the police force; associated as this seems to be by the Force Recruitment Officer with respect for 'established social standards'.<sup>10</sup> And a similar orientation also appears to be sought in applicants' previous records of work, where past employers are seen as a reliable authority to judge.

"What they are like during their employ and whether or not they consider them as being a suitable person to be in the police force. You'll find that the majority of the public have a set opinion about what a police officer should be and the standards he should uphold. So therefore they are fairly true in their account of the individual."

The above suggests that an applicant's previous employers are reliable guides as to their suitability for the police, typifying as they are held to do the standards of the majority of the public.<sup>11</sup> This further implies that the police are seeking those individuals whose past experiences and future aspirations are not unsupportive of established authority, such that their history and attitude indicates that they are likely to conform.

"So it depends on a person's attitude to accepting discipline, in which case members of the armed forces are usually quite good. They are usually quite smart and take care of themselves and are usually people of the world. So they are providing a vast experience."

It thus appears that one further pre-condition of getting into the police is a person's attitude to accepting discipline in the past, taken as one more possible indicator of their ability to conform in future. For the Recruitment Officer this comes to mean respect for the

current social relationships dominant in our society, which those appointed seem expected to maintain.<sup>12</sup>

"Yes, we are looking for people with common-sense. People that can express themselves by necessity, because they are dealing with the public ... are people with a certain leadership quality. And I think this is perhaps one of the criteria that the boards are looking for."

The above tends to imply that the police are seeking recruits who are practical people, whose 'common-sensical' outlook is such that they will probably unquestioningly defend the existing social order, even when working on the streets alone.<sup>13</sup> Such an orientation seems to be associated by the Recruitment Officer below with a balanced almost 'normal' view, any variation from which appears to be suspected as indicating instability, if not pointing to extremism, which is to be very much opposed.

"We are looking for a stabilised life really, to provide a balanced view ... The final say on their acceptance will lie with the Special Branch. ... Let me say, in case it wasn't on the last tape, that Special Branch do make a very, very comprehensive check on the individual applicant. It could be that they have some tendency towards, or leaning towards, an outlandish organisation, if you like, in which case they are not considered for the police ... There wouldn't be any objection to passing a person to the board stage, as long as the board were fully aware of this man's leaning towards one particular thing or another ... But having said that, he would not reach the board. It would be apparent during the vetting procedures and he would be rejected at that time."

Thus the Recruitment Officer tends to the opinion that the impartial selection of police recruits entails hiring those individuals likely to identify with the orderly, respectable, family orientated and hard working members of the public associated, as this is, with a patriotic law abiding majority. In conjunction with this, it is further suggested that in order to prevent people entering the police likely to damage public relations the police must take their own precautions and this begins with selection. For the Force Recruitment

Officer this amounts to the conclusion that the police are seeking those people who, by virtue of their history and attitudes, do not appear to lack the requisite emotional self control, sense of balance and respect for convention, to which a rough, permissive, criminal and 'outlandish' way of life are all seen to be opposed. An outlandishness or questioning which the Special Branch are specifically employed, at the gateway into the police, to ultimately prevent.

In sum therefore the Force Recruitment Officer, who is responsible for disseminating literature on the 'acceptable face' of a police career to all people who inquire to his force and is responsible only for the initial stages of selecting suitable people for the police, presents the above 'image' of what he thinks the police are seeking in recruits. But precisely because an important element of his position is reassuring the public, his remarks can only be considered as speculative at this stage, in relation to the people who apply for the police and more importantly, how board members decide who gets into the police.

Consequently, in an endeavour to begin to develop the above, the next stage will be to compare the views of the Force Recruitment Officer with the themes which 10 different interviewers were found to repeatedly raise (Chairman and assistant), when I observed 5 boards interviewing people for the police. Moreover, since one issue raised was that of the difficulties of applying sexual equality in the police, where possible the questioning of men and women has been examined separately to uncover any bias against women. So the way should now be clear to confront directly practical examples of interviewing people for the police. The interviews observed involved twenty-one male and ten female candidates.



Domain Assumptions of Board Interviewers

Significant Others

I begin our inventory of the domain assumptions of police selectors and the search for patterned answers with the first area which frequently appears in such interviews.<sup>14</sup> This is the issue of what do candidates 'significant others' think of the candidate joining the police organisation. This importantly means a candidate's family and friends. Those who may be expected to manifest certain moral values towards authority and its opponents, which the interviewer addresses and in so doing perhaps hopes simultaneously to reveal the candidate's own values. Here then are quotations from male applicants' interviews, where this issue was actually addressed fourteen times.

I. "What made you choose the police?"

A. "Well I wanted a good career after the Navy."

I. "What does your wife think about this?"

A. "She doesn't mind."

And

I. "Is your wife worried?"

A. "Well, yes, a little, but she accepts it."

I. "Isn't that a bit one sided?"

A. "Yes, but obviously the police offers her security."

Clearly therefore, interviewers are concerned to recruit men whose family support them and the standards which the police uphold. As this extract of an interview with the only black recruit observed in interviews reveals.

I. "Tell me, what is your families' view of us, the police, and your intention to join?"

A. "My family are respectable people. They think it's a great thing if I can get it. I shall be honoured."

Once more then it seems important to interviewers that they recruit men whose family support them and the standards upheld by the police and that this is signified by both the facts about the applicants' surroundings and by their motivation which for interviewers, seems to transcend differences in race. However, since the boards which I attended evidently regard women applicants as potentially less well motivated than male applicants, they had to try that much harder to convince interviewers of their motivation. Thus the issue of female candidates 'significant others' was raised fourteen times in the interviews of the ten women. This concern is evidenced in the quotes from female interviews below.

I. "What do your parents think about the police?"

A. "They are pleased. They don't want me to go on with office work because I can't go any further."

I. "Are you courting?"

A. "Yes."

I. "If he said don't join?"

A. "I wouldn't listen to him. I don't want to get married, certainly not to my current boyfriend."

I. "Surely, any reasonable husband is going to ask you to leave the police?"

A. "His general attitude is it's up to you."

And

I. "Would you mind leaving home?"

A. "My boyfriend doesn't like the idea."

First then interviewers are concerned that the 'significant others' of candidates are supportive of them, given the inconveniences and difficulties of police work in the maintenance of social order. <sup>15</sup> So all candidates are presented in interviews with the prospect of an

extremely arduous experience as a police officer which for interviewer only evidence of a readiness to give unreserved commitment to police authority is deemed to transcend. The more so in the case of women, who were regarded by the all male interview boards which I attended as potentially less well equipped to cope when compared with the men. For this reason women had to try that much harder to convince interviewers of their motivation and ability, given the prospective inconveniences of the job.

#### Managing the Physical Inconveniences of the Job

Since the interviewers tend to be of the opinion that police work is unpleasant, the next issue frequently raised in interviews is how candidates will manage given the inconveniences of the job. The issue was raised thirty times during the interviews of male candidates, examples of which are given in the following quotes.

- I. "What would happen if your wife was ill?"  
A. "I should have to get someone to look after her."  
I. "You realise the police is unsocial hours, bad weather, trying door handles?"  
A. "Well, I work nights at the moment so that would be no problem."  
I. "What about isolation, leaving home?"  
A. "Okay."  
I. "Would you mind working alone?"  
A. "No, initiative, autonomy."  
And  
I. "Do you really want to be disliked as a P.C., hated and inflicting loneliness on your future wife?"  
A. "Yes."

As far as male applicants are concerned then interviewers clearly appear to be concerned to point out to them that policework is onerous, not least since it involves unsocial hours, is often boring and sometimes dangerous.<sup>16</sup> So the board suggest that the nature of such a role, including unsocial hours, isolates a police officer socially from people the board regard as problems and also from the conventional section of society with whom they may be expected to identify.<sup>17</sup>

Thus interviewers are at pains to point out that recruits, if not all officers, fail to realise the extent to which they become 'tainted' by the character of the work they perform, while at the same time seeking to test the applicants' motivation.<sup>18</sup> Furthermore, this theme also appears to include a hint by interviewers to candidates that the nature of police work, including as it seems to do public hostility, not only separates officers from the rest of the population, but also tends to draw officers together as a group.<sup>19</sup> In conjunction with this, in the eyes of interviewers, public unpredictability seems to lead to their anxiety, if not physical fear and a preoccupation with physical defence and fitness; a recognition of the value of which is sought in male applicants.

I. "What sports do you play?"

A. "Well, squash, football."

I. "You must appreciate it is necessary for you to keep fit."

And

I. "What do you do to keep fit?"

A. "Run forty miles weekly."

I. "I note you are a Karate expert?"

A. "Yes."

According to the above male applicants preparedness to keep fit is taken to be yet one further indication of their motivation. Thus the problem for interviewers of the physical inconveniences and difficulties of policework leads them to look for evidence of which applicants will cope. This also seems of interest to board members where women applicants are concerned, since they were asked about physical inconvenience a total of ten times - but with subtle differences, as the following quotes reveal.

- I. "Does your fiance work shifts?"  
A. "He can do."  
I. "What about your future husband's working hours?"  
A. They could be unsocial."  
I. "Is he going to be pleased with you working unsocial hours?"  
A. "I have explained that and discussed it with my fiance."

And

- I. "If we posted you to (...) how would that affect your fiance?"  
A. Not much I shouldn't think."  
I. "We find some difficulty in you doing two things at the same time? Do you think such a job is likely to put an extra strain on your marriage?"

As with male applicants, interviewers are also concerned to point out to female applicants that policework is onerous, due in part to unsocial hours and other reasons. Secondly, like the men, they must demonstrate that no conflict of interest exists which will inhibit their compliance to police discipline and authority. But these issues are pressed harder with the women. So while for male applicants conflict between the applicants' loyalty to the police and organisation and their fiancées and wives tended to be played down, the opposite tended to be the case in the boards' treatment of female applicants.

Thus in the case of women's ability to cope with the physical inconvenience of a police career in comparison with men, their willingness to subordinate their prospective domestic roles and romantic ambitions to the demands of a police career seem to be highlighted as important indicators of interest and motivation, rather than any disposition towards athleticism they may have.

This different treatment of males and females continues with questions about discipline, since only the issue of male applicants discipline/indiscipline appears to be specifically focussed upon by interviewers.

Preparation of Male Applicants only in relation to Discipline

This topic concerned how well prepared are male applicants in relation to discipline and the strictness of their family, school and the like. The issue was put to male applicants a total number of fifteen times. The following quotes are examples.

- I. "What about discipline? Are your mother and father strict?"
- A. "I was told about discipline by my parents. I guess I didn't realise what they meant until I got older. I realise now but my mother and father are dead."
- And
- I. "How do you think you react to discipline?"
- A. "Well I can only go back to school as an example. You need discipline to make it efficient."
- And
- I. "Your school report says you were undisciplined in the junior school?"
- A. "Well yes, er, I didn't like being treated like scum."
- I. "Is it true to say that you dislike discipline?"

According to the above, the attitude of applicants towards discipline in the past is taken to be yet one further indication of their likely ability to conform to the dictates of their supervisors in the future in the police. A similar concern was involved in the next area interviewers focussed on, which was how applicants, both male and female, had coped with problems in the past. This was something which was taken to be an indication of their motivation and ability.

#### Past Record

This issue was raised on twenty seven occasions during the course of the male applicants interviews. We begin with the men.

- I. "What school did you go to?"
- A. "(...) Grammar, which became comprehensive, which broke up the tradition."
- I. "So tradition is important to you is it?"
- A. "Yes."
- And
- I. "You're halfway up in your present job and switching to another career?"
- A. "Well there are lots of responsibilities at the bottom of the police."

Similar questions were put to female candidates on five occasions. No noticeable difference in the nature of the questions was evident. I therefore conclude the examples of this section with an example of a female candidate.

- I. "Much policework is based on common sense ... What evidence have we that you have it? Certainly not through your achievements at school."

A. "I'll study. I've started a course."

I. "It's also isolated work. What evidence have we that you can stand it?"

As far as the above is concerned then, the interviewers' interest in candidates' records seems to be associated with how they will cope in future in the police. I address this issue next, beginning with the men.

#### Coping in future in the Police

The interviewers raised this issue fifteen times during the course of the male applicants interviews. Examples of which are given in the following quotes.

I. "Have you a temper?"

A. "Well."

I. "If someone called you a pig?"

A. "I don't think that would bother me."

And

I. "What about the threat of violence?"

A. "I expect it ... some people deny order and have to be educated or suppressed."

And

I. "How do you see yourself confronting a drunken Irishman?"

A. "Try to communicate, try to prevent being hurt."

And

I. "Have you any defects, well, I mean can you be beastly with people with speeding convictions? Ever seen a dead body. I mean you seem quite a mild bloke. I have doubts that you have the qualities to react to mean people. Tell me what you have got that makes you worthy of being a police constable?"



A. "I like to see a job well done."

I. "Have you deep rooted reservations?"

The issue of coping in future occurred some twenty three times during the interviews of the female candidates. In these cases there was no noticeable difference in the nature of the questions. The following are examples.

I. "Have you any faults?"

A. "I can be bad tempered at times."

And

I. "What about getting a brick through your front window?"

A. "I should be angry."

I. "So, they're standing outside your front gate shouting pig?"

A. "Well, they must be committing an offence."

And

I. "Do you think women should be protected?"

A. "No."

I. "Can you see yourself being abused. I can't for example?"

A. "Well, my father was very strict."

I. "That's irrelevant to courts ... What about coloureds, for example. Have you no objection to being in the middle of (coloured area) trying doors?"

A. "No objection really."

And

I. "Why police?"

A. "To help people."

I. "You could do that as a social worker, so why police?"

Thus, those interviewers observed above, interviewing applicants

for the police, are concerned with how well recruits will cope in the future <sup>with</sup> what they see as policing problems.<sup>20</sup> To this end interviewers seem particularly keen to recruit those people having what they consider to be the requisite self control, sense of 'balance' and respect for convention, to which allowing oneself to be intimidated or showing weakness towards 'mean' people is presented as being opposed. With this in mind, whether or not applicants have the 'qualities' to react without 'deep rooted reservations' or being like 'social workers', when confronted with those people in society deemed drunken, abusive and insulting like Irishmen and blacks, seems to be taken as yet another indicator of their suitability for the police.

In what follows next interviewers are concerned about what they consider to be a relative tendency for women to act less effectively than men. So the matter of sexual equality, as a concern in itself, eventually emerges in the interview. A topic which both men and women are confronted with directly. So I begin, as before, with the men.

#### The Value of Sexual Equality in the Police

During the male applicants interviews, questions on this subject were put by interviewers three times. A quotation from the male interviews is given below.

- I. "Should police constables and women police constables do the same thing?"
- A. "Yes."

Thus the issue of sexual equality in the police is not pursued with the men. The same issue was raised by interviewers on six occasions during the women's interviews and in a markedly different way, as the following quotes reveal.

- I. "Should police be exempt from the Sexual Discrimination Act ... Women and men are physically different ... Like the Fire Brigade?"
- A. "Well I myself am coming not to do office work. I am looking forward to working with men. I believe in equality. I think the Fire Brigade is different from the police."
- I. "Are they though! How would you get on with the lads where you live when they learn you are a cop?"
- A. "Okay."

And

- I. "Do you think there are too many women in the police?"
- A. "I think there should be equal numbers."
- I. "How would you feel if a W.P.C. turned up when you dialled 999?"
- A. "I wouldn't mind."

And

- I. "Why join a job which exposes you to violence?"
- A. "Well I can only give it all I've got."
- I. "What about violence?"
- A. "I don't see it makes much difference. Equal rights."

The assumption of interviewers in respect of sexual equality in the police therefore entails some anxiety about whether it is likely to affect police efficiency, equated, as this seems to be, with law enforcement against violent people, where the attendance of police women is presented by interviewers as potentially disconcerting to all concerned.<sup>21</sup> Consequently the recent increases in women applying to join the police, supposedly in the wake of changes in the law permitting sexual 'equality' in employment, appears to be seen as potentially unpolicelike and threatening unless women applicants show themselves as committed as the men to maintaining respect

for police authority.

Thus applicants' commitment to maintaining respect for police authority is taken by interviewers to be yet one further indication of their motivation, which male applicants appear to be expected to endorse by their ability to maintain a 'respectable appearance'. This is the next concern of interviewers which frequently occurs, as given in the section which follows.

#### Keeping up Appearances

While male applicants were questioned on the topic of 'keeping up appearances' on eleven occasions, the issue never came up in any of the female interviews observed. The quotations given therefore apply only to the men.

I. "Now there is something else. If you were asked to shave your beard off would you?"

A. "Well yes, I would."

And

I. "What about cutting your hair?"

A. "No problem."

And

I. "What qualities would you look for in a candidate?"

A. "Well, personality, interest."

I. "Exactly, and I do not think your appearance is fitting for our interview, do you?"

According to the above, male, rather than female officers appear to be particularly regarded as likely to 'let the side down' by 'hiding behind a beard', having long hair or generally tending towards a casual and 'cavalier' appearance. This in turn suggests that since senior officers' experience leads them to believe that

they cannot be certain of public confidence in the police, in order to allay any suspicion or accusation certain preventive measures are necessary to maintain an image of respectable authority in thought and deed, by demonstrating orthodoxy in dress and 'image' in an almost extreme and extravagant form.

Thus, the final concern which interviewers frequently introduce is what applicants think about the public view of the police in general and criticism in particular.

#### What Do You Think?

The issue of police relations with the public was raised eighteen times with the men. The following quotations are from the interviews of the male applicants.

I. "Complaints against the police. Should we investigate our own complaints, just like doctors and the Law Society?"

A. "Well, the police have to be above reproach ... I think the police are capable of investigating."

I. "What about Operation Countryman?"

A. "Well, we mustn't listen to the fringe press."

I. "Now, one M.P. recently said 'Sadly today you cannot trust the police'. What do you think about that?"

A. "Not so ... These people follow Goebbels, say something long enough and loud enough and people will believe it."

And

I. "What would you say the public's opinion of the police is today?"

A. "Most of the public respect the police."

I. "You mentioned community. Have you a desire to serve the community?"

A. "Yes. I should like to be out in the community, meeting them."

I. "Do you think they know what they want?"

And

- I. "How important is politics in police matters?"
- A. "Police should keep quiet."
- I. "So! You disagree with the Chief Constable of Manchester?"
- A. "Well, yes - the police have a lot of influence."
- I. "What about using it to improve the situation? ... Politicians lie, policemen don't."

The above suggests then, that senior officers are seeking people who are likely to be amenable to their own commonsensical view of society. This they appear to regard as a faithful portrayal of society in which criticism of the police is unnecessary and is stridently opposed. Moreover, similar questions were put by the interviewers to female candidates on five occasions. Once again, there was no noticeable difference in the nature of the questions, as the following quotations reveal.

- I. "What do you think about the rough area of (...) where you live?"
- A. "Well you come to accept that ... loud mouthed belligerence, but not all of them are bad."

And

- I. "Do you think it is important that a police officer has discretion?"
- A. "Yes, a small amount."
- I. "Your father is a taxi driver. Do you think the police should spend time persecuting motorists?"
- A. "Yes. Though I know there are crimes if you let these matters go they will eventually become important."

According to the above then, since senior police officers are somewhat anxious about the public image of the police and public criticism in particular, one further indication of applicants'

suitability is their preparedness to maintain unity with their fellow officers against such attacks generally and consonance with the political position of their senior officers in particular, rather than outside critics who appear to be regarded as less than impartial.

Summary of Domain Assumptions of Interviewers

This section has been concerned to expand and contrast the earlier views of the Force Recruiting Officer with those of senior officers actually engaged in selecting recruits. Thus, like the Force Recruiting Officer, the general overall assumptions of those engaged on selection boards tends to entail anxiety that recruits selected for the police will, above all else, defend established social standards.

More specifically, those engaged in selection first focussed on the significant others of candidates who seem to be expected to support authority, which includes the police. Secondly, interviewers were interested in how well prepared candidates were for coping with the physical inconveniences of police work and this was particularly evident with female candidates. Third, the men were specifically tackled about how well prepared they were in relation to discipline, which was seen as one indication of their ability to conform in the police in future. Fourth and connected to the above, interviewers questioned candidates on how they would cope with future problems as a police officer; to which allowing oneself to be intimidated or showing weakness towards wrong-doers seemed to be regarded as opposed. Fifth, the above concern re-emerged with interviewers questions to candidates on the issue of sexual equality. Thus the increases in women applying to join the police force with the advent of 'sexual

equality' seems to be regarded as somewhat threatening to police 'efficiency', unless women applicants show themselves as 'hard' as the men. Related to these concerns is the interviewers' anxiety about the police 'image' and the importance of keeping up appearances. Thus the final domain assumption of the interviewers suggests that they are anxious about the public image of the police in general and criticism in particular, which those seeking entry to the police seem expected to allay.

### Three Interviews for the Position of Constable

The final section of this research on recruitment will be concerned to develop further the above analysis of the views of the Force Recruitment Officer and the assumptions of interviewers by examining below the narratives of three sample interviews for the position of constable from a number of recruitment boards in which I participated as an observer.

Of the total of thirty-one interviews observed, eighteen men and six women were successful and three men and four women were unsuccessful. The above figures included nine men and five women initially viewed by interviewers as borderline candidates. Of these, eight men and three women were subsequently successful, while the other three candidates failed.

Thus the three interviews which follow consist of examples of successful, unsuccessful and borderline candidates, with the aim of demonstrating more exactly what is expected by interviewers who decide who gets into the police.

### The First Candidate

I begin with a female candidate, who, having separated from her Policeman husband in Ireland, now resides in England with her mother and small child



aged three and a half.

I. "Why do you want to join the police ... money?"

A. "No. I always wanted to join when I lived in Ireland. My cousin is a detective, but in Ireland you're just a glorified traffic warden."

I. "Well, why not join in Northern Ireland?"

A. "You've got to be single."

I. "How well do you think you did in the educational tests?"

A. "Okay."

I. "What have you to offer us?"

A. "Well, myself, I mean I like meeting people."

I. "What about violence?"

A. "I don't mind."

I. "What about your little girl?"

A. "My mother came over from Ireland."

I. "Yes but how would you look after your child ... What would happen if you were sick?"

A. "If sick I wouldn't have time off from work."

I. "If the National Front wished to march through (...) who should have the choice to decide ... Local government or the Chief Constable?"

A. (Seemingly impatient.) "I don't know ... Local Government I suppose."

I. "How would you manage in a fracas in (immigrant area) say?"

A. "Well, I don't know ... I suppose I should call for the police ambulance ... I mean I haven't been trained !!"

I. "What about being insulted?"

A. "Well I've been insulted quite often as a policeman's wife!"

So the applicant was asked to wait outside while the chairman and his assistant discussed the matter.

Chairman: "No way ... I don't like her attitude towards her child. She has domestic problems and lacks the temperament and qualifications for the police."

The above candidate was unsuccessful. However it is noticeable that this candidate had still been put forward for interview by the Recruiting Department, even though she had done very well in the qualifying educational test. Thus, like others who had similar difficulties (but were eventually successful at the board), she too was questioned about her examination performance. Secondly, also like other candidates (some of whom had attempted to start up their own businesses) this woman was questioned about whether her primary motive for joining the police was money. But since many of those who were also so questioned were also successful, it seems that board members combine other criteria, with educational performance and an interest in financial gain, when finally deciding whether an applicant is suitable for the police.

Having regard to the above interview then, as well as the assumptions of the interviewers illustrated earlier, first and foremost the above candidate failed because, in the interviewers eyes, there existed conflict between her proper, traditional, place as homebound mother, with being a candidate for an arduous, if not dangerous, role as a police officer. Secondly, since interviewers raise the issue of how applicants will manage given the physical inconveniences of policework, as well as whether any conflict of interest exists which will inhibit their compliance with police discipline and authority, this woman failed because by being a single parent of a young child she was judged unable to comply with the above. Third, by also showing herself intolerant of senior officers interrogative style of questioning, this candidate was further seen

as resistant to police discipline in particular and ill equipped to maintain social discipline in general.

### The Second Candidate

By way of a comparison with the above candidate the next candidate was a local, single young man aged 23. Since his parents are dead he now lives with an older relative but otherwise has few ties or connections.

I. "Why have you applied for the (...) Police?"

A. "Well I live in the (...) area, I know it. The police seems a challenging job with variety."

I. "What about discipline? Are your mother and father strict?"

A. "I was told about discipline by my parents. I guess I didn't realise what that meant until I got older. I realise now but my mother and father are dead."

I. "What about marriage?"

A. "No thanks."

I. "What about shacking up?"

A. "Why not?"

I. "Wouldn't that affect the police image?"

A. "Agreed."

I. "What sort of image is best for the police Andrew?"

A. "Pacifying."

I. "What about demonstrations?"

A. "Police should be more positive."

I. "How would you cope with shifts?"

A. "No problem."

I. "What about the unpleasantness of road accidents, death, injury, blood?"

A. "No problem. My father had a prolonged illness."

I. "Tell me Andrew. What if you were with a policewoman in a crowd with people shouting at the W.P.C.? What would you do?"

A. "Tell them to be quiet ... If not get help quick."

And now the comments of the interviewers while the candidate waited for a decision outside.

Chairman: Excellent, mature, self reliant, good understanding of our problems ... That's the acid test. Appointed."

According to the above once more interviewers raise the issue of why a candidate would wish to join the police in general and this police force in particular. In part this successful candidate answered the question of why he wished to join by associating his application with a degree of local knowledge, if not with local pride. But though for interviewers it does seem to be the case that being a local person is associated with commitment to maintaining the local order, particularly when contrasted with the first candidate, the interview of this candidate also indicates that even though policing is parochial, other concerns are at least equally important in succeeding in getting into the police. Not least of these is being amenable to a police career's demands, which this candidate was partly seen to be able to do, probably by virtue of his unencumbered background and also, his unreserved reply that the police for him seemed a challenging career with variety. Secondly, his interest and motivation was further endorsed for the interviewers by the attitude of his parents which did not seem to be unsupportive of respect for discipline and authority; which, as noted earlier, is frequently taken to indicate a candidate's ability to conform when in the police in future. Thirdly and connected to the above, is the interviewers overriding anxiety that the activities of one officer can bring the entire organisation under

suspicion, which this candidate evidently recognised by accepting that 'shacking up' would affect the police image; an image which this candidate was anxious to maintain by pacifying some audiences while being 'positive' with others. And these answers could be taken to be consistent with interviewers domain assumptions illuminated earlier, when they emphasised the importance for them of candidates who respect decent, hardworking, family orientated members of the public and the prosecution of the 'rough' and 'violent'.

But not only does this interview tend to reveal the importance for interviewers of those candidates for the police who are likely to maintain self control but also those who will endure unsocial hours and related 'isolation', which this candidate accepts. In conjunction with this interviewers raised the issue of how he would cope with problems like 'blood' as a product, no doubt, of injury, which not only illustrates that police work is unpleasant but also a candidate's motivation, which he answered by citing his experience of his father's illness, death and his own early independence. And, as has been indicated, independence is of great significance to interviewers when combined with conformity since officers will be on the streets alone. So the potential of a candidate to maintain respect for authority even when on their own is all important.

Finally, this interview also revealed senior officers' concern over the ability of women in the police to cope when compared with the men. This candidate endorsed this sentiment in his statement that he would get help 'quick' rather than trust policewomen to support policemen when dealing with that section of the public deemed unreliable at best and violent at worst. This seems to have also counted in his favour.

The Third Candidate

I conclude this section with another young male candidate who, bored with his job as a clerk with the Inland Revenue, now seeks to join the police.

I. "Why the police?"

A. "I want a job with total involvement, rather than just money ... and an outdoor life."

I. "Why this police force?"

A. "It's the first thing that came to mind."

I. "Tell me about your job?"

A. "Looking after tax affairs of 2000 people. How much they have to pay."

I. "Well that deals with people, as with us."

A. "Yes but gives set answers, it's too routine."

I. "But so is the police, the law."

A. "But the police are not just there to enforce the law. I know people in the police who suggest differently."

I. "Mmmm ... To whom should the police be accountable?"

A. "The public."

I. "Can you sharpen that down a bit?"

A. "Well, yes (attempting to smile) ... the responsible part."

I. "Are you saying the public dictate to the police?"

A. "Yes."

I. "Any exceptions?"

A. (Silence)

I. "Do you think unsocial hours may interfere with your social life?"

A. "Not really."

I. "You mentioned community ... the public. Have you a desire to serve the community?"

- A. "Yes I should like to be out in the community."
- I. "Do you think they know what they want!?"
- A. "Er, er, ... No."
- I. "How do we gauge it?"
- A. "Well the police have got to do things some people don't like. It's difficult to answer."
- I. "It's difficult for the police too! Do you think discipline is important?"
- A. "Yes."
- I. "Any police background in family?"
- A. "Direct family, no."
- I. "Courting?"
- A. "Yes, engaged."
- I. "Your school report says you were indisciplined in the junior school?"
- A. "Well, yes, er, I didn't like being treated like scum."
- I. "Is it true to say then that you dislike discipline?"
- A. "No. I can see the reason for it now."
- I. "Your hair might be considered a bit long for the police?"
- A. "Yes, I thought about getting it cut and will do."

Finally, the discussion while the candidate waited outside.

Chairman: "I am a bit disturbed about his school report. He may have problems with police discipline."

Assistant: "Well yes Sir, but his school report does go from bad to good. He showed a readiness to conform and has experience of dealing with people .... "

Chairman: "Mmmm ... yes, okay, we will recommend him for appointment to the Chief Constable subject to him getting his weight down and telling him when he comes in we shall expect him

to jump to ... Long hair and loose ties show a lack of respect for the board."

In the first instance the overall impression of observing interviews of which the above were typical, was that though interviewers were seen to be interested in eliminating the hopelessly unqualified, most candidates are accepted by being given the benefit of the doubt. So though this candidate appeared to be below the standards which police professionals claim they require, his performance nevertheless resulted in his eventual success.

First then, even though his lack of technique and indecision in the interview led the recruitment board to repeat questions about what he thought about the public, since he appeared to have struggled to accommodate himself to the themes of the interviewers he eventually redeemed himself, resolving any doubts in his favour. Secondly, though there was evidence in the background and appearance of this candidate of a failure to conform, it is evidently sufficient for the board if they can be reduced to childlike indiscretions and momentary naivete rather than persistent disobedience. Third, the board seems to weigh such matters as the above against candidates' other experiences. So it seems that in such cases as this the candidate's ability to cope in the past, like dealing with (hard) cases at the tax office, are important indicators as to how they will cope in the future. In the absence of any evidence to their detriment this seems to be given more weight than the above. In conjunction with this even though this candidate by his failure to show a preference for their police force, dislike of routine and initial answers to questions about the community, was seen to lack an initial appreciation of senior officers' preoccupation with maintaining law and order in a particular geographical area against



those who would oppose it, he managed, eventually, to equate police accountability with the law and both with the responsible part of the community whom he showed no desire of not wishing to emulate.

In conclusion then, although there is a tendency for senior officers to seek people whose past and present evidences that they are likely to conform, the indication given by many interviews such as this for candidates who are borderline suggests that most candidates do in fact get into the police, regardless of their ambivalence.

### Conclusion

This chapter has been concerned to empirically examine one element of the meaning of police professionalism by analysing the process of police recruitment and selection.

In sum, while senior officers tend to blame lower ranking police officers for conflict with the public, some radicals

blame police leaders. My aim in this chapter has been to examine the meaning given to professional police recruitment and selection by the police themselves by looking at how police selection works in practice.

My analysis began with the Force Recruitment Officer. The interview with him revealed that for him the impartial selection of police recruits entailed hiring those individuals likely to identify with orderly, respectable, family orientated and hardworking members of the public, which he associated with a patriotic law abiding majority. He further suggested that in order to prevent people from entering the police who are likely to damage the police image, the police must take precautions which begins with selection.

In conclusion then for the Force Recruitment Officer the police are seeking people who by virtue of their history and attitudes do not appear to lack the requisite emotional self control, sense of balance and respect for convention in comparison with which a rough, permissive or 'outlandish' way of life are all seen to be opposed. Special Branch are employed during the recruitment process to specifically prevent the entry of those with an 'unpatriotic' or critical attitude.

However, precisely because one important element of the Recruitment Officers' position is concerned with reassuring the public, his remarks could not be empirically validated. I therefore sought to expand and contrast the views of the Force Recruitment Officer with the overall assumptions of those engaged on the selection boards which I witnessed.

My analysis of the domain assumptions of interviewers revealed that, like the Force Recruitment Officer, the general overall concerns of interviewers entailed anxiety that those appointed to the police will defend established social standards, which first and foremost their significant others like family and friends, are expected to support. This is because police-work is presented as entailing much inconvenience and public animosity, which candidates are also questioned about to test their motivation.

But, whereas women were questioned particularly closely about such matters, men were tackled more about how well prepared they were in relation to discipline as an indication of their ability to conform in future. In a similar vein senior officers also examined how all applicants had coped with adversity in the past, as clues to their ability to cope with problems they may encounter if on the streets unsupervised in the police in future.

Interviewers also focussed specifically on how recruits would cope with future problems which the boards emphasise will require self control and a respect for convention, to which offending decent, respectable members of the public is presented as being opposed. Equally important however is the fact that board members are also concerned about the police failing in their duty, which showing weakness or compassion towards 'mean' or 'violent' people is seen to signify. Thus the increase in the numbers of women applying to join the police with the advent of 'equal opportunities' is regarded as somewhat unpolicelike and threatening to police 'efficiency', unless women applicants can show themselves to be as 'hard' as the men. This is a view male applicants are expected to endorse.

The above connects with the interviewers concern with the police 'image' and that men particularly subscribe to the importance of keeping up appearances, equated, as this is, with orthodox dress in an almost extreme and extravagant form. With the above in mind interviewers recurringly point out that the activities of one officer can bring the entire police force under suspicion, which they are concerned to prevent. To this end one further indication of a recruit's suitability is their potential loyalty to the police organisation, which favouring critics of policing in particular is taken to oppose.

The final empirical section of this chapter was concerned to develop still further the analysis of the views of the Force Recruitment Officer and the domain assumptions of interviewers through an examination of three sample interviews for the position of constable from a number of recruitment boards which I observed.

The first of these was unsuccessful, because the female candidate concerned was unprepared for the interview, as well as being hopelessly unqualified for a position in the police. In the interviewers' eyes there existed conflict between her role as a mother of a small child and being a candidate for an extremely demanding role as a police officer; a role entailing a commitment to police discipline and authority which this (separated), woman was deemed partly unable to fulfill by virtue of the 'irregularity' of her family life. Furthermore, by showing herself intolerant of senior officers' interrogative style of questioning this candidate was further seen as resistant to police discipline in particular and ill equipped to maintain social discipline in general. This amounts to a failure on the part of this candidate to appreciate that senior officers regard themselves as 'experts' in dealing with disorder in comparison with 'inexperienced' outsiders; which this candidate exacerbated by suggesting that local government rather than the Chief Constable should decide whether a public march should take place. So while officers engaged in selection were not perceived to be particularly punctilious, let alone analytical, in their conduct of such interviews they are alert to the candidate who is particularly careless.

In contrast to the above was a candidate who passed by virtue of his unencumbered background, as well as being amenable to a police career's demands, which in the case of this young man presented less of a problem for interviewers given their aim to preserve the police 'image'. Secondly, his youthful exuberance, positive motivation and attitude towards established social standards and the inconveniences

of policework was further endorsed for interviewers by his upbringing which was supportive of discipline and authority, which senior officers on the boards are committed to uphold. This included this candidate's view about the police showing weakness towards some people, which would be the case with too many policewomen, which board members tend to be very much against.

Finally, though the second candidate unlike the first was considered by the board to be very good, the last candidate showed some ambivalence in his answers to the board's questions. The overall impression of observing problematic interviews like this is that though the boards are interested in eliminating the hopelessly unqualified, most candidates who are interviewed are given the benefit of the doubt. Though this candidate was below the standards which police professionals claim they require, his performance nevertheless resulted in his eventual success. So this interview illustrates that even though candidates may lack technique and be indecisive, if they tend to defer to the interviewers this can go a long way towards their eventual approval. Secondly, though there may be evidence in a candidate's background and appearance of marginal non-conformity, if this can be reduced by interviewers to a temporary lapse or naivete, such indiscretion does not necessarily lead to disqualification. So the boards tend to weigh the quality and quantity of any non-conformity, as well as the candidate's attitude in the interview, against any evidence from one's past there may be of support for authority. And since this particular candidate had experience of dealing with people in a tax office this was given some credence in judging his ability to shape up if appointed to the

police. In sum therefore interviews such as this indicate that though there is a tendency for interviewers to seek those people whose past and present unproblematically indicates they will conform, most candidates do get into the police who are interviewed regardless of their ambivalence.

As far as recruitment is concerned then the above indicates that senior officers are concerned to reduce uncertainty (i.e. role conflict); strangeness (the unfamiliar intruding from outside); mystery (disturbing information in recruit's backgrounds); coercion (unmotivated behaviour); personal accountability (i.e. assigning to individual candidates the 'necessary' commonsense qualities for their success in getting into the police; assigning candidates who did not get in individual responsibility for their failure - rather than the assumptions held by senior officers); unpleasantness (i.e. seeking candidates who do not appear to be opposed to conforming with the police occupational culture/police morale).

I therefore propose that the above analysis contradicts the claims made to ethical impartiality in this area by some police leaders at the beginning of this chapter. Thus the aim of the recruitment boards examined in this research is to judge whether an applicant's morality and thus consciousness is amenable to maintaining the status quo, which the boards, following their own assumptions, take for granted. This in turn amounts to the boards equating respectability, initiative and enterprise with the majority and law breaking with its opposite. So the second assumption made by the radical criminologists is also not tenable. This is to say that far from senior officers I observed 'scheming' to promote themselves as impartial while tacitly engineering police loyalty in the service of business values, they actually believe they are acting on behalf of the majority. The more so since those recruits that get in (and most do), do not differ fundamentally in their interests from top police managers observed here.

In conclusion then, since most applicants do get through this somewhat unsophisticated selection process and few are rejected for incompetence, (though nowadays, with most forces at or near authorised establishment, unlike the research period, the position may have altered somewhat), the issue may be that of other 'processes' which recruits must also go through at a later stage which may serve to protect senior officers against initial 'errors'. This however leads to another empirical question; whether the imposition of the values of senior officers on subordinates which we have witnessed in recruiting is a feature of their 'idiosyncracies' or whether it is a product of the social values inherent in the police apparatus, typified perhaps by training and higher selection. If the latter, of course, it would suggest that whether forces are at or near authorised establishment or experiencing recruitment difficulties, makes little difference to the recruitment process. This question is

part of the task ahead. But one feature is already clear; the political neutrality and legal reliability of subordinate police officers in modern society are less a matter of the social source of their recruitment, than of their amenability to the values of those who select them when they apply to join.



CHAPTER FOUR

TRAINING

This chapter will be concerned to advance the empirical analysis of the contending views of police professionalism by moving forward to the next stage of a police officer's career manifest in police training.

Similar claims to those made about recruiting by police professionals are also made about training. While police professionals tend to see police training inducing much needed proper standards of behaviour and conduct from police subordinates, who are held responsible for conflict between the police and the public, radicals contend that behind the 'rhetoric' of professionalism, which represents policework as a neutral function, police professionalism is really concerned with streamlining police organisation and practices in the service of business values. One way this is imposed is via police training.

In what follows I shall be concerned to examine the meaning given to police training by the police themselves. To this end I have participated as an observer in training courses for both constables and newly promoted inspectors, (7 out of 10 weeks on the constables course and 1 week out of 3 weeks on the inspectors course), as well as interviewing course instructors and their senior officers responsible for implementing Home Office policy on such courses. When the findings of this research have been presented we should then be in a position to compare the claims made about professionalism with how police training actually works in practice. However, before presenting the results of this research on training a few details appear necessary, in order to acquaint the reader with a general description of training which awaits a police recruit and a newly appointed inspector, after they have been appointed.

I shall first provide details of how training for newly

appointed constables and later newly appointed inspectors fits into a police officer's career development; given that this is the route which all officers must follow: except for a numerically insignificant handful of people who are graduates and have passed an extended interview board to attend the Special Course.<sup>1</sup> This should be clear from the diagram over-page.

For the majority then, after an induction period of a few days with the trainee constable's own force, during which a recruit is 'sworn in' and issued with uniform and equipment, all recruits in England and Wales including ex-cadets attend a District Training Centre for ten weeks.<sup>2</sup> This is a recruit's first real experience inside the police after the special treatment of the lengthy selection procedure. The course, which usually consists of about 160 recruits, divided into 8 classes, is instructed for the most part by 2 sergeants allocated to each class. They in turn are monitored by an Inspector/Course Commander, who reports on their performance to a Chief Instructor (Chief Inspector). He is answerable to a Superintendent (Assistant Commandant) who reports to the Commandant (Chief Superintendent). Finally, other specialist instructors address the recruits. For the most part they too are police officers who take periods of drill, physical training, self defence and parades each morning, laid down in the curriculum.<sup>3</sup> The only interruption to this regime are occasional visits by outside speakers, who are usually police officers addressing the entire course on problems of public order, or, in the case of the few visiting academics, community relations. But such variation to the daily regime tends to be the exception to the rule and the images of law, drill and police relations with the public, which form the basis of the curriculum.



Given then that recruits are expected to attend to their training and exams, at the end of the course a report is forwarded by the Commandant at the centre to the recruit's Chief Constable, who may dismiss them if their performance is unsatisfactory, but, in any case, will append the report to the officer's personal file to be referred to when necessary throughout their career. Finally, before posting recruits are given a short course by their own constabulary to acquaint them with such matters as local bye-laws and force procedure which apply to their force area. This is supplemented by a sequence of continuation training, usually for two days per month at the recruit's force training school, during the two year probationary period. Such training is aimed to deepen the lessons laid down in the basic residential training examined here. Underwritten by the final residential three week continuation course at the District Training Centre, as well as on the job training.

The relationship of the Home Office to the development of the police training courses mentioned above was referred to in Chapter One but in preparation for what follows it seems appropriate to reiterate relevant details again, if only to establish the nature of this influence, if any, on the professional standards of police training which are at issue now.

Although District Training Centres are primarily the responsibility of the Home Secretary (Section 41 Police Act, 1964), they each have two committees which are responsible for their administration. A Local Authority Committee, made up of representatives of the Police Authorities, is responsible for finance and a Chief Constables' Committee deals with the selection of instructional staff later trained at Pannal Ash, Yorkshire and also 'technical' matters. Moreover, the co-ordination of training methods and subject matter throughout

England and Wales is achieved through the work of the Central Planning and Instructors' Unit at Pannel Ash.

Following the Home Office initiative of 1970-73, mentioned in Chapter One, a series of investigations began. As a result of these, the unit used a system of Training by Objectives to reduce the then thirteen week course to ten, as well as apparently changing the content by giving more emphasis to constables' training to dealing courteously and efficiently with members of the public and less to law and militarism.<sup>4</sup>

In the case of supervisors' training, the antecedents of which were also traced in Chapter One from Desborough to Trenchard and now, in 1980/1, with the decentralisation of the former Bramshill Police College Inspectors' Course, the same ethos appears to prevail. But since supervisors' training also raises the issue of the formal powers of police supervisors over subordinates, as well as the contractual nature of a police officer's duties and responsibilities, vis-a-vis the Home Secretary, his or her Chief Constable and also, the Police Authority, it is necessary to explain this position before looking at an outline of the supervisors' course.

While it is clear, from the Police Act, 1964, that the Home Secretary has powers to enable him to ensure that the police service is efficient, he does not have operational control over Chief Constables.<sup>5</sup> So while successive Home Secretaries have seen to it that there is a substantial degree of uniformity of practice and conditions of service, throughout the country and that resources, such as training, that cannot be maintained by individual forces, are provided on a national basis as central services even in the one force where the Home Secretary has a dual role (in that he is also its Police Authority), the

Metropolitan Police, he does not have operational control over the Chief Officer, the Commissioner.

The Commissioner of the Metropolitan Police and the City of London have similar autonomy, in so far as the direction and control of their forces are concerned, as the Chief Constables of provincial forces.

As far as the position of the Chief Constables or Commissioners (in the case of the two London forces) is concerned, the position is well established in British law. So, in addition to the Police Act, 1964, quoted above, the courts have emphasised that a Chief Constable is independent of the Executive.<sup>6</sup> Every police officer, by virtue of his holding the office of constable, is 'an officer whose authority is original, not delegated, and is exercised at his own discretion by virtue of his office: he is neither a Crown Servant nor a servant of the Police Authority' (Royal Commission on the Police, Final Report, 1962).

Since then constables are not employees of the local authority the powers of such authorities too do not extend to operational questions. So, while the Police Act, 1964 again lists the duties of the Police Authority to supply the people, equipment and buildings necessary for policing, including powers to appoint Chief Constables, Deputy Chief Constables and Assistant Chief Constables and when necessary, require them to retire in the interests of efficiency, they nevertheless do not have operational control over Chief Constables.

The Chief Constable then retains operational control over his police force; albeit that the Police Act, 1976, which created the Police Complaints Board, ensured that when complaints are received from the public he must sit as a member of a tribunal with two members

of the Police Complaints Board, who can out vote him when a decision as to the guilt of the accused is made. But though this is the case, the police still retain powers to investigate such complaints as well as decide on punishment when a decision has been made.

Given then that senior police officers retain responsibility for operational matters, the extent to which they have wide discretionary powers to be able to influence the lives of members of a police force appears to be clear.<sup>7</sup>

However, since it has been noted that such powers are extremely flexible, the suggestion now made by police professionals is that such elasticity has enabled a new level of tolerance to emerge in police managements; typical of which is higher police training for inspectors. For, in an attempt to give every inspector the same training as that formerly enjoyed by a few, selected

to attend Bramshill Police College, regional training centres were established and considerable emphasis was placed on the personal skills needed by inspectors, as well as the 'technical' aspects of policework.

So the newly promoted inspectors' course too is presented as meeting problems with the public via the adoption, by supervisors, of a more professional approach in the management and training of their subordinates; evidenced, in higher training, by the addition of the 'human sciences' laid down in the curriculum.<sup>3</sup> Furthermore, it is also suggested that as with all such courses that consist of officers from many police forces, much of the value of attendance at such courses is gained from the interchange of ideas and the sense of unity within the police service which is created, despite the existence of separate police forces.



Moreover, such three week courses held regionally for newly promoted inspectors usually consist of about twelve newly promoted inspectors being instructed by two inspectors/instructors also trained, like the constables' instructors, at the Central Planning and Instructors' Unit, Pannel Ash, Yorkshire. They in turn are answerable to a Chief Instructor (Chief Inspector), who participates on the course along with a number of visiting speakers who usually consist of police officers giving talks on specialist topics, such as dealing with complaints against the police, race relations, terrorism, as well as public order. Finally, all of the staff are answerable to a Chief Superintendent (Training), who supervises the centre and ensures that the course methods and content are appropriate to the curriculum; laid down by the Central Planning Unit in conjunction with the Home Office.

#### A Senior Basic Police Trainer's View of the Role of the Police

My next task will be to present the material gathered from those concerned with training; beginning with the basic training of constables at a Regional Training Centre.

First, I commence with the comments of a Course Commander (Inspector), whose statements on the function of the police in today's society may serve as an introductory backdrop to contextualise the views of police training that follow. For the Course Commander one basic concern of the police is that of maintaining social order in the interests of the majority, to which criminal and bohemian behaviour is seen to be opposed.<sup>9</sup>

"Basically erm human, the human animal is an animal who likes to live within a certain framework ... who prefers to live within an ordered society and this is the basis in which we are allowed to operate the police system ... say in English society ... The persons outside this are the criminals or at some stage was the hippy, which are a great minority."

He also suggests that society is characterised by people who are leaders, normal and followers, as well as those who are vulnerable to incitement by the disorderly.

"The basic principles of the population hasn't changed because you have such a cross section of people who are sheep, people who are leaders, people who are quiet, people who are rowdy."

He adds that because there are people who are extremists and violent you must have law to maintain individual freedom, to which the majority subscribe.

"Because within a particular society you have that type of personality ... you must have a common overall discipline, we call it law. It's a set of conduct that says how people will live within a common framework of as much freedom as you can give them, but live within a society within a common aim, which is to produce oneself, by children, to clothe, feed and look after the dependents; to live a virtuous life - without extremes of any nature, such as violence."

In conclusion, the Course Commander suggests that the overall objectives of the police in British society are concerned with the observance of conformity to the existing social order, embodied in law. Criminality and extremism are seen as the beginnings, the seed bed, of disorder for the wider majority, which it is the job of the police to 'weed out':

"The ones who do not wish to live by these particular laws, who opt out, are the criminals, if you wish - and the extremists. And in order for the mass majority to live according to the rules laid down then we must weed out the ones who do not wish to live by that ... and that is my job as a policeman."

In sum then the Course Commander, who is responsible for supervising subordinates who instruct in the classroom while occasionally participating himself, presents the above image of what he thinks the general objectives of the police are. But, precisely because he does spend much time outside the classroom, his remarks

on the context within which basic police training takes place can only be considered as abstract at this stage in relation to the meaning of police training for the police themselves. But we shall have cause to refer to the Course Commander again because he is directly involved in instructing recruits on matters of procedure as well as discipline.

### Basic Police Training

The next stage in this chapter will be to examine the interviews of a number of Course Instructors (Sergeants) and the Course Commander, which will be complemented by notes gleaned from my participation on the course.

I begin with the first element of the curriculum of interest to trainers in socialising recruits; this appears to transcend differences in race among police officers, evidenced by the comments of this black police sergeant commenting on police powers:

"The important thing is they must know what their powers are ... which obviously, they are taught to them. In fact they are emphasised in every lesson, right, but erm then comes the practical time and we hope, you know, we look for whether they can relate this theory that they have learned to the practice. Not only that but apart from relating the theory we also look for examples, you know, whether they use their head at all, common sense and discretion some times, you know, because theory alone isn't enough. Relating the theory to an incident ... I think what I like to see is whether they use their head and common sense."

Several initial points are being made here. First is the necessity to know the law, particularly powers of arrest, stop, search and procedure. Secondly, it seems that because the law is often expressed in such broad terms as to render a clear interpretation of the legislature's intentions difficult, in exercising discretion the police take their cues from 'common sense'.<sup>10,11</sup> So the class

instructor delivers early to recruits a sense of the flexibility of the immense powers of arrest, stop and search which the police possess. This is well illustrated in the following quotation.

"Remember in the police whenever a door is half closed to you there is usually another one staring you in the face."

Moreover, along with the above suggestion to recruits that police have wide powers amounting to the fact that they can get people for a lot of things is another message; that because instructors believe that crime is becoming a more serious problem and morality is declining and police are the embattled thin blue line protecting society from its follies, the violation of procedural rules is justified in the name of the 'higher' interests of reducing criminality. Again, the same sergeant instructor addressing a class of recruits;

"You need to know what may happen if you don't conform to the Judges Rules. Here cautioning and formally charging people is necessary. In practice if you do this they won't say anything."

Thus the police are instructed, as a tactical matter, to recognise an obligation to appear to be obeying the letter of procedural rules, while often disregarding its spirit. So the training philosophy of the police has the end justifying the means. According to this philosophy the demands of apprehension require violation of procedural rules in the name of 'higher' justification of reducing criminality.<sup>12</sup> So while the court can rule that information gathered illegally cannot be admitted into evidence at a trial, the police are instructed that in practice the courts are powerless to protect the rights of citizens in the face of determined opposition from the police; partly because the police often have ample evidence to convict without a confession (due to information received), partly because the rules of procedure, even when applied (as they often are not), affect

interrogations only slightly because the police can still question suspects virtually at will.<sup>13</sup> As the instructor puts it to recruits in the classroom;

"C.I.D. will show you that after people are arrested and later they decide what they will be charged with. All will be revealed in the fullness of time."

According to the instructor's lesson to recruits then it is a matter of maintaining both a public and a private face, dependent upon the audience one is addressing. The public face, of total enforcement of law, efficiency and respect for procedural neutrality with the police the servants of the public and courts, and the private face of discretion and adherence to the occupational culture of the police and one's superiors by detaining certain individuals and groups as police 'common sense' dictates, and later gaining the evidence. For the police can seldom arrest someone for a crime unless there is a witness who can identify a criminal, so the lack of adequate means to gain information is desperate.<sup>14</sup> Thus when courts rule that police may not in future engage in certain enforcement activities since these constitute an irregular procedure, the inclination of instructors is typically not to feel shame but indignation<sup>15</sup>. The more so since they seem to believe in training that the police have special competence on how to single-handedly reduce criminality in the community. So the idea that the courts (yet another audience to be tackled by police) control police behaviour is yet another illusion which the instructor must immediately dispel. Again to the class;

"Don't worry you will all be so programmed when you leave here that you will have no trouble in court."

And the above points are endorsed by the Course Commander when interviewed, in the following way;

"I learned again that although the law is inflexible in the law books, it is certainly flexible by discretion, when you're outside on the streets. In other words some persons you arrest, some you report for summons, some you probably caution yourself for the same offence depending again on the circumstances and again on the persons you're dealing with. I tend to say let's look at the context of how this particular incident happened and whether the man himself is being an arrogant bastard and saying 'I'm not helping you because I don't think I should', or is he a man who has momentarily made a slip and probably will never do it again and this is where to me good policing comes in. And I'm talking about a minor offence because I don't believe in discretion on a deliberate law breaker."

The above senior officer tends to confirm that because the law is 'flexible by discretion' the police are able to deal with people differently dependent upon the circumstances; a determination not to arrest or 'throw the book' at someone is most common at the level of the petty offender and especially if the offender is an otherwise law abiding citizen. He further suggests that police are more likely to deal harshly with people if they are belligerent as opposed to being co-operative.<sup>16</sup>

Further, that since as a practical matter the discretionary powers of the police to stop, question or even arrest people they suspect of engaging in wrong doing is extremely wide, the way such discretion under the law is exercised is characterised by the 'common sense' views of the police. Moreover, since for the police the above practices are so well established by usage as to be almost taken for granted they genuinely believe that they represent the majority of the public: to which only a minority of suspicious people appear to be opposed.<sup>17</sup> Such an attitude implies that it is necessary, in the eyes of instructors, to be trained to be suspicious about certain people's behaviour until they can prove that they are entitled to be treated otherwise.

As one female instructor puts it :

"To some extent I think we have got to teach here that there are certain members of the public who dislike the police, who are perhaps mental, who are violent, and if they are not careful you are going to be the one who's beaten up or get a knife in you or get shot. And you've got to teach them to trust nobody until they've proved they can be trusted. So we're, I suppose in a way, we are building distrust into people."

This clearly suggests that policemen and women are indeed specifically trained to be suspicious and to mistrust people until they've proved they can be trusted and that in exercising their discretion a recruit is expected to look for the unusual, in order to differentiate between those people who should be subjected to on the spot interrogations and those who may not (18). As the class instructor reveals in our interview this includes people 'who do not belong' where they are observed.

"To be aware what's going on and to see people where they are not normally. Circumstances that don't fit the bill. Just to note their attention...you should use the pocket book and note down relevant details and be aware of things that might develop."

Eligibility for arrest and prosecution appears then to rest in part upon such factors as perceived deviation from stereotypical images of correct appearance, dress, place of residence and also background. The existence of a record can only reinforce the stereotype, as the following quotation from a female class instructor indicates.

"I must admit, if I've got a fairly plausible shoplifter, who's sort of saying 'Look it was a genuine mistake, I just didn't realise, put it in the wrong bag.' Now I might be fairly open minded, think well alright you're quite plausible maybe you did love. If I check up and find she's been at court four times for shoplifting, straight away I'm going to think that's a load of old rubbish. Rightly or wrongly I am going to go back and say 'Now look here, now all this phoeey about'..."

Thus, according to the class instructors, both men and women

who by virtue of their reputation appear to lack respect for constituted authority are all subjects who should be suspected. This includes people with previous convictions, unescorted women in public places (particularly at night), loiterers around public toilets, a man sitting alone in a stationary vehicle for an exceptionally long time, particularly during working hours, or vehicles which are dirty or have parts missing, or do not 'look right'. Again, yet another instructor addressing recruits on the stereotypical habits believed typical of working men.

"What do you think when you hear the mention of goods vehicles. Let's see; night time, heavy lorries, greasy chips, dirty overalls, dingy rooms, being held up by clouds of smoke."

According to the class instructors, in order that the police can prevent a small minority of 'disorganised' people disorganising society at large preventive measures are necessary; and this is particularly so amongst those who by their social standing and demeanour appear most likely to challenge discipline and authority, existent in society.

All of the above points are constantly reiterated to recruits in the classroom by instructors; the elasticity of procedure, the fact that you can more or less get anyone for anything; the notion that the police represent the majority, and, last but not least, the constant, stereotypical, presentation of polar, atypical examples of extremism (Krays) against a background (the silent conforming majority) of overtypicality.<sup>19</sup> Thus is policework presented to recruits as giving priority to the detection of the violent, organised, criminal, seen as ever-ready to unhinge the order of the wider world; and to the disrespectful, petty offender whose lack of respect is perceived as likely to lead to bigger things, unless 'nipped in the bud'. With a view to catching such people, recruits are instructed on the importance



to the police of acquiring and using informants. Again, as the Course Commander makes clear.

"My belief in the detection of crime is through informants. And by informants I don't mean the type you see on television ... An informant is the local shoemaker, when the P.C. drops in for a cup of tea, as he normally does, and the shoemaker says: 'Hey! I didn't know Billy Bloggs has got a brand new bike. It's a Chopper.' 'Oh is it!' You've got a stolen bicycle on your patch. You have an informant. Now if you said to that person 'Thank you very much I'll pay you £2 and you're my paid informant' he will be horrified and stunned dumb, because he doesn't know he's being an informant. ... That is how you clear offences and crime, not by going to the local youth club and chatting them and giving them talks and playing football with them ... I don't believe in making friends between police force and civvies in that context."

Thus, the Course Commander's interest in 'keeping the streets clear of crime' is manifest in the suggestion above, that police discretion under the law should be exercised in the pursuit of those people stereotyped by police as immoral, criminal and dangerous. But, since hard evidence is difficult for the police to come by great importance is given by instructors, both in and out of the classroom, to ensuring that the orientation of recruits is such that they will be prepared to take the initiative in implicating those people suspected of disobedience; by the use of records, by questioning witnesses and by the use of informants.<sup>20</sup>

Furthermore, the instructors' suspicion over certain members of the public also comes to focus in the classroom on certain segments of youth, deemed to be at variance to the 'place' of youth in general. So, those young people in possession of commodities or holding positions of influence deemed more suited to their established 'betters', tend to be regarded by police instructors as occupying discrepant roles, rationalised as implausible.<sup>21</sup> As the sergeant instructor tells the class.

"Take punk yobos driving a Rolls Royce car. Arrest on suspicion? What would they be doing in such a car? Even if you're wrong, say it's a pop group. The car could have been stolen."

According to the instructors then, those young people apparently failing to behave conventionally or getting above their 'station', tend to be stereotyped as undersocialised and subject to extra suspicion; not least since they tend to be regarded as acting as misguided leaders to gullible followers, which appears to be a reason why instructors hold some anxiety about the state of youth in general. As the Course Commander puts it.

"The youth of today causes more problems ... they've been taught to question ... and the lack of discipline is now showing."

So, in considering police training in exercising discretion under the law, embodying as it does stereotypical views of the proper place of youth in a disciplined society, it is those young people and groups who are seen to deviate from this view, particularly, but not exclusively, working class youths who tend to symbolise for the police the direct or indirect source of much trouble. Furthermore, those places believed to be frequented by many of those considered as scroungers in an area too affluent for their own good, are constantly cited by instructors as the harbingers of disorder about whom an officer must learn. Thus armed with information and stereotypes of certain people and places a recruit is instructed to be positively aggressive towards those people, and punitive should they respond. Again a class instructor.

"Well common sense tells us that you exercise your powers by grabbing hold of the villain and saying 'I have reasonable suspicion that you have been involved in some sort of incident which might have led to an arrestable offence' ... "

Thus the differential treatment of people at law, dependent as

it is clearly thought to be, on stereotypical images of indiscipline and indolence, result in police trainers advocating the suspension of such people's 'rights' to 'freedom' until they prove to the police that they are entitled to that right. And this is taught to recruits. Again the Course Commander's endorsement.

"Again I give a lesson which causes a great deal of merriment here on safe custody of prisoners, and its a practical lesson as far as I'm concerned and I always demonstrate it. And once a fortnight they put a sketch on which involves a man in inspector's uniform grabbing somebody by the scruff of the neck and the arse of the pants and throwing them into a cell, which was about the strength of the practical lesson, but the whole course accepted that as a practical instance. But you don't teach that in law do you?" 22

First then, not only is a recruit required to accept that such people have abroated their rights but also that dealing with such stereotypical 'targets' is where police priorities, and thus rewards for recruits, lie. And secondly, that by eliminating such challenges to authority the law and the police supervisory officers will support them. Again the instructor in the classroom.

"If you occasion assault in using reasonable force to effect an arrest you will be supported. This has been the case with Liddle Towers and Jimmy Kelly."

A recruit is thus being socialised not only into suspicion and mistrust towards the public generally (until they have proved they can be trusted), but contempt for those stereotyped by instructors in particular. Furthermore, given that the social hierarchy is accepted as natural then so too is the differential treatment of such people at law, which discretion allows and 'common sense' endorses. Acceptance of such a position is thus a likely consequence of police training for constables. And since the successful police officer needs the full support of his/her colleagues if he/she is to 'make it', his/her adherence to common sense includes the specific condemnation of such people stereotyped as undersocialised, ignorant or evil; and these

groups are specified in the classroom by instructors. As a course instructor states in interview about what he points out to recruits in the class.

"Well you make them aware. I mean you tell them in one of the lessons that if you've got a high cosmopolitan area you've to police one way; covering the Yorkshire Dales it needs to be policed another. And it's difficult to make some people aware ... that there are places like (...) ... The families like the (...) and the (...) ... all these people I can point out to probationers in (...) ... The (...) and all these buggers ... Scots, Irish and coons, er, and anyone that's drinking a lot. Scots in (...), coons in (...), Irish anywhere."

Thus the rationale of the police and of the criminal law, the underlying collectively held moral sentiments which justify penal sanctions, are expressed by trainers as arising most clearly from the threat of stereotypical individuals, groups and areas deemed to be a danger for the community. So instruction includes the transmission of a 'perceptual shorthand' to identify certain kinds of people stereotyped as troublemakers, that is, as persons who use gesture, language and attire that the instructor has come to recognise as a prelude to crime and violence. This is echoed by a female instructor talking about the different areas inhabited by 'rough' working class people.

"There's an estate in (...) called (...) which is a very, very rough estate, very anti police. And if you get into trouble on the (...) certainly they'd come and help them, not you. There's the (...) which is predominantly West Indian and that one area alone would probably need 2 or 3 times the cover of any similar sized area because they are very anti police, you know. Before they start they've got such a chip on their shoulder against authority ... plus the fact they do a lot of muggings and robberies. They run the prostitutes."

Thus a disposition to stereotype is an integral part of the trainers view of society. Secondly, far from this applying to a minority of officers acting arbitrarily they are all actually trained to do so. Third, such stereotyping includes instruction that more crimes are committed in the poor sections of town inhabited by the 'rough' than in wealthier areas. Thus the police are instructed in the beginning to divide the population and physical territory under

observation into a variety of categories, and, having made some assumptions about the moral character of the people and places in these categories, they then focus attention on those categories of persons and places felt to have the shadiest moral characters.<sup>23</sup>

Fourth, since the police are instructed that they represent the (silent) majority, not to mention the superiority of the British system of 'justice' then those showing contempt for due authority are considered to be irrational if not extremists, which convention and the law must oppose.

Thus those few academic speakers who do visit the centre to give talks on the 'causes' of public hostility towards the police and hassle the police to examine their own attitudes, tend to be considered by the trainers to have been misled into pursuing a line contrary to that which the Great Majority think manifest, as this is believed to be, in the value of concrete police experience. As a female instructor puts it.

"They do have quite a few visiting speakers ... they've had University Lecturers and they've talked over their heads because they've not related to policework."

So such people as visiting academics, who give talks on such subjects as the importance of the police attending to good communications and community relations, tend to be regarded as having their heads in the clouds; merely giving their own minority interpretation of events, rather than the primary definition of order which instructors appear to associate with a more objective view, common sense and the importance of facts - generated by 'real' experience in the police.<sup>24</sup> Furthermore, not only are such people as visiting academics stereotyped as talking at variance with the instructor's experience of policing, but where lessons on the importance of good

police communications with the public have been included in the curriculum of the training course, for the police themselves to instruct recruits, it tends to be treated by them as irrelevant. For this reason the same female sergeant instructor tells us that instructors generally ignore such subjects because they:

"Have this communications thing, which is not done properly ... their deffing it out. I mean kicking it into touch; not doing it; doing revision instead ... They don't see the relevance of it."

Far from instructors promoting community relations in training the subject is considered to be irrelevant. As another sergeant instructor puts it.

"It's a load of bollocks human relations ... If somebody (in class) stood up and said 'Am I here to prosecute?'. Yes you are here to prosecute. Not to be popular. But you're there to abide by a certain standard and stick by certain morals, er, that's it."

It appears that those people advocating more 'progressive' ideas about crime, punishment and community relations are stereotyped by the police as talking at odds with dominant definitions of social order and police common sense, rooted as this has been shown to be in trainers' practical experience of policing. Again the female instructor's view.

"Now to me people who stick their heads in the sand too much, I think there's a tendency for some of them to, they are bad to work with ... I mean perhaps some of the social workers who have not done a lot of actual fieldwork, as I think they call it, would tend to have all these principles they've been told at University in their heads without the experience to back it up!"

Evidently seen to be lacking 'common sense' and concrete police experience then, such people as social workers are stereotypically presented to recruits as typifying misguided and relatively inept administration; out of touch with the fixed points of the moral universe, like family, school, church and community life, which are applauded in

the police. So the police find themselves opposed to those who seem at odds with 'authoritative' definitions of social order, consensus, and common sense; people who, like social workers, are presented to recruits as somewhat unprofessional by virtue of their apparent involvement with the undersocialised, rather than uncritically supporting the police. And the above is continuously suggested to recruits in the following ways.

"You will be dealing with people who treat children so. There were no social workers when I joined. Policemen usually deal with these matters. They are by nature more able to do so."

Now a female instructor addressing a class on the same issue.

"The social services are naive. You should see some of the social workers I have met, they are so gullible, they believe almost anything. They might be educated but know nothing of life. Our job is to enforce the law ... If social workers can afford to be taken in by criminals a policeman can't."

Police recruits are thus instructed that unlike some 'gullible social workers and other 'naive' members of the Social Services, summarily dismissed as knowing nothing of life, they must exercise their discretion under the law according to the norms of collective police experience, which suggests that they will be rewarded for catching and convicting suspects, rather than giving them the benefit of the doubt.<sup>25</sup>

As yet another instructor in whose class I participated stressed in interview:

"A lot of social workers ... relate or equate themselves to the people that they are dealing with and try and get on their terms ... and get involved with them on a non professional basis, sort of casual friendly basis, where the villain himself can con that person and frequently does con him into all sorts of situations, whereby ... the social worker then goes back and says he's a misunderstood lad and this, that and the other; He fell out of his pram when he was bloody seven and his brother wouldn't buy him an ice cream on his birthday, and he didn't have pumps when all the other kids had pumps, or he didn't have a bike when all the other kids had bikes, and he wouldn't benefit from a custodial sentence. When the

policeman whose more professional says 'Yes six months in the bloody can would probably suit that bastard down to the ground, because he won't be knocking any more old ladies on the head. That bloke is a danger to society, he's out screwing every night ... and somebody is going to say it's all misunderstood. Let him out!'"

A consequence of recruits socialisation is that they are orientated towards the assumed authority of police experience rather than the mere opinion of those outsiders perceived as threatening such authority. So such people as social workers are presented to recruits as being misled and encouraging others to do likewise, thereby making policework more difficult. Finally then, the above instructor expresses his indignation at other members of the judicial system and the media, cited by him as doing the same thing.<sup>26</sup>

"That is what is affecting policemen today it is permissive. It's all a bloody joke. Somebody, a victim, wrote a letter to the '(....) Evening Telegraph'. They were a victim of a mugging ... And they said that the only group of people who showed any form of professionalism - and they had dealings with social workers, the courts themselves, the magistrates, and two lots of solicitors, plus members of the press - the only person that showed any form of professionalism was the police. And they said it was rubbish that was trotted out in court in this bloke's defence. And the way he was treated in the witness box made a mockery of law and order in this country today."

According to the above not only is permissiveness and criminality seen to be caused by those individuals and groups stereotyped as wrongdoers, but, for the police, such behaviour appears to be seen to be exacerbated by certain members of society who are stereotyped by instructors as out of touch with reality, if not 'corrupt'. Given then that in exercising discretion under the law the police believe they are pursuing a minority in the interests of the majority, then those individuals seen to be at variance with police interests are seen as less professional; which amounts to being typed as less than impartial.



Basic Police Training and the Role of Discipline

Given then that in how police recruits exercise their discretion instructors tend to be concerned that recruits will give priority to weeding out crime and those stereotyped as criminals, in this section I shall examine that element of the curriculum in police training which appears to focus on disciplining recruits; the discipline felt to be necessary so that they can be trusted to carry out such tasks when they are subsequently allowed out on the streets alone. My empirical examination of this process with which I resume my analysis of basic police training, begins again with the comments of the Course Commander whose statements on how he addresses each new course on this subject should serve as an outline of the rationale of course discipline.

"I tend to separate the course into two halves in that respect. I had a meeting of my instructors on Sunday, with the new course coming in ... and my instructions were ... 'You (recruits) will be screwed down. You will be instilled with discipline, from square one.' No way if I caught an instructor addressing a student by their christian names during the first six weeks of the course then the instructor will be on the carpet and he'd be in my black books. I don't want no nick names, no acting the fool. They will be made to jump when the instructor says so. They'll stand up when a stranger walks into the room, to attention, until they are told to sit down. Basically because we're dealing with raw civilians off the streets. Part of any policeman's life is discipline, not only discipline in uniform but self discipline. There's only one way in my opinion you learn that and that is by being physically taught by someone who enforces discipline."

The aim of police discipline and punishment then is as a tool to mould recruits' attitudes with numbing regularity. Furthermore, such an attitude by police instructors suggests that the ordering and direction of a recruit's civilian values must change if he<sup>/she</sup> is to make it in the police. So the directive seems to be that one must defer to those above and avoid trouble. This amounts to the suggestion that the more one expresses commitment to the police, represented by police trainers, the better one is seen to be performing by the Centre

staff.<sup>27</sup> And this implies not only that punitive threats and measures play a central role but that a pre-condition of any remission is acceptance of the imperatives laid down by the Training Centre Staff.

Again, the Course Commander:

"Having said that, once we get over the 5-6 weeks then they have a guide as to how they should act, we then move into an area where they earn a bit of remission, if you wish, having toed the line discipline wise, then we'll start to relax a little bit ... Now if you did that from the first week towards the 6th or 7th week you'd have bedlam on your bloody hands ... but they know for a fact that if they get out of hand, then the big boot comes down and they suffer for it ... You give people their guide-lines and you say 'You step out of that line and you are in hot water.'"

The above suggests that the staff at the Police Training Centre are ever watchful, especially at first, for any sign in a recruit of indiscipline; indiscipline which is seen as a threat both to their hierarchical conception of social order and to the exercise of due authority and deference which serves to legitimise the structure as well as the police task itself.<sup>28</sup> And this importantly includes any lack of respect by recruits for their 'Significant Others', typified by instructors, which the instructor below illustrates in the following way:

"It's only in respect for your ... rank and senior officers really. I think if you respect ... I mean let's face it, at home you respect your parents. If your elders came and you show respect for them, well why shouldn't that be continued in the job? What's wrong with it? I mean if somebody is senior and he's achieved his rank and he's gone higher than you in authority. Unfortunately, you know, it's a structure built occupation ... if you can show respect for somebody indirectly ... they will have respect for you. But on the other hand if you do not show respect for a person who deserves the respect ... to the rank, then I think there is something wrong with you."

So, by a common-sensical analogy with the role of parental authority, the Centre is presented as the institutional site where

the socialisation of young police officers to respect their 'significant others' is first tellingly and intimately carried through. According to the above such a process entails repression and regulation of recruits' individual values, to be replaced by respect for senior police officers; (typified by Training Centre staff) taken to personify the values of the dominant majority. This implies that the discipline, hierarchy and authority at the Training Centre, entailing as it does rewards and punishments, are a means to prepare recruits to realise that such a structure typifies the police community generally, to which normal police officers in the course of their daily work should conform. As a female instructor puts it when giving her view of such a regime.

"Getting them functioning as a unit I suppose. Getting them to realise they are part of an organisation, because they are, the police, they are a very tight knit community ... And I think possibly the shouting at them and this drill does that, it knits them together, sometimes perhaps against the common enemy, you know the drill instructor ... but it does bind them together."

According to the above then the regime at the training centre is importantly concerned with instructing recruits to be respectful towards dominant authority, which any failure to conform is taken to oppose. This was evidenced in the classroom, for example, during my participation on the course where I noted that it was not unusual for the instructor to interrupt the class to berate a student. On one occasion this involved an instructor interrupting and exclaiming in a loud voice; "Stand up Mr. (...) stand on your chair". At this everyone looked curiously at the recruit; the 30 years old drill instructor and an ex army sergeant. He appeared embarrassed, if not humiliated and annoyed. He hesitated and the instructor screamed: "Stand on your bloody chair". The recruit obeyed. He was then told to stand on his desk. Then the instructor commanded: "Fined 20 pence for having brown socks on."

As far as the Centre staff are concerned then, not only do they appear to find it necessary to be on guard against any lack of respect for their authority but, as the instructor below suggests, they are also concerned with any reluctance of recruits to manage the 'Physical Inconveniences' of being a police officer. This includes a preparedness to conform to police discipline.<sup>29</sup>

"They have to eat at the proper times and they have to stay in the dining hall until they are told to leave ... They have to be in bed at a certain time. They have to sign in and sign out. Can't take their cars off the Centre. That sort of discipline ... Teach discipline to those who need teaching it. There's a level or there's a chart if you like, where some of them come in, they don't know anything. They've never been taught to salute or anything."

So, not only have recruits to demonstrate that they accept such matters as the inconveniences of being sent to bed early and being confined for the most part to the Centre, but, by extension, they must also demonstrate (by standing to attention, saluting and marching) in an almost stereotypical manner, that no conflict of interest exists which will inhibit their conformity to the police definition of social order. For, as the instructors recurringly suggest, the lack of discipline among recruits when they enter the Centre is taken by them to be one indication of the necessity to impose discipline from 'square one'.

"It's remarkable say, when they do come here they do show off through a lack of self discipline and show themselves up. You've only got to hear them talking and the way they carry on to realise that a lot of them are wankers ... as long as they continue to give this sort of example of themselves they will have the rules."

This unpreparedness of recruits in relation to discipline when they first enter the Centre is cited as legitimating the role of discipline of the course; and to ensure that recruits will be prepared to conform to the dictates of their superiors in the future in the police. Furthermore, this evidently includes some concern on the part of

instructors, that the training and discipline at the Centre is such that recruits will be instilled with standard ideas and approaches when coping with problems in the future. Again yet another class instructor's views:

"It standardises your ideas and approaches ... that's very necessary, the discipline ... by standardising it it makes you think as a policeman; makes them all think coppers. Eventually gives a policeman's mind."

One very important element of police training suggested by the above is the employment of disciplinary measures to ensure that recruits' ideas and approaches are in line with police common sense. So instructors seem to be on the look out for any form of behaviour amongst recruits at odds with the above. Again the same sergeant instructor's view:

"How do we keep them together? By the British standard of policing, and er by the British Police Force ... what it was and always will be. That's it. Any radicals will be soon weeded out. Lost."

Any sign of failure to conform is thus to be promptly dealt with as indiscipline, and this amounts to the suggestion that all unofficial forms of expression not to mention criticism must be eradicated to ensure recruits do as they are told when out on the streets alone in future.

Moreover, since the above involves considerable anxiety on the part of police instructors that recruits will present a respectable image when performing their duties in front of the public, then instructors point out that 'keeping up appearances' is also an important sign of conformity, which a recruit is expected to display.<sup>30</sup>

"Well they have to be smartly turned out. They have parades they have to go on to make sure their appearance is correct. They have to wear a certain type of dress when they are not in the class room. Have their hair fairly short ... As I say proper dress for casual evenings ... discos, things of that nature."

Since police training centre staff evidently see the police upholding respectable authority, then those undergoing training are expected to defer to such authority, in thought and deed. For the above instructor this is manifest in a concern that recruits demonstrate orthodoxy in dress and 'image' in an almost stereotypical form. This orthodoxy is taken to be yet one more indication of commitment to conformity.

Thus recruits must demonstrate that they have internalised social discipline, as defined by trainers, before leaving the 'total institution' that is the police training centre.<sup>31</sup>

The recruits must show by their conduct that a consequence of police training is that when exercising their discretion they will respect the views of their senior officers when dealing with offenders:

"There wouldn't be a training centre here unless it had a certain purpose ... They'll be aware of offences and how to deal with those offences ... because you've got their respect by that time ... You don't need to enforce the discipline ... it applies in prisons and services, in any walk of life you like."

According to instructors, the purpose of the course at the basic police training centre is to ensure that recruits will strictly adhere to doing as they are told by not only being aware of offences pointed out by instructors but also how to deal with them. As the same instructor puts it:

"What it means is that the bloody villains on the street know that when they are dealing with the police they are going to get a professional job done, unless they are getting fitted up. Whereas they know that when they are dealing with social workers all they've got to do is say the right thing. If they are dealing with psychiatrists they know how to behave at the right time. If they are dealing with solicitors, they know the ones they can tell the truth to and the ones they have to con."

Finally instructors suggest that a major consequence of discipline and punishment at the centre will be that by the time

recruits leave the centre their socialising influence will have been such that recruits 'voluntarily' support the view of social order held by the police. This implies that recruits leaving the centre will share their instructors' mistrust of those individuals and groups stereotyped as 'villains', who appear to be failing to conform to the police stereotype of correct behaviour; as well as those people stereotyped as unprofessional who seem to be advocating that 'villains' be given the benefit of the doubt. So instructors imply that a recruit wishing to succeed must come to share their colleagues' interest in instilling respect for authority among those cited as otherwise unlikely to display it as well as their senior officers' dislike of public criticism of the police in general. The critics are presented as at variance to the interests of the dominant majority, on whose behalf the police believe they impartially uphold the law.<sup>32</sup>

Summary of Basic Police Training: Law, Discretion, Dominant Definition of Order, Stereotypes and Discipline

The findings so far reveal that along with instruction on the law, particularly powers of arrest, stop, search and procedure, there are several other points which the police do not appear to publicly proclaim.

First, as a practical matter, the discretionary powers of the police to stop, question or even arrest people they suspect of engaging in wrong doing is extremely wide. Secondly the exercise of discretion is characterised by the common sense views of the police - views which distinguish between 'fact' and 'opinion', which give rise to the suggestion of instructors that, wherever possible, recruits should adhere to 'objective' and 'authoritative' statements of respectable members of society, rather than the 'rough'. The result of this

structured preference in training is that instructors tend, faithfully and impartially, to reproduce the existing hierarchy of credibility in society, which they associate with consensus. That is, instructors take the language of the public and, on each occasion, return it inflected with dominant and consensual connotations. Thus instructors are actively engaged in translating the unfamiliar - hooliganism, violence - into the familiar for recruits; as being 'caused' by a minority of workshy layabouts, acting against the interests of the dominant majority; which they associate with consensus. Recruits are therefore being given a translation of how to evaluate deviant behaviour, legitimated by what the instructors believe the majority of the public demand.

Thus, the idea of consensus and the instructors' belief that the police represent the public interest is very important in training. Instructors therefore assume that they are speaking for the public when giving their own views on where 'rewards' for the police, and thus recruits, lie. This seems to be associated with the campaigning tone adopted by instructors, particularly against blacks, working class youth, the unemployed and areas cited as being populated by the 'rough', 'feckless' and the 'idle'; underwritten, as this seems to be, by a belief that the police are 'where the action is', and that this claim to expertise is justified by its objective facticity separate from comment, value and mere opinion. This is to say that since instructors assume the police represent consensus, and, also, that police tend to be the experts, for instructors, independent police action is legitimate against those stereotyped as 'rough' and those police 'suspect' of crime. In other words, police exigencies mediate between events and the courts, justified, for instructors, on the grounds that they believe the police dispassionately represent the people.

33



So, the virtual inability of other institutions to oversee the police has the effect in training, that while the courts can rule that information gathered illegally cannot be admitted into evidence at a trial, the police are taught that in practice, the courts are powerless to protect the rights of citizens in the face of determined opposition from the police. This is partly because the police often have ample evidence to convict without a confession

, and partly because the rules of procedure, even when applied (as they often are not) affect interrogations only slightly because the police can still question suspects virtually at will.

Thus, the fact that the police are a primary source of 'information' about 'crime', and also command the passage between dominant definitions of criminality, the courts and the general public, has the consequence that in performing this mediating role the police are enhanced, not weakened, by the fact that they are formally and structurally independent; both of the sources to which they refer and of the 'public' on whose behalf they speak. The more so, since legitimate conduct for instructors takes place within the dominant definition of consensus, balance and impartiality - but deviance does not.

The instructors are therefore interpreting events to fit their definitions of the social universe. A consequence of this is that instructors effectively deny divergent viewpoints a chance to be heard. Thus, for example, the position of critics of the police tends to be regarded by instructors as preposterous, 'play acting' or trivial. On the other hand, the similar a statement or event to instructors' views, the more probably it will be heard. The latter includes anxiety among instructors over the 'seriousness' and 'extensiveness'

of certain crimes, and to keep alive in the public mind the police's own concerns. Recruit training therefore includes an expectation that recruits will echo these anxieties; reinforced, as they are, by instructors in the classroom by anecdotal tales drawn from the instructors' 'experiences'; emphasising the bizarre, atypical, eccentric, strange or grotesque characteristics of certain sections of the public.

The above connects with the observation that, for instructors, certain individuals and groups, such as blacks, youth, the unemployed and welfare class, tend to be regarded as disrespectful, if not violent, dangerous and extremists, and that little things can lead to 'bigger' things, unless nipped in the bud. In order to prevent such individuals and groups threatening to unhinge the social order then recruits are instructed to take independent action to preserve the status quo. Indeed, police officers are specifically trained to be suspicious and to mistrust people, until they have proved they can be trusted; particularly if such people deviate from stereotypical police images of 'respectable' authority. Such images entail a commitment to orthodox appearance, dress, place of residence and background.

Thus armed with information and stereotypes about the morality of certain people and places, a recruit is instructed to be positively aggressive towards those people; not least, by the suspension of the rights of such people to freedom, until they have 'proved' to the police that they are 'entitled' to those rights. Furthermore, not only is immorality and crime seen to be caused by those stereotyped as wrong-doers, but, for instructors, such behaviour appears to be exacerbated by unconventional opinion; typified by

some community relations experts, social workers, academics, and members of the judiciary; who seem to be supporting those whom the police condemn. This is to say, that since for the police events are 'caused' by the immediately preceding actions of particular individuals or groups, criticism of the police appears as essentially ephemeral, and confined to a small group of 'unrealistic' people, whose criticism is unnecessary.

Instructors thus see the police as the defenders of the national interest, indispensable to the public good. Being 'where the action is' reinforces their image of crime fighters, searching out 'bad apples' on behalf of the consensus - with the result of leaving the basic framework of assumption undisturbed. This condenses into a view that they in fact are providing the basic information without prejudice; a view which all staff interviewed at the centre share.

Given then, that in how police exercise their discretion instructors are concerned that recruits will give priority to conforming to the police stereotype of order while eliminating opposition, the above section also reveals that the basic police training course contains discipline and punishment to gain compliance. It also implies that a pre-condition of any remission is acceptance of the imperatives laid down by training centre staff.

The regime at the training centre is importantly concerned with instructing recruits to be respectful towards their senior officers, which any failure to conform is taken to oppose. Moreover, not only have recruits to demonstrate that they accept such matters as the inconveniences of being sent to bed early and unsocial hours, but they must also demonstrate (by standing to attention, saluting and marching) that no conflict of interest exists, which will inhibit

their conformity with police discipline and authority justified, for the instructors, by the 'ignorance' of recruits when they first enter the centre.

So, instructors are concerned that the training and discipline at the centre will ensure that when recruits come to leave they will be instilled with 'standard' ideas and approaches; to be employed by them when dealing with 'problems' in the future. This amounts to the imperative that all unofficial forms of expression, not to mention criticism, must be eradicated, to ensure recruits do as they are told and give a good impression when dealing with respectable members of the public in the future.

In sum then, a major consequence of discipline and punishment at the centre is that recruits must come to 'voluntarily' support the view of order held by the police. So, recruits wishing to succeed are expected to share their instructors' mistrust of those people stereotyped as disrespectful, workshy, immoral and criminal, as well as others - viewed as less than impartial.

#### Higher Police Training

In what follows, I shall be concerned to contrast and compare higher police training, typified by the training of newly promoted police inspectors, with the basic training of constables already outlined.

First then, I commence with the interview of a senior instructor whose statements below on the powers of the police to exercise discretion under the law, should serve as an introductory backdrop against which to contextualise the function of a senior officer as defined by higher training:

"I don't think we should forget the fact that an inspector is still a constable and that the levels

of discretion that a constable has the power to enforce an inspector has."

The above instructor implies that senior police officers have all the wide legal powers of arrest, stop, search and procedure which their subordinates have, including the flexibility to exercise discretion under the law. Furthermore, it is suggested below, by yet another senior officers' instructor, that because the law is often expressed in such broad terms as to render a clear interpretation of the legislature's intentions difficult, in exercising discretion police supervisors too take their cues from 'common sense:

"All we can do in the classroom situation ... you can give a skeleton of procedures to be followed and the meat has to be hung on it by a person's commonsense and experiences of past incidents."

According to the above, higher police trainers seem to take for granted that police exercise their discretion according to common sense; provided this has been acquired through practical police experience. An instructor:

"Policework is ninety five per cent common sense ... in the same way that a person can be a leader he will merely be a person who has a greater depth of common sense than persons below him. It's a feeling that you get."

The above instructor suggests that policework is dominated by a common-sense, the acceptance of which appears to be a pre-condition of police leadership.

Given then that in how police exercise their discretion higher training also tends to be concerned that officers will conform with common sense, I resume my analysis with the comments to the class of newly promoted inspectors of a senior officer/instructor. This comment concerns a review of a mock appraisal exercise involving 'role playing' on closed circuit television. in use in the classroom

for this purpose. The participants of the role playing exercise, to which the class instructor's comments below refer, involve an inspector who was a member of the class and a constable from another course being held at the centre, who 'volunteered' to play the pre-defined role of recalcitrant subordinate, two years off retirement. The inspector is playing the role of a senior officer in the exercise appraising the 'work rate' of the constable, who, the class was told to assume was a subordinate with a 'personal record' of failing to 'jump to' and report members of the public for offences. In the words of the class instructor, the senior officer in the exercise was about to be faced with a 'uniform carrier'; a resentful, cynical, 'bolshy' subordinate, exemplified for the instructor by the <sup>Constable's</sup> record and 'silence' during the interview. In the eyes of the instructor the apparent 'low work rate' of the 'community' constable, evidenced for him, by a lack of offence reports and also his apparent lack of reciprocity, justify the inspector's stereotypical appraisal of the constable - and these comments to the class.

"That guy was obstructive, cynical. There are some people like that. They don't accept the system and go through their police career bucking authority all the time. It's obvious he's dissatisfied. I think I should attack him. It's like interviewing a hardened criminal. It's up to you to get the maximum work out of him."

As with basic training then, the above tends to suggest that higher training courses for senior police officers also place considerable emphasis on ensuring that subordinate officers conform to the dominant definition of order, which senior officers assume the public demands.

Instructors therefore appear to assume they are speaking for the public, when giving their views of where 'rewards' for the police, and thus inspectors on the course lie. This involves an interpretation of events and subordinate officers' conduct, fitting their own common sense assumptions - which effectively deny the potential for alternative

definitions to emerge in the police.

Thus, the position of the subordinate in the exercise, who claimed he was involved in community policing rather than reporting 'offenders' tended to be regarded as 'obstructive', 'anti authority' and 'cynical'; underwritten, as the instructor's view of the constable appears to have been, by the 'objective' facts of his record; which was not open to much manipulation or negotiation.

So by analogy with how police are trained to evaluate their publics, a police supervisor seems to be expected to appraise subordinate motivation by their past record as a guide to their future; thereby differentiating between those to be rewarded and those to be coerced. As the same instructor puts it during interview.

"I accept that there are people who dislike work and they have to be coerced and this, that and the other...Purely and simply we're trying to point out to inspectors that these people are about and they are in the police force, and it's up to them, by studying the individuals they've got with them to realising (sic) who can be subject to less supervision, because they know that they are self motivated towards doing a good job. You can know that a certain person is capable of doing a certain thing and if you tell him exactly what you want him to do he will go and do it to the best of his ability. Where another one, you can tell him what you want him to do but you'll have to constantly monitor him to make sure he's doing it, because he's not sufficiently motivated to do it off his own bat. There are some people in the police force, who all they're interested in is coming in for eight hours, doing as little as possible and picking up the money at the end of the month. I'd liken them to some people in the car industry...and all we're trying to do is to point out to the inspector that this is in fact so and some people will require...coerced, threat of punishment to do the job."

The suggestion is that a senior officer's function very importantly involves punitive threats and measures to gain compliance. So the more one expresses commitment to the police the better performing one is seen to be by senior officers. Thus the discretionary power of police supervisors over their subordinates is such that it enables them to use their control over

disciplinary action to coerce them to adapt, contribute to or work for a particular cause; which amounts to the fact that pressure is put upon subordinates to accept the imperatives laid down by senior officers.

As another instructor puts it.

"You can use many ways of enforcing discipline in it's er'm, in the sense of getting work out of a person. There are many directions you can take, to put it bluntly, to make things unpleasant, but still within your authority. You can make life difficult enough for him, so that eventually he should start to work again."

Since the authority of senior police officers is almost unlimited the above instructor indicates that supervisors can informally, if not formally, 'make life miserable' for those whose conduct appears to indicate that they are not abiding by the normative code of the group; such conduct is seen as a threat by senior officers' instructors, both to the hierarchical conception of social order and to the exercise of due authority and deference. These serve to legitimise the structure, as well as the police task itself.

Moreover, as the above instructor adds, this also includes an expectation that senior officers undergoing training will ensure that subordinates defer to their authority.

"By making them (newly promoted inspectors) recognise that now they have achieved the rank of inspector they have a far greater responsibility to control the people beneath them to the best advantage ... They are responsible for enforcing the level of discipline through the sergeants that you demand of the constables."

Ensuring that police subordinates defer to their 'significant others', typified by their superiors, appears to be a pre-condition of avoiding punishment, embodied in police discipline. Again an instructor.

"We understand we've got a discipline code and should be working as a unit to help and achieve our objectives and if somebody, for any reason, is failing to get into the spirit of things ... it's up to the inspector to try and find out why ... Now maybe he's deliberately not done it ... I would have this officer in and I would tell him what my feelings were; 'And if you fail to top the line next time' ... He's committed an offence under the discipline code. If he persisted - 'bang!' At least you've



given him warning notice - put a shot across his bows, if you like. And, if he doesn't respond to it - sink him next time!"

Clearly, it ill behoves a subordinate police officer to fail to respond to downward pressure to 'produce', particularly if there are no mitigating circumstances and they are persistent offenders. The same instructor goes on to imply below, that in discriminating between those subordinates who are 'getting into the spirit of things' and those who are not, senior officers are evidently expected to treat a subordinate's amenability to training in the past as an indication of their 'self' discipline to operate, without coercion, on their own in future.

"Discipline really is training ... I feel the only way you get a really good form of discipline is 'self' discipline, because these lads are operating on their own really, aren't they, more often than not. You can't be behind them all the time, and if they haven't got self pride and self discipline, it's gonna be extremely hard to instil."

One consequence of disciplined training and ongoing supervision is that most officers conform. Again, another instructor on the same topic.

"There is a saying in the police force, if you give a man enough rope he'll hang himself ... But they are very, very much the minority. Eventually that type of problem tends to be resolved through them going so far down the ladder that they make serious mistakes. And once they start to make serious mistakes, they then become subject to total discipline and either suspension or subsequent dismissal."

Since the majority of officers are seen to conform those who fail are evidently regarded as a numerical minority making 'serious mistakes', whom it is the job of a police supervisor to subject to total discipline or subsequent dismissal. Furthermore, those making 'serious mistakes' appear to be regarded as such not only by their attitude towards their senior officers but also by the way they 'handle' situations; where their approach brings suspicion on the police as a result of public complaints.<sup>34</sup> Again, an instructor.

"If the inspector's doing his job properly he will be aware that if the chappy is constantly getting a number of complaints ... for instance, you see, we get police officers assaulted, well it's surprising how often it is the same officer who is getting assaulted all the time. Well, this can't just be coincidence, it would suggest that the officer's approach may be lacking a little bit in the first place. It almost gets a member of the public to belt him, you see, or, erm, be a bit naughty towards him. I think that this would manifest itself if a bloke is being a bit uncivil ... towards the public; well it would manifest itself by the number of complaints I suppose that he would get against him, or the number of unsavoury incidents, not necessarily complaints, that he gets involved in. So, you begin to think to yourself why should a member of the public pick on this policeman, it could be something wrong in his make-up."

Instructors on higher training courses appear keen then to point out to senior officers that they should be on guard against those officers who appear to lack the requisite self control and respect for convention. Failing to maintain respect for dominant authority, getting assaulted or soliciting complaints against the police, are some of the ways this is exemplified.

Moreover, since the above anxiety about the public image of the police evidently entails some concern that subordinates will present a 'respectable' appearance when performing their duties in front of the public, senior instructors (like constables' trainers already examined) point out that they expect newly promoted inspectors to insist that subordinates 'keep up appearances' as a sign of conformity. As the instructor in interview reveals in the following way :

"You see, the sort of thing I'm talking about is: erm ... it shows an attitude of mind ... There's no way that I could ever go to an incident and sort of go to it improperly dressed, for instance. If I go to an incident there's no way I could go and deal with people without, say, my hat or helmet on, tie undone or buttons missing off my tunic or not looking presentably smart and shoes clean. And, I'm afraid that nowadays ... looking neat and tidy ... and I sometimes think, well it would be foolish to say otherwise, some policemen fall short of this particular thing, and that to me shows an attitude of mind."

So, senior officers' instructors not only propose that police leaders evaluate subordinates' respect for authority by their attitudes

towards their supervisors, colleagues and work - as well as their 'approach' towards different members of the public - but also their appearance. Furthermore, the latter implies that senior officers' training tends to applaud orthodoxy in speech, dress and manners as representative of the majority. On the other hand, non-conformity with this stereotype tends to be seen as indiscipline. So the instructor adds.

"We go through the benefits of having a disciplined organisation (on the course) and I suppose it comes down to the ultimate deterrent, that is, the implementation of the police discipline code. But, this comes to one of the things I'm talking about - a simple thing like hair cuts ... one of their (newly promoted inspectors) tasks is to instil this discipline within the troops."

Senior officers in training evidently see the police as the outer bearers of respectable authority, to which those subordinates wishing to avoid punishment are expected to defer.

Furthermore, the above concerns about discipline and authority seem to be related to senior instructors' anxiety about the strengths and weaknesses of different sections of the public to criticise the police. This appears to have the consequence that if subordinates wish to avoid punishment from their senior officers, then, in comparison with how they are expected to deal with 'failures', when dealing with the successful and wealthy they must adopt a respectful approach. Again, one of the instructors.

"Different force areas ... different areas do require a different form of policing. When I worked at (...) which is a very rural area it was a different environment. When I was at (...) I was dealing with the lower working classes to a great extent and their wants and needs are vastly different to the people of millionaires row at (...). A different approach is required entirely ... You can talk down (...) in gutter language if you like. If talked any other to them they'd assume you were taking the mickey out of them. If you used the same approach at (...) you'd have so many complaints you wouldn't have time for anything else."

So the higher training of senior officers tends to reveal an overriding concern about the public image of the police, related as this

is to the public's view of the police in general and potential criticism by the wealthy and middle class in particular.<sup>35</sup> So yet one further feature of management training in the police is the recurring emphasis on ensuring that subordinates exercise their discretion, under the law, so that they demonstrate solidarity with their senior officers and colleagues against outside criticism; by adopting a more respectful approach towards those considered successful while condemning the poor as potential troublemakers, if not morally inferior.

The above suggests that the role of newly promoted inspectors is to mediate - to act as 'gatekeepers' - between the public, the law and individual police subordinates by using their common sense, which, the instructors assume, represents consensus. So newly promoted inspectors seem to be expected to commend those subordinates who defer to the successful (by prosecuting the poor and 'disrespectful'), while punishing those subordinates whose approach tends to deviate from senior officers expectations.

Finally, the above variation in how senior officers are expected to demand that their subordinates vary their behaviour when exercising their discretion, seems to be regarded by instructors on courses as policing impartially. This is illustrated in the following way.

"The area of discretion? ... It's teaching how and when discretion should be used ... to teach a person to be totally impartial, when he is exercising his discretion ... The inspector is the key figure in the police force ... He's the first level of higher supervision. If we can train him to a higher level of efficiency, then the force must be more 'efficient'."

#### Summary of Higher Training

The above findings on higher training reveal that, as with constable training, when exercising their discretion, police leaders too are expected to take their cues from common sense - provided this has been acquired through practical police experience. Moreover, acceptance of the

'objective' and 'authoritative' credibility of common sense appears to be a pre-condition of police leadership; associated, as this appears to be, with the dominant definition of order, and how subordinates should work.

Given then, that by virtue of their rank, inspectors in higher training are expected by instructors to have assimilated the above, much of the focus of such courses tends to be concerned with scrutinizing subordinates to ensure that they can continue to be trusted to conform. A consequence of such training is therefore a stress on uniformity of thought, beyond the threshold of which action is required. Newly promoted inspectors are thus actively engaged, with instructors, in giving translations to other members of the class on how to evaluate subordinates' behaviour. This connects with the observation that a police supervisor seems to be expected in higher training to appraise subordinates' motivation by their past record as well as their 'reputation' as a guide to the future; thereby differentiating between those who are to be rewarded and those who are to be 'targetted'.

Furthermore, and again as with constables' training, the fact that senior officers are formally and structurally independent - both of the public and of the dominant 'consensus' to which they refer - has the consequence that they have wide powers over their subordinates; which enables senior officers to use their control over disciplinary action to coerce subordinate police officers to accept the imperatives which they lay down; with the option that they can make life 'miserable' or even punish any one who fails to abide by the (common sense) code of the group.

In the eyes of the instructors on higher training courses, the above failures of subordinates include a lack of respect for existing hierarchy and authority as represented by senior officers. These demand

that subordinates demonstrate conformity by voluntarily producing results if they are to avoid being the subject of close monitoring or punishment. Moreover, since it is the opinion of senior instructors that the majority of officers conform, those who fail are evidently seen to be a conspicuous minority which it is the job of a police supervisor to root out. Not least since they tend to be cited as also lacking in their approach when dealing with the public and this results in public complaints.

Thus instructors propose that police leaders evaluate subordinates' respect for authority by their attitudes toward their supervisors, colleagues and work, as well as their approach and their appearance. This connects with the observation that senior officers are anxious about the strengths and weaknesses of different sections of the public to criticise the police. This has the consequence that senior officers in higher training are urged that if police subordinates wish to avoid punishment from their superiors, then in dealing with the successful and the wealthy they must adopt a respectful approach.

According to the instructors on the senior officers' training course then the role of the newly promoted inspectors is to mediate between respectable members of the public, the law and individual subordinates, who, common sense dictates, should take an 'entirely different approach' towards the 'rough'. Thus a dominant thread in management training in the police is the recurring emphasis that subordinates exercise their discretion under the law, so that they demonstrate solidarity with the common sense of their senior officers and colleagues against outside criticism by adopting a more respectful approach towards the successful while condemning others stereotyped as 'troublemakers', particularly in poor areas.

Finally, it also appears that since the dominant social order

tends to be regarded by senior officers as natural, then so too is the way subordinates are expected to treat different social classes. This is regarded by all concerned in higher training as policing impartially. What such a view of impartiality ignores is the discriminatory aspect of this differential policing.

#### Conclusion.

This chapter has been concerned to empirically examine one further element of police professionalism by analysing the process of basic and higher training. For as was stated at the outset of this chapter some senior police officers and radical criminologists are making opposing claims about this process. In order to test these claims my aim has been to examine the meaning given to police training by the police themselves by looking at how basic and higher training works in practice.

First my general conclusion is that police training tends to stress vocational security, constancy and obedience. 'Adjustment' and 'belonging' rather than competition are stressed at the basic police training centre. The 'growth' of recruits is measured by his/her social adjustment to what police instructors assume to be 'reality' rather than by recruits 'individualistic' accomplishments. Individual behaviour is measured against the needs and norms of the 'police' and those members of society who cannot adjust or like recruits are stereotyped as 'indisciplined' are considered to be 'abnormal' or 'immature'.

In a general sense then new recruits tend to be regarded as 'irrational' by the police but through police training, experience, 'commonsense' and (police images) of the law, it is assumed that recruits can control their 'impulses' and come to know and achieve a kind of rationality. Instructors therefore tend to assume that the police are rational because they must constantly attend to 'authoritative', dominant and 'objective' definitions as to who are the most 'respectable' members of society, and who are the most 'serious' offenders vis-a-vis the 'public interest' if they are to perform their jobs with precision and caution.

A second point of the trainers' ideology lies in the assumption that recruits (along with other sections of society) are responsible for their individual 'impulses' which it is the duty of the police to control. It is the police training centre's duty to replace 'individualistic' tendencies, 'unmotivated' behaviour and non-conformity with 'motivated' behaviour and strict obedience to the norms of the organisation, which defines personal worth. The above further assumes that there are no bad police socialising agents - only bad recruits. Police training centres are assumed to represent 'consensus' or the 'public interest'. It is up to recruits to do so.

Thus an imperative of police training is that the recruit is now accountable to the police. Training limits the individual officer's 'autonomy' by giving him/her rules and routines to follow, underwritten by the police's occupationally inflected (commonsense) version of dominant definitions of 'law and order'. At the same time the training centre in order to secure the control and reliability of the recruits is built on security (e.g. they cannot leave the 'compound' without permission, except at weekends - and even this can be withheld); routinisation, fixity of procedure (e.g. Standing Orders), and constancy of stimuli and response. By such mechanisms as control over police discipline (e.g. a rigid rank structure, saluting, marching to classes, drill and parading each morning) and rewards and punishments the police eliminate sources of uncertainty and inconstancy while emphasising vocational security. 'Individualistic' tendencies and 'risk' taking are devalued. The stress for appropriate police behaviour is on 'reliability' and conformity rather than innovation. The police want personnel who will conform to the 'tried and true' way rather than challenge 'established procedures'.

On the other hand the recruit is relatively 'free' from coercion, provided he/she subscribes (or comes to subscribe) to 'authoritative'



definitions of police priorities and 'violent' individuals accepted by instructors. The police's priority, according to instructors, is to instil respect among those sections of society assumed to be 'seriously' threatening the 'public interest' as defined by the political and judicial elites of society, underwritten as this appears to be by different punishments handed out to the 'dangerous' elements of the lower orders when dealt with by the courts.

The result of this structured preference in training is that primary definitions of who are 'respectable' and 'worthy' and who are 'seriously offending' the public interest set the limits of where police priorities lie for the trainers. Senior officers therefore tend to situate themselves in a position of structured subordination to the powerful - the ideology of whom tends to be inflected in the classroom, (36). This, the police assume, represents the moral framework of the people and thus how police discretion under the law is to be applied.

Thus instructors are actively engaged in offering a translation of 'serious' offenders - and thereby the differential treatment of people at law - for recruits, which instructors commonsensically assume to be 'objective' on the grounds that this is what the 'majority' of the populace demand. Instructors therefore assume that they are speaking for the public when giving their own views on where rewards (and condemnation/ outside interference/punishment) for the police and thus recruits, lie. Moreover, since, according to dominant definitions, arrest and subsequent conviction are more important the more 'serious' or 'dangerous' the offence against the 'public interest', for the police, the ends come to justify the means (e.g. the demands of apprehension of 'violence' and those the powerful stereotype as 'violent', 'layabouts', etc., require violation of procedural rules in the name of the 'higher'

justification of prosecuting the 'sponger' and those defined as 'layabouts').

The more so, since legitimate conduct for instructors takes place within the dominant definition of the 'public interest', while the deviance of those 'rough', 'feckless' and 'idle' offenders against the 'public interest' does not.

On the one hand then instructors insist that recruits show respect towards those sections of the population assumed to have the appropriate rank, demeanour and respect for police authority; those whose approach is impersonal and should be approached impersonally. On the other hand instructors transmit other stereotypes to recruits about the poor, the unemployed, 'scroungers', 'animals', the 'feckless', working class youth, blacks, agitators, students and extremists - whose 'indiscipline' is assumed by the police to threaten community order; exemplified by the family; the wealthy, those who have 'made it on their own', community and church.

Recruits therefore seem expected to defer to the successful, while looking down on the 'rough' and others stereotyped as threatening to corrupt the innocent or ignorant, or likely to subvert the 'common values' of the 'normal' enjoying their well deserved happiness. Accepting the logic of this then those undergoing training are expected to regard as abnormal those person who are 'out of place', 'out of time', 'out of mind' or 'out of order'. This is to say in the wrong area for their social class, out of school or work, protesting against the police, being black - or failing to uncritically support the police (e.g. social workers).

Confronted with such 'rough' districts or such an 'enemy', vigilance, suspicion and violence is the conclusion of such reasoning, which police discretion allows and the law endorses. This includes the notion that those stereotyped as indolent, disorderly and criminal have no rights, so not 'being taken in' and 'not taking any crap' are also justified by such reasoning - which people who complain of police conduct advocating that the police attend to community relations and 'civil rights' do not 'understand!'<sup>37</sup>

Thus recruits are instructed that they must share their senior officers' interest in instilling 'respect' for authority among those stereotyped as immoral, while simultaneously condemning 'progressive' opinion, assumed to be at variance with 'commonsense' and the 'will of the majority', whom instructors believe they impartially and fairly represent. Moreover, not only do punitive threats and measures in police training play a central role, but a precondition of any remission is acceptance of the imperatives laid down by training centre staff.

All of the above reinforces the negative stereotype of the economically less fortunate, whilst tending to conceal those who, for example, are drunk privately and those whose 'crimes' are subject to low rates of criminalisation. Instead they represent and reflect negative stereotypes held by societies dominant members in relation to the economically less fortunate. They also show the preparedness of the police as agents of social control to objectify and typify 'wrong doers' and 'implausible' victims in terms of those stereotypes and the law. For instructors in basic police training then it seems that they view the public as 'transparent'.

Furthermore, the above expectations of instructors in basic training are echoed by all participants of the senior officers' courses examined in this chapter; not least since acceptance of the dominant assumptions mentioned are an important precondition of being deemed eligible for higher training. Secondly, since by virtue of their rank senior officers are deemed to have acquired the above, the dominant focus of higher training examined here is with methods to ensure subordinates conform to such demands. So by analogy with how police evaluate their publics a police supervisor undergoing higher training is expected to employ commonsense stereotypes to appraise their subordinates' motivation. In so doing senior officers appear to be expected to differentiate between those subordinates who are to be rewarded and those to be

intimidated as lazy or deliberately disobedient and hence in need of coercion.

Thus the discretionary power of police supervisors over their subordinates enables them to use their control over disciplinary action to coerce them to accept the imperatives laid down by senior officers. This amounts to the demand that subordinates must defer to their superiors in thought and deed. These concerns tend to be related to senior officers' anxiety about the varying strengths of different sections of the population to criticise the police. This has the consequence that if police subordinates wish to avoid punishment from their senior officers then in dealing with successful and wealthy members of the public they must adopt a respectful approach, while condemning others stereotyped as troublemakers. For senior instructors the above is believed to be policing impartially.

In concluding this chapter then it remains to confront directly the claims made by some police professionals and their radical opponents in the U.S.A. whose respective thesis on police professionalism I have been concerned to partly examine by way of the study of basic and higher training throughout this chapter.

I therefore propose that the above empirical examination of police training contradicts the claims made in this area to ethical impartiality by some police leaders at the beginning of this study and the suggestion that a new level of tolerance is abroad in police training. Thus the aim of both basic and higher training examined in this research is to ensure that subordinate officers' morality, and thus consciousness, is amenable to maintaining the status quo; which instructors in higher training following dominant assumptions, take for granted.

The above analysis suggests then that far from police problems emanating from the behaviour of an undersocialised minority of subordinate officers, which police leaders, via police training, are seeking to resolve,

the consequence of such training is that both senior and subordinate officers tend to share a similar perspective. In other words, there is no significant difference in the socialisation of recruits and their senior officers which would explain police conflict with the public, though I should emphasize that ranks beyond the federated were not observed and interviewed, except as selectors. Secondly, and connected to the above, whereas some police professionals suggest that their aim today is to reform the perspectives of lower ranks as well as future leaders via police training, in actuality discrimination is embedded in the rationality of such courses, which direct that acceptance of certain rationalisations (common sense), believed representative of the majority, are a condition of becoming a successful police officer, (38).

Furthermore, the above suggests that the position held by some radical criminologists that senior officers are 'conspiring' to streamline police organisation and practices in the service of class interests and business values, rather than the general community, is also not tenable. Far from senior officers engaged in training observed in the research 'scheming' to promote themselves as impartial while tacitly engineering police loyalty in the service of business values, they actually believe they are acting on behalf of the public interest. The more so since not only do senior officers undergoing training share the aims of their instructors, but, more importantly perhaps, the majority of recruits pass their training and in so doing do not seem to differ fundamentally in their orientation from their senior officer/instructors.<sup>39</sup>

In conclusion then, since most officers observed in training do get through this somewhat unsonhisticated process and few recruits are rejected, the issue may be that of still other 'processes' which officers must go through if they wish to advance in their careers at a later stage, which may serve to protect senior officers from 'slippage'. This however leads to another empirical question; whether the imposition of the conservative values of senior police officers on subordinates which we have witnessed in basic and higher training is a feature of those engaged in training or whether it is a product of the policy of the police in general, typified perhaps by the process of higher selection and promotion boards? This is the final empirical task ahead to determine. But as far as this chapter is concerned this much is already clear; the political neutrality and legal reliability of the police are less a matter of the undersocialisation of police

subordinates, or the oversocialisation of senior officers, than the amenability of both to the common sense categories and the politics of labelling, which form the 'hidden curriculum' of police training.<sup>40</sup>

CHAPTER FIVE

PROMOTION



In this chapter I shall be concerned to advance further the empirical analysis of the contending views of police professionalism by examining the next stage of a police officer's career, manifest in the process of police promotion. For while police professionals tend to see the process of police promotion as one way to ensure that proper standards of behaviour are reinforced over police subordinates, radicals contend that behind the 'demagoguery' of police professionalism, police professionals are really concerned to minimise the traditional problem of police loyalty and to develop a force which is more responsive to the needs of the wealthy and respectable. One way this is being achieved is via police promotion.<sup>1</sup>

In what follows I shall be mainly concerned with the professionalism of police promotion, though an important subsidiary interest will be with lateral movement, from uniform policework to work as a detective involving criminal investigation; particularly since such movement appears to be closely scrutinised and greatly valued by the police themselves.<sup>2</sup>

So since movement into the criminal investigation department appears to be regarded as the most prestigious initial move available, it is with an empirical analysis of this area with which I shall begin. To this end, my aim in the first instance shall be to seek to establish the broad areas of concern in the selection of personnel for the C.I.D., as defined by senior officers who have long served as detectives. In so doing, it is hoped that several key themes will emerge with which to begin inquiries into the nature of discretion employed by decision makers on C.I.D. selection boards; the boards before which an officer must appear in order that he/she may be considered for appointment.

Finally, the section on selection for the C.I.D. will conclude with the treatment of several applicants (constables) before C.I.D.

selection boards, in an endeavour to uncover what are the necessary requirements for getting into the detective branch.

When the above exercise has been completed the next stage shall be to employ a similar method of study to examine the assumptions of those involved in selecting officers for positions of sergeant and inspector. My aim once more, shall be to initially establish the broad areas of concern in promotion to higher rank, as defined by senior officers whose job includes providing a 'report' to promotion boards about subordinates under their command applying for promotion, as well as occasionally sitting on boards. When these assumptions have been mapped it is hoped that once again several key themes will emerge, with which to begin an analysis of the nature of discretion employed by decision makers on promotion boards, in an attempt to uncover what constitutes the essence of success and failure in getting promoted.

With the above objectives in mind, I participated as an observer in four boards for selection from police constable to detective constable; four from constable to sergeant and four from sergeant to inspector. Unfortunately, for various reasons, it was not possible for me to take up the offer to be present at the interviews for Chief Inspector or higher ranks, though the selectors involved have been interviewed extensively such that the 'rationale' for higher rank should become clear.<sup>3</sup>

First however, as with the previous chapter, some groundwork appears necessary in order to familiarise the reader with the standard options available to a basic grade officer who wishes, having successfully completed the two year probationary period, to 'get on' in the police. This however, does not include those few

officers, having passed an extended interview, who are selected for rapid promotion via their attendance at Bramshill Police College. These were referred to in previous chapters as a relatively insignificant number; not to mention a form of advancement unpopular in the police.<sup>4</sup> Suffice it to say here, however, that they too, even though singled out for rapid promotion, must all complete the first two years of their service on the beat.

Most senior officers in the police are drawn from a single point of entry and perform functions signified by a high degree of conformity, not least due to the influence of the authorities and the law on their organisational structure, referred to in previous chapters.

So, given that the overwhelming majority of police officers are normal entrants and given that during their probationary period and afterwards they are continually scrutinised and reported upon, including reports on standard attachments with specialist police departments, what began at the time of their recruitment and early training is constantly updated on their personal files; and this includes their performance in exams and in practice. Such appraisals appear to be taken into consideration should an officer try for specialisation or promotion, as he/she advances in service; be this in an attempt to gain access to such specialisms as traffic, the mounted branch, C.I.D. or promotion to sergeant and beyond. For, as mentioned, selection for C.I.D. and promotion in the force studied both necessitate that an officer appears before a board (composed of a Detective Chief Superintendent and a Detective Superintendent) held bi-weekly, followed by a six month trial period before a final decision.

Those candidates seeking promotion to sergeant and inspector, having passed civil service exams held annually, must pass both a primary and secondary board, held on different dates.<sup>5</sup> In the case of the primary boards, these are chaired by a Chief Superintendent, assisted by two Superintendents, sitting on a rota basis. In the case of the central boards these are chaired by an Assistant Chief Constable assisted by two Chief Superintendents, who, like the officers on the primary boards are usually, but not exclusively, divisional officers, sitting on a rota basis.

Given, however, that above the rank of inspector promotion is more difficult, boards for the position of chief inspector are held annually; while selection for superintendents and chief superintendents is based on the chief constable and his assistants selecting such people by discussing their various 'merits' in private. Finally, appointment for the position of assistant, deputy and chief constable are via the Police Authority.<sup>6</sup>

In what follows, my aim shall be to test the competing claims of police professionals and their radical opponents, by looking at how those aspiring for the C.I.D. and promotion are selected. The material which follows was gathered by direct observation of such boards and interviews with senior officers and long serving detectives, whose statements on the functions of the various ranks to be examined may serve as an introductory backdrop, to the study of the selection of detectives and higher ranks, which are examined below.

#### Selection for the Criminal Investigation Department

I start by presenting the material gathered from long serving senior detective officers, giving their views of the attributes

required in junior officers wishing to become detectives. My aim is to provide an introductory backdrop to the qualities sought of a would-be detective with which to compare how senior detectives actually interviewing applicants for the criminal investigation department, later decide who gets the chance to enter the C.I.D. So their comments will serve as an entree to C.I.D. selection, to be followed with my findings from the board interviews in which I participated as an observer.

Here then are the remarks of one Superintendent who has long served as a detective giving his view of one of the prerequisites necessary to become a detective:

"With a detective you've got to try and assess if he's the sort of man that's going to fit into the team that you've got ... You could have an officer who is potentially a good detective but who wouldn't fit into the team. I don't think he would be recommended by the detective inspector or the detective chief inspector, unless they thought ... that they could mould him."

One characteristics sought in an applicant for the detective branch, as the above makes clear, is the ability to fit into the team, which amounts to the ability to get along with other detectives and show oneself amenable to the demands placed upon one by detective work as well as senior detectives. The same senior officer continues:

The C.I.D. tends towards long hours, certainly during major inquiries still, whereas the uniform man, as a rule, will work his eight hours and go home and forget the job. But the hours worked by the C.I.D., irregular hours, not knowing when their tour of duty is going to finish ... and unless an officer is pretty easy going ... personal relationships can get a bit ragged ... "

The above implies that the officers sought for the C.I.D. are those so to speak who 'cannot do enough for a <sup>good</sup> firm':<sup>3</sup> they are expected to demonstrate that they are amenable to the demands likely to be placed upon them by detective work. i.e., a readiness to do long and unsocial hours.

Moreover the same senior officer goes on to suggest that yet one further requirement of being trusted out of uniform as a detective is the ability to maintain respect for police authority; embarrassing police relations with the public is opposed to this:

" ... a detective who's going to commit minor misdemeanours or indiscretions certainly would be an embarrassment because there's no doubt that part of the work of a detective is to get round the pubs and the clubs and that sort of thing, and he's on duty when he's drinking and if that man gets out of order it's going to be an embarrassment for the department and the police service as a whole ... and I can see a reason for taking him off those sort of duties, but it's unfortunate that then he's automatically returned to the uniform patrol section."

Thus those seeking access to a career in the detective branch must show that no conflict of interest exists which will inhibit their compliance with the demands of the C.I.D., including the motivation to come to terms with the inconveniences of such work. Secondly, and connected to the above, it appears that they must also demonstrate that they are adequately disciplined to conform to the established norms of the department. As the same Senior Officer puts it:

"Certainly you're looking for a man who's capable of working with a minimum of supervision ... so you're looking for someone whose not only got the flair for being a detective ... but a good knowledge of the law of course."

The above Senior Officer suggests that as well as demonstrating that they are adequately disciplined to conform to the established norms of the department, those wishing to become detectives must show that in exercising their discretion under the law they have a flair to maintain respect for the police without being closely supervised. Furthermore, as the Senior Officer below adds, this is associated with giving priority to catching and convicting those the police suspect of crime.

"If they are exceptionally good ... what we call thief takers ... which one would demand of a good detective, got to be a thief taker, got to be happy making arrests."

According to the above, not only is a person deemed eligible for the C.I.D. by virtue of the quality of their past relationships with their colleagues, as well as the public, but also their work record, where priority appears to be given to selecting those officers who are persistent in catching those individuals suspected of crime. Again another senior detective:

"A good detective will not be a good detective if he doesn't arrest criminals ... However you could have a detective who embarks on a very long protracted inquiry, might only produce one prisoner, yet he's done excellent detective work. So one would judge a detective's efficiency by all sorts of factors. By his ability to glean and use information ... the ability to interrogate and so on."

A good detective then, is not only expected to arrest those deemed 'criminal' but to this end he/she is expected to be persistent; which evidently includes gleaning information by the use of informants, by questioning witnesses, and by interrogation. Finally, yet another long serving detective officer summarises the views of his colleagues in the following way:

"The type of individual that I would be looking for, as a C.I.D. man ... Common sense - top of the list of all the abilities I would attribute towards him. A good mixer; a good practical copper, who knows when to apply the book, and when to delay ... Somebody who's got a natural ability to talk to someone in the same language; finding common ground and 'exploiting' that common ground, obviously, on the C.I.D. Somebody that can be trusted, not only to do his work, he can be trusted to behave properly; he doesn't run away with the television idea of the Sweeney, or things like that. A good, sensible, well balanced, copper who knows how far he can go and knows when he's gone far enough. I would not accept the glory seeker; the one who thinks it's all glamour and sports cars and birds and booze. I wouldn't accept that individual, because he's not in it for the right reasons. If he's married, one of the main considerations would be the support of his wife in going into the C.I.D. If she's not one hundred per cent behind him then I'd tell

him to forget it because there are enough problems in married life without something like that. If he's single then it doesn't apply ... But the single man's inclined to be less responsible than the married man who's a couple of kids at home. And in the C.I.D. he's going to be in a position where you're going to rely on his responsibility - 'a lot'."

In sum therefore the senior officers who are responsible for recommending subordinates for advancement to the C.I.D. present the above image of what they think makes a good detective. But precisely because one component of their present work is reassuring the public rather than selecting detectives on C.I.D. boards, their remarks can only be considered as tentative at this stage in relation to how those sitting on C.I.D. boards actually decide who becomes a detective.

In an endeavour to develop the above the next stage will be to compare the views of senior officers above with the themes which C.I.D. board interviewers were found to repeatedly raise when I was allowed to actually observe them interviewing constables for the C.I.D. However, since the interviews for the C.I.D. involved seventeen male candidates but only one woman, examples of specific questions to the one female candidate have not been treated separately in the section below on domain assumptions - though the frequency with which dominant topics in the interviews were put to the woman and the men are given. Suffice it to say that the narrative of the female candidate's interview is analysed (to uncover any bias against women candidates) in the final part of my examination on C.I.D. selection, when three sample interviews of candidates will be presented with the aim of examining more exactly what is expected by interviewers.

I begin my research of the domain assumptions of C.I.D. selectors with the first area which frequently appears in such interviews.<sup>9</sup>  
This seems to revolve around the candidate's senior officers and



colleagues in different police departments and are in some way connected with detective work. This topic was raised by interviewers eighteen times with the men and once with the woman.

I. "Who's the Assistant Chief Constable, Crime?"

A. "Mr. (...)."

And

I. "Where does Detective Chief Superintendent (...) work?"

A. "Support Group."

And

I. "Who's the Assistant Chief Constable, Crime?"

A. "I don't know."

And

I. "Much contact with C.I.D.?"

A. "I have more contact with the two detective constables on my area."

And

I. "Tell us about yourself?"

A. "I work as a resident beat officer."

I. "Does that bring you into contact with the C.I.D.?"

A. "Yes."

And

I. "What are the problems of being in your present job of being a fast response driver?" (Crime car responding to burglar alarm calls, etc., before being handed over to the C.I.D.).

A. "Cannot see crime cases through to the end."

And

I. "Does the Collator help much in identifying suspects?"

A. "Yes, I am always in the Collators."

And, finally, on this issue.

I. "Have you had any reason to contact the Technical Surveillance Unit given your interest in crime matters?"

A. "No sir."

The above suggests that not only is a candidate's knowledge of senior detectives and contact with detectives generally of interest to interviewers, but also the candidate's breadth of knowledge about certain strategically located, 'monitoring' units backing-up 'local' detectives, which are used to co-ordinate surveillance and investigation of those members of the public whom the police regard as 'suspect'. Both the applicant's knowledge of detectives and their knowledge of techniques available to detectives to monitor 'suspects' are taken to be indications of their motivation - rather than candidate's having an interest in the local community.

The above focus of interviewers on the applicant's motivation is supplemented by an interest in the degree to which applicants have been prepared to 'put themselves out' in the past to catch those considered 'criminals'. This is indicated for interviewers by the cases applicants have had. This question was raised 14 times with the 17 men and 4 times with the woman - in whose interview interviewers consistently put similar questions which had been put to the male candidates much more frequently.

I. "Any interesting cases?"

A. "Arresting men for robbery. Frenchmen - who were armed!"

And

I. "When did you last lift someone for crime?"

A. "Two nights ago, theft of street lamps."

And

I. "Recent cases in crime?"

A. "Burglary, after a chase."

And

I. "What was the most interesting case you had?"

A. "Breaking into meters."

And

I. "Which was your most notable arrest?"

A. "Four people for section 18 (Grievous Bodily Harm). I saw them run away after cutting a man down with a hammer."

The above suggests that far from subordinates being encouraged to enforce all the laws, informally at least, interviewers are more interested in the 'crime' cases subordinates have had. This evidently includes the past experience of candidates in Crown Court (when defendants plead not guilty and elect to go for trial by jury) and how they have coped, when the police evidence pertaining to the case may be questioned. The question was raised 9 times in male interviews, but never with the woman.

I. "Seen to Crown Court recently?"

A. "Yes, three weeks ago - reckless driving."

I. "When did you last go to court with a criminal offence?"

A. "Three months ago, shoplifter, not guilty."

And

I. "Been to Crown Court?"

A. "Once."

I. "Not sure you're ready for C.I.D.?"

And

I. "When did you last give evidence at court ... Ever given evidence at Crown Court?"

A. "No - Quarter Sessions, ten years ago."

I. "You're not looking for a skive are you?"

A. "No sir, I'm looking for work."

The above implies that senior officers reward those subordinates who subscribe to the police 'cult' of making arrests. They therefore examine a subordinate officer's records of arrests and appearances at court, to ensure that those wishing to become detectives hold the same priorities and are well motivated; the more so, since such people seem to be expected to take independent action to pursue those suspected of crime, if selected to become detectives in future.

Given then that senior officers' definition of police professionalism and police efficiency is associated with arrests, those applicants who appear to have had few arrests and appearances in court with criminal cases, are scrutinised closely and given a particularly hard time; on the grounds that they could be unproductive and looking for a 'skive'.

Furthermore, the expectation of senior officers that a candidate's past work record will show that they are productive in taking independent action to arrest those suspected of crime, also raises, for interviewers, the importance of criminal records in policework; the use of which by candidates is also seen to be an indication of an applicant's motivation. This issue was raised 21 times with the men but 5 times with the woman.

I. "What information have you put in? Have you seen target criminal?"

A. "Yes."

And

I. "When did you last feed something to the criminal investigation department?"

A. "Yesterday. When I visit anywhere I make a point to check on someone. If they have form (previous convictions) I give it to the collator."

And

I. "What you have been doing? What do you know about identifying suspects?"

A. "We can use photographs."

I. "How have you been using them? Where are they?"

A. "Police Headquarters."

And

I. "Do you normally give information about criminals to the Collator?"

A. "No, I'm working at the lock-up (manning the central police/court cells)."

I. "Do you think working at the lock-up, being out of 'active' duty would make life difficult for you?"

According to the above then the boards suggest that aspiring officers must make arrests, using every resource that is at hand.

With a view to catching 'suspects' then applicants appear to have to be prepared to take the 'initiative' in implicating those people suspected of disobedience; by the use of criminal records and by passing information to the detective branch they have gained on the beat. This seems to be related to the use of informants, which was raised in the interviews by senior officers 16 times with the 17 men, but twice with the one woman.

I. "What do you know about informants?"

A. "Have to be careful, what I have heard from detectives."

I. "I am talking about how we handle informants ... Suppose one asked you to co-operate with him in getting people one job?" (allowing the informant and his associates to get away with one crime before the informant turned them in for subsequent crimes - as 'payment in advance' and to allay suspicion).

- A. "I should inform the detective chief inspector."
- I. "That's a way out in an interview ... What would you do in accordance with police orders?"
- A. "Tell him he would go down for it."
- I. "No, no, no ... you would tell him he would drive the car."
- And
- I. "Can informants commit minor crime?"
- A. "No."
- I. "Yes."

Contrary to the comments of senior officers at the beginning of this section (who implied that a detective who commits minor indiscretions would not be tolerated) in actuality the above suggests that in practice senior officers encourage subordinates to act as agents provocateur, on the grounds that, for the police, the ends justify the means.

Thus the board imply quite clearly that for them a professional police officer is one who takes independent action; he/she is one who has learned to outwit, often successfully, the principles of due process. The above includes the use of informants to detect suspected offenders by tempting them to do something illegal. To gain the informants' co-operation it is further implied that subordinate officers should engage in certain strategies. So the interviewers appear to include in their evaluation of applicant's suitability whether they are aware that one of the most important ways of clearing crime, as well as gaining information, is for the police to offer informants some kind of 'break' in the criminal process, such as: withholding arrest and protecting the identity of an informer/petty offender when he has committed (or is about to commit) a crime and can give information about accomplices and/or

a 'big case'; bringing about a reduction in a charge of an offender; making a recommendation for a lesser sentence; as well as allowing an offender to have offences taken into consideration rather than charging him/her with them all.<sup>10</sup> Thus questions about the issue of 'clearing crime' were raised 18 times in the interviews of the men and 6 times with the one woman. Examples of these questions are given by the following quotations.

I. "There are a number of ways to clear up crime. Tell me what police orders say about offences taken into consideration?"

A. "They have to be similar offences."

I. "That's a very minor part actually ... What happens if a defendant refuses to have them taken into consideration?"

A. "Write them off."

I. "But no evidence?"

A. "You could go and interview him in prison. No fear of reprisals for him then, so he may see fit to admit them."

And

I. "What do you know about offences taken into consideration?"

A. "Clearing offences by getting defendant to have them taken into account when he appears before the court.?"

The above indicates that though the police suggest that professional policing entails rewarding those officers who are responsive to the general community, informally considerable pressure is applied inside the C.I.D. for officers to pursue selective enforcement of the law. This is to say that rather than the police being seriously interested in finding lost dogs, family quarrels or welfare, the internal reward system of the police is such that the desire to appear efficient at solving 'crime' becomes the primary consideration of the C.I.D.; and the more crimes 'cleared' the

greater the reward.

Moreover, since the police rarely catch anyone in the act of committing crime, but see their interests as keeping up a public appearance of themselves as 'efficient' crime fighters, they are in effect rewarded for informally 'massaging' the clear up rate by exercising their discretion on the basis of certain stereotypes of the successful, and others of the poor, who police stereotype as disrespectful, failures and suspects - both as potential offenders and victims of crime.

Given then that senior officers imply that subordinates seeking to get on in the police will participate in the statistical manipulation of police 'efficiency', it seems that such practices include providing suspects with 'rewards' and 'penalties', to motivate self incrimination. As the interviewer suggests, in cases where a defendant refuses to have offences taken into consideration, once convicted, he/she may see fit to admit them, because he/she is awarded virtual immunity from future arrests or past offences. Furthermore, it is also suggested that one should induce defendants to have offences taken into account when he/she appears before the court in exchange for which the police will reduce the charges.

Finally then, another frequently occurring issue is how enthusiastic applicants are to conform to the norms of the C.I.D. which was raised 17 times in the male interviews and twice with the female. This usually came up when interviewers put the question about what applicants thought about the qualities required of those employed as detectives.

I. "What do you think about C.I.D. work?"

A. "I think you make much more effort."

And



I. "What are the necessary qualities for a detective do you think?"

A. "Detective, dedication."

And

I. "What do you think is the difference between a uniform officer dealing with crime and C.I.D.?"

A. "Greater depth."

And

I. "What qualities do you think are needed for a detective?"

A. "Not to take things for granted."

The degree to which subordinates aspiring to enter the C.I.D. are motivated to contribute 'greater effort', if appointed, is clearly another area of considerable concern to interviewers when they ask candidates what they think is required for the C.I.D. This seems to amount to an expectation on the part of senior officers that in carrying out the practices outlined in this section a would-be detective must be prepared to subordinate all of his/her outside interests and attachments to the demands of the C.I.D. In the eyes of the interviewers this appears to involve much more commitment than is required of uniformed officers.

#### Summary of Domain Assumptions of Interviewers

This section has been concerned to expand and contrast the earlier views examined of the long serving detectives, by looking at the assumptions of those senior officers actually engaged in selecting detectives on C.I.D. boards.

In contrast to the views of the senior officers interviewed at the beginning of this section, with the police the passive, impartial servants of the general community and courts, the above suggests that for board interviewers, a 'professional' officer is one who takes independent action in pursuit of those the police perceive as 'criminals'.

Given then senior officers' assumption that such selective enforcement represents impartiality, it seems that those officers wishing to get on must demonstrate that they are supportive of crime fighters generally and senior detectives in particular. For interviewers this is signified by the applicant's contacts with such people, as one aspect of their motivation. Secondly, since for senior officers subordinates are likely to be rewarded who are dedicated to catching those people police stereotype as 'wrong doers', they examine an applicant's past arrest record and appearances at court to establish if they have made good arrests, as a guide to the motivation to pursue 'wrong doers'. Thus those officers who have had only a few 'good' arrests and a few appearances at court are given a particularly hard time.

Furthermore, senior officers' assumption that a candidate's past record will indicate that they are motivated to make arrests in future also raises, for interviewers, the importance of criminal records in policework; the use of these by candidates is also seen as an indication of an applicant's motivation. This suggests that for senior officers an aspiring officer must make certain assumptions about the morality of certain people and areas and then concentrate on such people and areas suspected of having the shadiest moral characters. The assumption is that the reputation and/or past criminal record of such people predicts the future.

According to the above then, senior officers assume that an ambitious officer must be suspicious about such people, and, in order to facilitate their arrest use every resource that is at hand. This includes the use of police records and also passing information about 'suspects' and others which they have gained on the beat to detectives.

Thus the next area of concern for interviewers is to inquire what candidates know about the use of informants. This is to say that senior officers include in their evaluation of subordinates whether they are aware that one of the most important ways of 'clearing crime' as well as gaining information, is to offer informants some kind of 'break' in the criminal process. This includes concealing crimes they have committed, reducing charges against those who 'co-operate' and also allowing an offender to have offences taken into consideration. This is done in order that the police can 'massage' the clear-up rate and thus keep up the public appearance of the police as 'efficient operators'.

So, a candidate's motivation to be a detective is evaluated partly on the basis of his or her past record to cope with catching offenders and also on his/her commitment to manipulate criminal statistics, by not recording some crimes on the one hand and offering inducements to offenders to admit offences on the other. Thus the past support candidates have demonstrated for the above practices is taken to be a guide by board members as to whether they are motivated to become detectives; rather than trusting certain members of the public who senior officers perceive as putting police professionalism in doubt.

Finally, the above examination tends to reveal that for senior officers the goals of the police justify the means. This amounts to the suggestion that an aspiring officer must be that much more dedicated to the police if he/she wishes to be rewarded. Given then senior officers' expectation that those seeking access to the C.I.D. will give priority to catching those perceived as 'wrong doers', it seems that in comparison with their uniform colleagues C.I.D. applicants must subordinate all of their outside interests to the demands of their

senior officers; which suggests that they must make that much more effort to signal commitment.

### Three Interviews for the Position of Detective Constable

To develop further the above analysis of the view of long serving senior detective officers and the assumptions of the interviewers, I intend to examine the narrative of three sample interviews for the position of detective constable from a number of C.I.D. selection boards I observed.

Of the total of the eighteen interviews observed, fifteen of the men and the one woman were successful and two men were unsuccessful. The above figures included six of the men and the woman initially viewed by interviewers as borderline candidates. Of these borderline candidates all were subsequently successful.

Thus the three interviews which follow consist of examples of successful, unsuccessful and borderline candidates, with the aim of demonstrating more exactly what is expected by interviewers who decide who get in to the C.I.D.

### The Unsuccessful Candidate

I begin then with a male candidate who, as a graduate with three and a half years service in the police force, has applied to pursue a post graduate course and is now applying for the C.I.D.

- I. "What crime have you dealt with?"  
A. "Shoplifting, etc., etc."  
I. "Ever dealt with professional shoplifters?"  
A. "Yes, one."  
I. "Who searched his house?"

- A. "No one ... parents respectable."
- I. "So you left it at that did you?"
- A. "Er, yes."
- I. "Do you see your future in C.I.D. or uniform?"
- A. "Well in due course I should like to transfer to London."
- I. "We see you have a degree and are interested in further study?"
- A. "Yes. I think it may help."
- I. "Will it help to prevent you getting your balls kicked in on nights. What arrests did you have before?"
- A. "Keeping observations on a car park."
- I. "What do you know about informants? How do we deal with them if they let us know of something they're involved in?"
- A. "Tell the inspector or lock them up."
- I. "Then we wouldn't get them would we!? Suppose you had to deal with a juvenile who's parents were not available when you collared him. How would you deal with it?"
- A. "Get in touch with the Social Services Department."
- I. "What about interviewing him ... "

So the applicant was asked to wait outside while the Chairman and his assistant discussed the matter.

Chairman: "Definitely no. He lacks the experience, hasn't made up his mind yet about what he wants to do and doesn't seem eager enough."

It seems that the above applicant was unsuccessful in being selected for the C.I.D. for the following reasons.

First, since interviewers evidently take a candidate's success at catching criminals as an indication of their motivation it seems that the above applicant's limited achievements in this area could be one reason why his suitability was placed in doubt. In conjunction

with this, since the senior detectives conducting the interview seem to give priority to the detection of crime as a measure of subordinate effort this particular candidate admitted failure to take the opportunity to search shoplifters' houses, as well as interrogate juveniles before calling social workers, seems to have been regarded as excessive naivety which placed his suitability in further doubt.

Furthermore, this applicant's negative attitude towards the police use of informers also appears to have been at odds with the interviewers' positive attitude towards the use of an informer system, as a necessary means to law enforcement. This seems to have been seen by them as yet another contributory factor why they should rule the candidate out. Moreover, it also appears that the applicant's interest in pursuing an outside post graduate course, as well as eventually obtaining a transfer, was taken to indicate a lack of appreciation of senior officers' preoccupation with practical police work and of fighting 'crime' in their particular area.

In sum then this candidate's limited experience and his apparent reluctance to subordinate his outside interests to the demands of senior detectives seems to have been a very important factor contributing to why he was not selected, and thus why the interviewers ruled him out.

#### The Successful Candidate

By way of comparison, the next candidate is a 26 years old police constable who is married to a policewoman.

I. "Who is the Assistant Chief Constable, Crime?"

A. "Mr. (...)."

I. "We see you are married, wife in police as well at (...)  
Both in same division ... Will that cause problems?"

- A. "No."
- I. "How do you see yourself developing?"
- A. "I would like to reach at least Inspector."
- I. "Grammar school, yes?"
- A. "Yes I got 9 'O' levels, 2 'A' levels ... I went into accountancy 3/5th qualified, then I packed it in. I decided that sort of job was not for me ... I didn't like working with money in an Office."
- I. "Does that also apply to this job?"
- A. "Well I am more interested in operational work."
- I. "How old are you?"
- A. "Twenty six sir."
- I. "Have you tried for the Special Course?"
- A. "No, but obviously I would like to get it."
- I. "Tell me about your police service?"
- A. "(...), Central Lock-Up, then basically panda car driver and resident beat officer."
- I. "Much contact with C.I.D.?"
- A. "I have more contact with the Detective Constables in my area."
- I. "Who nominates target criminals?"
- A. "The Collator."
- I. "Have you seen the current target criminal?"
- A. "Yes."
- I. "Did you put any helpful information in about him?"
- A. "Yes."
- I. "Will this result in his arrest?"
- A. "It could help enlarge knowledge of his movements but the Special Patrol Group are following him."

- I. "Why not Surveillance Squad?"
- A. "Special Patrol Group more handy."
- I. "If you're successful today would you move if asked?"
- A. "Yes, but obviously I should be more familiar where I am obviously."
- I. "What do you know about offences taken into consideration forms?"
- A. "They are used for a defendant to have offences taken into consideration at court ... rather than charging him with them."
- I. "What type of offences could a defendant have taken into consideration ... a burglary and rape?"
- A. "I would charge him with burglary and rape."
- I. "Quite right."

And now the comments of the interviewers while the candidate waited for a decision outside.

Chairman: "Good lad, confidence, common sense, no hesitation."

In contrast to the first candidate who was rejected then the applicant above seems to have easily succeeded in being selected for the C.I.D. Not least, since by his attitude towards senior officers as well as his unreserved commitment to the demands of the police he seems to have impressed the interviewers that he had the requisite motivation to subordinate all outside interests to the operational concerns of the board.

Moreover, not only does this applicant appear to have been seen as highly motivated because he was prepared to subordinate his education and family to a life of 'fighting crime', but also because he appears to have supported certain police methods as a means to this end. This is to say that the above applicant's commitment to giving priority to 'clearing crime' seems to have been endorsed for the



board by his participation in the surveillance of police 'targets' as well as 'gleaning' information about such people, which the board evidently believe is an important prerequisite for an officer's early advancement. Finally, since officers conducting C.I.D. interviews evidently also evaluate an applicant's suitability by the methods they employ to ensure 'good' convictions from the courts, it seems that this candidate's decision to charge a defendant with such offences as burglary rather than allowing him to have them taken into consideration, was taken to be further evidence of his 'strength of character', as opposed to someone who was ineffectual who left such issues to doubt.

#### The Borderline Candidate

I conclude this section with a female candidate who was the only woman appearing before any of the boards I attended in all of the areas studied throughout this chapter. Moreover, unlike the previous candidate, this officer had recently completed a C.I.D. attachment. Now the interview.

- I. "Are you prepared to move?"  
A. "Yes."  
I. "Are you courting? Will your boyfriend mind?"  
A. "No, I'm not courting, at least not seriously."  
I. "What did you deal with as a panda car driver?"  
A. "All sorts of things."  
I. "You've recently been involved with a murder inquiry. You interviewed the wife. What did she say?"  
A. "Not a lot."  
I. "What did you think about C.I.D. work?"  
A. "I think you make that much more effort."

- I. "What sort of cases have you had?"
- A. "I've dealt with an incest."
- I. "How did you deal with that?"
- A. "She was reported for process."
- I. "Ever been to a post mortem?"
- A. "Yes."
- I. "Who's the Assistant Chief Constable, Crime?"
- A. "Mr. (...)."
- I. "I'm just asking you this to see if you are parochial. We are a large force. What qualities do you think are needed as a detective?"
- A. "Not to take things for granted."
- I. "How would you deal with an aggressive male?"
- A. "Just by talking to him."
- I. "Tell me about identification parades."
- A. "If you've got one suspect you must have eight or more on parade ... Keep all witnesses separate. All I.D.'s must be similar in appearance. The suspect can object to anyone. Can't have public on parade."
- I. "What's the instruction on the identification of one person alone?"
- A. "No reply."
- I. "Because there have been too many mistakes made so rarely do this. What are the points in court needed to determine a good I.D.?"
- A. "Whether it was fair."
- I. "You're talking about identification parades ... They would want to know about visibility, day, night, foggy, etc. (smile) ... You hadn't read that. How long since the witness saw the culprit. Tell me what police orders say about offences taken into consideration?"

- A. "They have to be similar offences."
- I. "What about the complainant?"
- A. "Inform injured party that offences have to be taken into consideration, but if injured party objected tell the court."
- I. "Can you tell me about the Technical Surveillance Unit?"
- A. "Microphones on (....) floor of police headquarters."
- I. "What is the most interesting case you have had?"
- A. "Forgery. Old man making coins at his home."
- I. "Tell me what you did?"
- A. "Sent it to the Forensic Science Laboratory to see what the coins were made of, to see if they were made of same stuff as mould metal. We had to put in our own statements and file for the Director of Public Prosecutions."
- I. "What's the difference between a file for the Director of Public Prosecutions and an ordinary file?"
- A. "Double spaced and a list of charges for the D.P.P. to decide."
- I. "Do you know what the essential differences are?"
- A. "No, not yet."
- I. "Going back on identification parades ... tell us about the alternatives to parades?"
- A. "Photographs."
- I. "What else?"
- A. "Point him out at haunts."
- I. "... and confirmation. What about photographs?"
- A. "Must be at least 10 photographs shown at police headquarters."
- I. "Would that person subsequently attend an identification parade?"
- A. "I don't know ... "

And now the discussion while the candidate waited for a decision.

Chairman: "I thought you were a bit unfair on the subject of Director of Public Prosecutions."

Assistant: "Well, she should have looked up the procedure."

Chairman: "Well?"

Assistant: "You don't think she should have looked up the matter on her own?"

Chairman: "You can't put an old head on young shoulders but I am surprised she didn't read up on the Director of Public Prosecutions."

Assistant: "I would have my doubts if she had not had the experience you say she's got."

And now to the candidate.

Interviewer: "I think your knowledge is suspect but yes, accepted."

According to the above then, though the second candidate unlike the first was considered by the board to be very good, the last candidate appears to have been regarded as borderline, not least because she was a woman.<sup>11</sup>

Given then that the boards are interested in selecting those officers who are prepared to dedicate themselves to the vagaries of the C.I.D. it seems that this female candidate was subjected to additional pressure by the interviewers and had to try that much harder to convince them she was suitable. And this includes having to provide evidence that she had experience of dealing with gruesome incidents in policework (the post mortem) which in detective work appears to be a matter of routine. Furthermore, since the boards evidently expect that candidates have demonstrated determination and success at catching 'wrong doers', not only did this female candidate have to provide evidence in this area but also of her ability to tackle aggressive males - the assumption being that as a woman she would have particular difficulty with this area of policework. She is also asked whether she would be prepared to use her authority to

'clear-up' offences by the use of surveillance and granting offenders freedom from prosecution in return for admissions. Furthermore, though the board were less than happy about this candidate's knowledge of procedure the fact that she was prepared to make every effort to catch those deemed 'criminals' seems to have overridden the negative aspects mentioned, such that she was selected for the position of detective rather than being typed as 'parochial', 'naive' or 'ineffectual' and therefore being ruled out.

#### Summary of Selection of Detectives

In sum this section has been concerned to empirically examine the selection of detectives particularly since such appointments are greatly valued by the police themselves. To this end the broad areas of concern involved in the selection of personnel for the C.I.D. were first established by interviewing long serving detective officers. This was followed by the actual study of C.I.D. selection board; in an endeavour to uncover the domain assumptions of senior officers.

The first candidate was unsuccessful, not only because of his limited experience and reluctance to subordinate his outside interests to the demands of senior detectives but also because he appeared to be unprepared in both his knowledge and orientation to adopt certain methods favoured by the police, as a means to apprehend those whom the police 'suspect' of wrong doing.

In contrast to the above the second candidate easily succeeded in being selected for the C.I.D. not least since by his attitude towards senior officers as well as his orientation towards 'crime fighters' and his unreserved commitment to the 'demands' of the police, he seemed to have impressed the interviewers that he had the

requisite motivation to subordinate all outside interests to the operational concerns of the board - and this included his support for certain police methods as a means to this end. This is to say that since the boards give priority to 'looking good in court' it seems that this applicant's interest in charging people with offences which would result in 'good' convictions as well as his support for the 'surveillance' of police 'targets' and gleaned information about 'suspects' was taken as strong supportive evidence leading to his selection for the C.I.D.

The last candidate appears to have been problematic mainly because she was a woman. Consequently she had to make that much more effort by showing that like the men she had the practical experience and motivation to employ various means to catch those the police suspect of engaging in 'wrong doing'.

#### Promotion to Higher Rank

In what follows I wish to deepen the above analysis of career development in the police by moving forward to an examination of the selection process for higher rank. This is based on my direct observation on promotion boards for the positions of sergeant and inspector, as well as extensive interviews with the selectors who sit on most promotion boards. I hope this enables the rationale for promotion to the highest police ranks to become clear.

My first task will be to present the material gathered from the interviews of very senior officers whose position entitles them to participate on promotion boards, giving their views of the attributes required in police subordinates wishing to obtain promotion. This is to provide an introductory backdrop to the qualities sought of those aspiring to become police leaders against which to compare how

senior police officers actually engaged in interviewing applicants for promotion later decide who gets the chance to be promoted. So their comments will serve as a beginning to understand police promotion, to be followed with my findings from the board interviews which I observed.

Here then are the comments of one of the senior officers mentioned giving his views of the prerequisites necessary to become a police professional.

"I would feel very warm towards an interviewee who said 'Well I can remember an old Inspector of mine who used to do this, that and the other. And I've always thought that was the kind of bloke I'd like to be. I've modelled myself on him and the qualities of his and he did this, that and the other. And I've always felt I've always made him my model. He was my ideal policeman. That's why I would be that kind of Inspector'. The guy's thought about it. He's got his standards. He shows me that he's got objectivity and subjectivity."

One suggested pre-requisite for promotion then is respect for the standards of senior officers typified by subordinates who model themselves on their superiors who embody their ideal. And this seems to be associated with serving a long apprenticeship to gain experience.

"I think the edge is on practical experience because I think it goes right back to ground roots ... A policeman is taught and expected to be self reliant ... Because of his self reliance he is inclined to judge any supervisory officer by those standards. In other words he will not accept a supervisor who he believes has not done the same as he has, stood up and done it for himself. And this permeates all the way through and you'll find that in practice the senior officers that command respect are the ones that have done the most on the ground."

Self reliance, practical police experience and working on the ground are clearly important. To these must be added the ability to lead by example.

"Well the first thing we look for is has the officer got the necessary experience and knowledge to be capable of

carrying out the rank which he has made an application for ... The second thing is is he the type of individual capable of passing on his experience and knowledge to his subordinates. As I said before, is he the type of chap that is going to set the right example to the subordinates under his command, because I think supervision in the police service today has a lot to do with leading by example."

Direct personal experience of discipline, of having the leadership role, fits well with this emphasis on experience and practicality.

"I always look at their attainment ... What they have done since they left school ... There have been several ex-serVICemen who have entered the police service quite late and made rapid promotion simply because they've been used to taking the leadership role. For example Regimental Sergeant Majors have joined the police and made rapid promotion to Inspector simply because they've got the experience of having charge of bodies of men, taking control of situations and these qualities become very readily evident."

To this emphasis on practical experience of discipline and leadership of bodies of men, must be added good personal experience of dealing with crime, of catching those defined as wrong doers and gaining convictions.

"If he's a constable on the sergeants board find out what he's dealt with actually himself; how many times he's been to court, what sort of cases he's had, what sort of complicated reports he's put in to find out what he's actually done himself ... and then he may tell me about particular cases he's been involved in, I get him to tell me about them... and then from then on I ask him questions more in the role of a supervisory officer."

Knowing how to approach people - which entails being able to distinguish 'villains' and 'hooligans' from others - is also apparently a pre-requisite for promotion.

"You've got to have this dual personality. I always say treat people as you'd expect your parents to be treated ... but if you're dealing with a person at the other end of the scale, a hooligan or whatever, you have to be firm ... If you're in the C.I.D. and you're interviewing a villain you have to be in a position to talk to him in the same language. To talk to him to get his confidence ... the next minute you may be talking to a complainant who's a man of some note,



so obviously you adopt a different approach. If you can't adopt a different approach you're going to have problems because if you talk to a man of some note, a complainant really, in the same manner that you're talking to a villain or a hooligan, you could well come unstuck ... and it's something I come across a lot in the investigation of complaints."

The above suggests that those people are sought for command who are able to demonstrate that by virtue of their deference to the standards of their senior officers, as well as their experience of discipline, they will ensure that their colleagues hold the requisite sense of balance and respect for convention to which being 'soft' with those defined as 'hooligans' or at the bottom of the social scale, or showing disrespect towards established if not successful members of society is held to be opposed. And for the senior officer below upsetting respectable members of society also seems to be associated with the question of officers' appearance.

"Because we are a disciplined organisation there's nothing worse than seeing a scruffy policeman on the streets. I think the increase in trivial complaints made against police officers has something to do with the lowering of standards of the attire of officers."

Senior officers' anxiety to allay criticism from 'respectable', established, members of society involves an expectation that aspiring officers will ensure that subordinates adopt the 'correct' approach and keep up conventional appearances. Furthermore, those aspiring for promotion are expected to be familiar with the need to finely discriminate between various types of offenders.

"In practice there are hundreds of thousands who never go to court, who break the law ... because each case is considered on its merits and other factors are considered besides other than just whether in fact he is guilty or not guilty of an offence ... One does take account of the views of the medical profession and the social services ... but then one would decide whether it was worthy of a caution ... which is one way of dealing with it, or no further action to be taken at all, or that in respect of both parties, one might make a case for saying that in the public interest that person should be prosecuted ... We

We don't have to abide by that (Social Services) views ... That's coming away from the accountability side isn't it? ... There may be a time when our views don't run side by side and we may believe that the public interest is served by prosecuting in a particular case and in that case prosecution would ensue ... There are guidelines, such as the seriousness of the offence, the age, the prevalence of the offence in a particular district ... The public interest ... ready to serve ... the number of previous convictions that person has got, the number of persons involved, the number of persons perhaps corrupted by that individual." (My emphasis.)

The above implies then that those aspiring for command are expected to be aware that police organisation and policy is such that the police are less interested in prosecuting those such as children, the aged and 'petty offender' than in instituting proceedings against particular individuals and groups seen as threatening to 'corrupt' the 'public interest' - which board members evidently believe they represent.

In sum then the above senior officers suggest that those officers are sought for command who by virtue of their respect for the ideals of their senior officers will ensure the compliance of their fellow officers to such standards. This seems to be associated with serving a long apprenticeship and respect for police experience.<sup>12</sup>

In conjunction with the above it seems that senior officers expect that those seeking promotion will ensure the adherence of police subordinates to the conventional ways of policing - by catching and convicting those considered 'wrong doers'. Moreover, not only does it seem that senior officers judge an aspiring officer by their commitment to the prosecution of those defined as 'villains' and 'hooligans' but also by their ability to ensure the observance of a respectful attitude by police subordinates towards the high ranking and successful, which senior officers seem anxious to preserve. This seems to be associated with a requirement that those seeking promotion will maintain a 'respectable' police image among police subordinates

by ensuring that they 'keep up appearances'.<sup>13</sup>

Finally, it seems that not only must those seeking promotion be prepared to take disciplinary measures against other officers to ensure the above but, also, in their attitude towards police organisation and policy, demonstrate that they are able to preserve the 'public interest'. And for the senior officers above this appears to amount to the fact that they reserve the right to be more lenient with 'petty offenders', a commonsensical category they themselves unquestioningly adopt on the one hand, while seeking the incarceration of those deemed corrupting or subversive of the public 'body' on the other.

Thus the senior officers cited who participate in selecting officers for promotion to the rank of sergeant, inspector and above, present the above views of what they think is demanded of a good senior officer; but precisely because one component of their role is reassuring the public, the next stage will be to compare and contrast the views of the senior officers quoted with the domain assumptions of senior officers actually engaged in interviewing officers on promotion boards which I observed.

#### Domain Assumptions of Board Interviewers Selecting Sergeants

I begin my research of the assumptions of senior officers actually engaged on promotion boards with the selection of police sergeants. The primary and central boards which I observed involved a total of twenty five male constables who were applying for promotion to sergeant. The first area of interest which frequently arises in interviews for promotion is the interviewers' perusal of the applicant's personal record before they enter the room - which happened on every occasion I was present. This is to say the record of an applicant's

past experience. This is often accompanied by a recommendation by the applicant's local senior officer and is revealed in the following comments of the Board Chairman here reading such records aloud.

"Stationed at (...) police station. Resident beat officer. Divisional Commander stated in 1979 that (candidate) lacked impact. Deferred by Central Board in 1979. Also leadership qualities suspect due to series of assaults. Joined 1969, attached to C.I.D. Wishes to stay in uniform at (...). Married with two children aged 9 and 5 years. Leisure activities include reading, gardening. Reading social history such as biography of Duke of Wellington."

And

"Passed exams 1978 at second attempt. 11 years service. Was acting sergeant. Attended 3 months C.I.D. attachment though not C.I.D. orientated. Has conflicting recommendations on file but strongly recommended by Chief Superintendent at Division."

The examination of a candidate's personal file seems to be connected to the board's interest in uncovering evidence of a candidate's 'police leadership qualities'. This seems to be associated with the board's interest in the time it has taken a candidate to pass his/her police promotion examinations, the nature of the candidate's police experience and their 'impact on others'. Furthermore, very senior police officers assumptions about 'leadership' and 'impact on others' seem to be related in some way to an interest in the cases applicants have had, getting commendations and being aggressive in the pursuit of wrong doers. This topic was raised some 64 times in the 25 interviews.

I. "When did you last give evidence at Crown Court?"

A. "Four years ago ... dangerous driving."

I. "When did you last put a file in on a criminal case?"

A. "Five weeks ago - I passed it on to the detective."

I. "He's doing the file on this is he!? But if you're going to be a sergeant do you think you have enough experience to advise young officers on files and crime cases?"

- A. "Well yes, I haven't had any sent back."
- I. "You've been in the job 11 years, never had a commendation. Why is that?"
- A. "I have had four good arrests but never had a commendation."
- And
- I. "You seem to like being a resident beat officer ... Is it not a fact that since you were assaulted you have sought a quiet number?"
- A. "Well no, (...) is a quiet backwater, I prefer a busy station, but ..."
- I. "But you're looking after yourself! Why are you doing it?"
- A. "Well I'm working on my own and don't like shifts."
- I. "You're trying not to get into any aggro."
- A. "I don't agree."

The above suggests that one indicator of a would-be sergeant's interest and motivation is that he or she has acquired enough practical experience to advise young officers in future, particularly of catching 'wrong doers' and obtaining convictions. To this being a resident beat officer (involved in community policing) or failing to get commendations from senior officers seems to be regarded as opposed.

Moreover, the interest of interviewers in the past experience of candidates as a guide to how they would 'set an example' in future is supplemented by an interest in how applicants would deal with issues of discipline in the police. This came up 56 times. For example:

- I. "How do you treat the timid chap who does not report offenders?"
- A. "Tell him it's his job to do it."
- And
- I. "If you had a junior police constable who had seen nothing,

done nothing, etc., etc., what would you do?"

A. "Well I would get out with him."

I. "Would we be talking along discipline lines?"

A. "It depends on the constable. The first thing to do is to show by example."

I. "Well if after six months there is no improvement. No progress?"

A. "Well if you have a useless individual on your hands I should report adversely."

According to the above then it appears to be suggested by senior officers that those seeking promotion are also judged to be well motivated by their interest in maintaining downward pressure to produce. Secondly, board interviewers further imply that in discriminating between those subordinates who are being 'useful' and those who are not a would-be sergeant is expected to take into account a subordinate's work record and practical 'experience', before deciding whether they are disciplined enough to operate on their own in future.

For interviewers the above anxiety about the 'effectiveness' of some subordinates to tackle those defined as 'wrong doers' also seems to be related to a concern about what they assume to be a relative tendency for women in the police to be less forceful than men. This subject was introduced by interviewers on 19 occasions. This is illustrated in the following way:

I. "Would you send women out in rough areas?"

A. "You need to use your common sense upon which decisions are based."

And

I. "What's your view of policewomen entering the police force in numbers?"

A. "Well we should revert to the old system."

The assumption of promotion board interviewers in respect of sexual equality in the police then appears to entail 'common sense' anxiety about whether it is likely to affect police 'efficiency' and respect for the police, associated, as this seems to be, with aggressive law enforcement against people living in 'rough' areas - which those aspiring to become police sergeants appear expected to endorse.

Moreover, the above appears to be further associated with considerable concern on the part of senior officers that those seeking promotion will ensure that subordinates keep up 'respectable' appearances. This subject emerges as an issue in itself in the interviews. The matter was raised on 17 occasions. Examples are:

I. "How do you deal with an untidy officer?"

A. "Discipline. It galls me to see people going around without a helmet."

And

I. "Supposing you are a sergeant and see a resident beat officer entering a pub ... having a drink in the outdoor with the licensee ... What do you do?"

A. "Tell off the licensee .. It's an offence for him to sell the officer liquor on duty."

I. "A lot of P.C.'s might agree with going on licensed premises for a cup of tea?"

A. "Yes, okay but out of licensing hours."

The above suggests that senior officers also judge an aspiring officer's motivation by their reaction to those officers whose attire and demeanour seems likely to undermine the police 'image', particularly if there are no mitigating circumstances and they are persistent offenders.

The next recurring area of interest seems to involve the board

playing the devil's advocate to test whether candidates' concerns are really consonant with those of senior officers. This issue was raised on no less than 49 occasions.

I. "Going back to the Vagrancy Act. What would you say about the suggestion that it gives power to someone to arrest someone because he doesn't like the look of his face?"

A. "If a situation required us to act ... If someone is acting furtively, well then it's necessary."

And

I. "If you were in charge and you had the choice to call the S.P.G. (Special Patrol Group) to incidents what would you do?"

A. "Oh yes, with strikers."

And

I. "How do you see the role of resident beat officers?"

A. "Essentially he is an information unit in the community to gain information ... "

I. "Soft touch! How can we enforce the law if you have a soft touch!?"

A. "I disagree, the resident beat officer gains information."

I. "But surely our job is to enforce the law fairly, impartially. That's what we're paid for isn't it?"

A. "No I don't agree with dragging people to court straight away. It alienates people."

I. "You mustn't run away with the idea that people 'apreciate' softness - We knocked a lot of people off too!"

The above implies that one further indication for promotion board interviewers is an aspiring officer's motivation; how applicants would employ resources most effectively given the differing demands on the police and the interviewers' anxiety to avoid 'softness' with those stereotyped as 'troublemakers', which



seems to be related to maintaining police morale. This involves interviewers putting would-be sergeants under pressure to uncover whether their priorities are really consonant with the board's.

Summary of Domain Assumptions of Board Interviewers Selecting Sergeants

According to the above then, interviewers are inclined to judge an applicant's 'leadership' qualities partly by their personal records, which is taken to be one indicator of their practical experience of catching and convicting 'wrong doers' and their 'impact' on others. Evidence that applicants are highly motivated to take an aggressive line with those the police define as immoral, hooligans and 'wrong doers' (commendations/interest in 'crime' cases/going to Crown Court) is judged by interviewers to be a guide as to whether they are fit to 'pressurise' subordinates if promoted in the future; particularly when dealing with police-women, who seem to be regarded as less effective than the men in certain situations.

Furthermore, not only does it seem that senior officers expect would-be sergeants to pressurise subordinates seen as less effective but also ensure subordinates keep up a respectable appearance - the absence of which is assumed to be offensive to 'important' members of the public, which senior officers are anxious to prevent. The above also suggests that one further indication for promotion boards of an aspiring officer's motivation is associated with how they would deploy organisational resources most effectively, given the conflicting demands on the police and senior officers' concern to deal with 'trouble' while simultaneously maintaining police 'morale' - which those seeking promotion seem to be aware of.

Three Interviews for the Position of Police Sergeant

With the above in mind the next stage will be concerned to compare and contrast the views of the senior officers cited by way of examining below the narratives of three sample interviews for the position of police sergeant from a number of promotion boards observed. Of the total 25 interviews which I witnessed at both central and primary level, 23 candidates succeeded and two failed. These figures included six candidates initially viewed by interviewers as borderline. Of these borderline candidates all of them were subsequently successful.

Thus the three interviews which follow consist of examples of successful, unsuccessful and borderline candidates, with the aim of demonstrating more exactly what is expected by senior officers who decide who becomes a sergeant.

The Unsuccessful Candidate

First then, the comments of the board reading the candidate's personal record aloud before he entered the room.

"Three 'O' levels, one 'A' level. Single, passed exams 1979. Divisional report: 'Lacks personality to make sergeant rank. Quiet, introverted man, based four years on one division.' He's done mobile patrol and attached to thefts of vehicles squad. Lives with mother. Father died when 14 years of age. Leisure activities include squash, stamps and war gaming."

And now with the candidate:

- I. "Do you think being an acting sergeant on the Accident Inquiry Squad will help you to assess whether you can be a sergeant?"
- A. "Yes, as well as collating information regarding an accident."
- I. "Do you think there is too much specialisation?"
- A. "No, the whole idea of these squads is to make it easier for the man on the beat."

- I. "Let's assume you have a P.C. with 22 years service in who comes to work with an earring in, what would you do as a sergeant?"
- A. "Tell him to take it out."
- I. "If he tells you to get stuffed what would you do as a sergeant?"
- A. "Discipline code."
- I. "How far are you going to go?"
- A. "Well you would try to reason with him."
- I. "There is a school of thought that says once you resort to discipline you have lost the battle?"
- A. "Not really, I mean what else is there? Little things lead to bigger things unless stopped."
- I. "What prompted you to join the police?"
- A. "I looked at where my education was taking me and the police appealed."
- I. "Supposing a man is wounded, cut down the face, result of a knife attack ... the attacker admits it, Crown Court case probably ... what is the procedure?"
- A. "Obtain a statement from the complainant ... witness statement. Get the doctor to examine the injured party ... get C.I.D. officers to assist with inquiries."
- I. "What else would be produced in evidence?"
- A. "Photographs of the injury."
- I. "If a man was arrested by a P.C. who complains about assault, what would you do?"
- A. "Investigation by acting Inspector ... details in Complaints Register."
- I. "What about statement of complainant?"
- A. "Yes, after appearance at court."

- I. "If you have a stroppy P.C. on your shift who isn't pulling his weight. What would you do with him?"
- A. "Initially ask him to do it."
- I. "And if he still refuses?"
- A. "Then discipline."
- I. "Well suppose he hasn't committed a discipline offence. How about telling him 'No back chat - get out!'"
- A. "Well, yes."

And now the discussion while the candidate waited outside.

Chairman: "He hasn't the personality to handle a difficult man. I am going to defer him. He's only 23 years of age and only has four years experience. Deferred."

First then, the above suggests that because the candidate's divisional report indicated that he had limited first hand experience - and also that he was 'quiet' and 'introverted' - the board set about playing the 'devil's advocate' to deliberately test such doubts. So since the interviewers evidently place considerable emphasis on practical experience as a basis for 'leading by example', it seems possible that the nature of this young officer's four years experience was deemed to be such that he was judged to lack the 'authority' to gain the respect of older subordinates, which added to the interviewers doubts.

Furthermore, even though this candidate was able to answer several questions on standard police procedure about dealing with crime cases, as well as complaints, it seems that because he indicated that he would indiscriminately discipline subordinates he again appears to have been regarded as lacking the credibility to supervise older officers; he appeared too ready to resort to discipline. This is to

say, that though the above candidate's support for existing police priorities appears to have been evident in his appreciation of specialist police departments, regardless of criticism from some members of the public, the fact that he failed to take the personal responsibility to discriminate in his treatment of future subordinates, seems to have been regarded by the board as potentially divisive and undermining of police morale.

#### The Successful Candidate

By way of comparison with the above candidate, the next officer's details read out aloud were as follows :

"Detective constable (...). Grammar school, ten years service. Uniform duties then Special Branch. Divorced, getting married again."

And now with the candidate.

1. "How do you see your future?"
- A. "Uniform sergeant. If a vacancy occurred in future I would make C.I.D. application."
1. "What type of sergeant would you be?"
- A. "By the book."
1. "Okay, say you are a uniformed sergeant. In comes a detective whom you know. He tells you he has matrimonial troubles ... plus £5,000 in debt ... You point him in direction of (police) benevolent fund - but, you're wrong. The detective constable is in 'big' trouble. You want to tell the Detective Superintendent. What would you do about it. He's (detective constable) an old friend?"
- A. "I would break confidence."
1. "As far as I'm concerned you gave the correct answer. If there was one thing in your vast past experience where you

were a little weak in any area what would it be?"

A. "To be honest I don't think I have any. I have always tried to keep abreast of events by talking to colleagues."

I. "As a patrol sergeant what sort of breaches of discipline do you think you would deal with?"

A. "Totally depends on type of person he is. How he acts as a P.C."

I. "Give me a few examples?"

A. "Drinking on duty I would report to you. Attitudes to public; where he has upset respectable members of the public."

I. "What about late for duty?"

A. "If first time I would give verbal warning, enter in pocket book. If it continues I would discipline."

I. "If P.C. sitting in panda car reading paper when public on way to work what would you do?"

A. "See him back at police station. Seek explanation. Tell him off!"

I. "Agreed! I saw one sitting on the approach to a zebra crossing doing it. What problems do you think you would have as the supervisor with W.P.C's.?"

A. "I would alter W.P.C's patrols in rough areas. I wouldn't let them walk alone."

I. "And if the Inspector disagreed?"

A. "It's a lawful order. I should do as I was told - but keep my fingers crossed."

I. "Leisure activities?"

A. "Full bore pistol shooting."

I. "Should police be armed?"

A. "No... I can't see arming the police in the street as desirable. Police not competent."

I. "Do you think there is ever a time when drinking half a pint on duty is justified?"

A. "No - though I do drink myself."

I. "What about some fella who has had a nasty shock?"

A. "Yes, first enter in pocket book."

Discussion: 'Recommended.'

In comparison with the first candidate then this officer proved suitable on the following grounds. First, it seems that since senior officers are seeking those subordinates who defer to their authority the fact that this officer suggested that he would confide in them, even the problems reported to him by an officer who was a good 'friend', appears to have been taken as one indicator which contributed to his success. Secondly, since senior officers appear to value those subordinates who have proven experience of catching 'wrong doers' and obtaining convictions as a guide to how they will endeavour to lead by example in the future; this officer's experience as a detective also appears to have been seen as a sign of his motivation which contributed to his selection. Third, since senior officers also appear anxious that those selected will exercise their discretion over subordinates in a way which maintains police morale, the fact that this officer suggested that he would first warn those subordinates committing minor misdemeanours, as well as altering women police officers' patrols on the grounds that they were ineffectual in dealing with 'rough' people, also appears to have counted in his favour.

Furthermore, since the board are evidently concerned that preventive measures are taken by those appointed to preserve the police 'image', it seems that since this candidate stated that he would condemn any subordinate who's public behaviour or appearance was likely to offend respectable members of the public this too

counted in his favour. And the above also seemed to include his concern to prevent antagonising police relations with the public by the indiscriminate issue of firearms to 'incompetent' officers.

In sum then, in comparison to the first candidate, the above officer appears to have shown himself more amenable and careful in responding to the insinuation made by senior officers that in the exercise of discretion an aspiring officer must strive to ensure respect for police 'efficiency', while maintaining police morale, by rewarding those subordinates who conform to the above and sanctioning those who do not. To this the indiscriminate use of disciplinary measures against respectful, experienced, hard working officers is apparently seen to be opposed.

#### The Borderline Candidate

With the above in mind, I now consider the interview of the third candidate applying for the position of sergeant who's personal details read aloud were as follows :

"Three years service. Single. Passed exams at first attempt."

And now, the interview.

- I. "What interests have you?"
- A. "Squash, swimming, fictional reading."
- I. "If you were the sergeant and a panda car was involved in a road traffic accident with a private vehicle, how would you cope with it?"
- A. "I would deal with it ... Breathalyse both drivers ... If negative deal with accident normally. If it's blatantly the P.C's fault I would suspend him."
- I. "Would you inform the Superintendent?"
- A. "No."



- I. "What about if injury was involved?"
- A. "Not unless he was shot."
- I. "What about welfare?"
- A. "Yes, that's my job to put a report in."
- I. "What about older P.C's taking the rise out of you?"
- A. "Oh, yes ... er ... "
- I. "Any ideas for reform?"
- A. "Yes, probationary constables sitting in offices, get them out on the streets."
- I. "Supposing students were sitting in at (...) Polytechnic. The Principal wants to chuck them out. What would you do?"
- A. "Well it's against the law ... Criminal Law Act ... We have power to chuck them out ... they're trespassing."
- I. "The number of police women at (...) Road (police station). Does that bother you?"
- A. "Well, I would definitely turn a blind eye unless there was no male officer to go out with them."
- I. "Supposing the police have coloured problems. Any ideas?"
- A. "Use resident beat officers."
- I. "Ever applied for C.I.D.?"
- A. "No."
- I. "If a detective constable has a prisoner in for over four hours should he be released?"
- A. "Well the Bail Act says 24 hours ... I would either keep him in for over four hours as per Section 38(2) or let him out. I wouldn't go seeking advice."
- I. "Say an officer was off sick with flu but you found out he was digging the garden. What would you do?"
- A. "Knock him off."

And now the discussion while the candidate waited outside.

Chairman: "I have reservations ... he doesn't accept our confidence ... lacks experience. Don't think he will get through central board. Nevertheless recommended to central board with reservations."

The above suggests, first and foremost, that since senior officers on interview boards are anxious to promote those subordinates who model themselves on their superiors, those officers wishing to 'go it alone', due either, as in this case, to being too over confident or aggressive, or, as in other interviews, to being too timid, tend to be regarded by interviewers as not accepting their confidence which amounts to ignoring their experience and interests and putting them at risk.

Secondly, since, in part at least, the above is importantly related to maintaining police morale by supporting the apprehension of those defined by the police as 'villains', 'rough', 'disrespectful', 'hooligans' and 'criminals' it seems that this officer's suggestion that he would impede detectives by deciding without consultation, to bail prisoners who could still make 'admissions' seems to have been taken to indicate a degree of indifference to police investment in 'crime fighting' and detectives performance - which senior officers seem anxious to support. Furthermore, since the above is related to the imperative that those seeking advancement should exercise their supervisory discretion by assisting, if not rewarding, those who take a hard line with people defined as 'rough', while moving officers to more innocuous positions who appear to be 'weak' or inexperienced, it seems that this officer's decision to indiscriminately deploy women officers as well as trainee constables also caused some concern.

Given then that senior officers tend to give priority to

catching 'wrong doers', maintaining police morale and a 'respectable' police image, this candidate seems to have raised doubts about his ability to discriminate when dealing with subordinate police officers and also members of the public. For to unhesitatingly decide to indiscriminately prosecute the members of a student faculty may exacerbate the situation and be more than the 'market' can take and against the 'public interest' unless further justification is supplied.

Senior police officers interviewing would-be sergeants therefore assume that the policy of the police in utilising organisational resources is to maintain respect among the public for the dominant definition of social order, which they also assume represents 'consensus'. Thus, since the board evidently believe they impartially represent the public they apparently have no desire to bring the law into disrepute which this candidate, by virtue of his inexperience and zeal, appeared likely to do. And this amounts to the suggestion in the above interviews that senior officers promote to sergeant when the candidate looks likely to safeguard their interests and do not promote when the past and future orientation of such people clearly conflicts with their interests. Moreover they look at a candidate's reputation and demeanour as well as using interrogation when there is doubt.

Given then that there was an absence of any written material condemning the above candidate, the matter appears to have been left to the central board to note his performance, make the final decision to defer if necessary and advise him to adjust his approach where necessary.

#### Summary of Selection of Sergeants.

In sum it seems to be the case that it is those officers who are able to demonstrate that they are able to fulfil the demands of their senior officers (leadership qualities, impact on others), as well as

their colleagues who are likely to be promoted.

Moreover, since interviewers tend to take for granted the dominant view of social order, acceptability entails that a candidate conforms with their concerns. This amounts to an expectation that an aspiring officer accepts his/her 'superior's' belief that the police represent consensus which the police impartially uphold. The role of a supervisor which begins to emerge then is to set the limits of subordinate action by urging subordinates to prosecute those individuals and groups who appear to deviate from 'consensus' and the law - underwritten as this seems to be by dominant ideas, 'common sense' and the 'factual' nature of police experience, rather than 'uninformed opinion'. And since acceptability tends to be related to commitment to catching those the police condemn it is those officers who have more practical experience and success at apprehending those stereotyped as 'disrespectful' or 'villains' who tend to be preferred.

Furthermore, given that senior officers evidently expect that those appointed employ discipline and authority as a means to achieve the above, it is those officers able to discriminate to ensure such 'efficiency' who tend to be promoted to sergeant. Finally not only does the above amount to a preference for those applicants advocating sanctions outside and inside the police against those defined as 'unproductive', but also candidates able to protect the solidarity of the police as well as the police 'image'.

#### Selection of Inspectors

My final empirical task will be to develop the above findings by examining the assumptions of senior police officers engaged in selecting inspectors. These will be compared once again with the comments of the very senior officers quoted at the beginning of this

section on promotion to higher rank and with examples of three actual interviews. Thus my aim once more will be to compare the findings revealed so far with those which are to follow; with the additional objective that at the end of this exercise it is hoped that the rationale for attaining the highest police ranks should become clear from the expectations of the very senior police officers revealed in the interviews. Given then the comments of the very senior officers on the qualities required for promotion (pp.188-193), I begin this section with the domain assumptions taken straight from board interviews of would-be inspectors. The interviews concerned involved a total of 17 male sergeants applying to become inspectors before both primary and central boards. The numbers mentioned were due to the fact that 5 candidates declined permission for me to be present at their interviews for 'domestic reasons' and another 'failed to turn up'.

Domain Assumptions of Board Interviewers Selecting Inspectors

The above having been said, it is evident that at the beginning of interviews for inspectors, as with those for sergeants, the candidate's personal record sets the scene as it were at all the promotion interviews which I attended; read aloud by the chairman as in the following example.

"Sergeant (...). 39 years of age. Not recommended by division. 9 years service. Cannot mix - no good. I know him ... too determined but intelligent - very intelligent. Married, 2 children. Leisure: Debating Society. Reads 'Daily Mail'; reads law. No academic qualifications but wants to go to do an LL.B."

As with constables aspiring to become sergeants, the interviews

for inspector open with a general introduction based on the candidate's personal record - which appears to be employed as a vehicle to begin examining the applicant's motivation. Questions about the candidates' motivation arose some 19 times in the interviews observed. This is revealed by the early questions to yet another candidate, as the following makes clear.

I. "You say you kept up with the law ... Why did it take eight years to pass the inspectors' examinations?"

A. "That was my own fault."

One indicator for interviewers of a would-be inspector's motivation appears to be the time it has taken them to pass the inspectors' examination. Another seems to be the width of their past police experience. For example:

I. "Following your last deferment we recommended you did an attachment to the C.I.D. or Special Patrol Group to get more experience, but you don't appear to have done much about it. Why not?"

A. "Well change of shifts and going to (...) University on a short course. I'll be perfectly honest, I was advised at division not to bother."

Given then that senior police officers appear to be of the opinion that those aspiring to higher rank in the police must show they have the requisite motivation to subordinate their outside interests to the demands of the police, it seems that one indication for them of subordinates' motivation to conform to this expectation is evidence that applicants have passed their promotion exams on 'schedule' while simultaneously 'getting their hands dirty', catching wrong doers on the C.I.D. or such units as the Special Patrol Group.

Another area which interviewers raised some 22 times was that of

how applicants, as sergeants, had coped in the past with subordinates' 'indiscipline'. The following quotation is an example.

I. "Have you ever had to report someone for a discipline offence?"

A. "Yes, a woman police constable for being late on duty and also beat officers for neglecting their duty."

Interviewers therefore appear to be interested in a range of areas belonging to a candidate's past experience, the relation between which is simply that all are part of the future role. The question of how applicants would exercise authority over subordinates in the future if appointed to lead as inspectors therefore eventually emerges as an issue in its own right. Questions such as those which follow were raised by interviewers some 60 times. Examples are:

I. "Leadership method?"

A. "Commonsense, discipline as in the army, because an autocratic style is easier."

I. "Leadership style with Special Constables?"

A. "Give them regular's discipline. Also make them part of the police way of doing things."

I. "What about a solicitor ... educated special constable who has independent source of income ... Wouldn't that create uncertainty?"

A. "I should be 'suspicious' of him... Keep 'him' apart from others!"

And

I. "How would you maintain discipline without recourse to me as a Superintendent? Imagine an officer who is a uniform carrier?"

A. "Well it would be reported in his annual assessment."

And

I. "What do you see as the purpose of discipline?"

A. "To identify those who are too bolshy or too timid."

Interviewers therefore appear to include in their assessment of

an aspiring officer's 'leadership' qualities how they will discriminate in exercising discipline over subordinates if appointed as inspectors in the future. This includes a concern about 'uniform carriers', special constables with independent incomes and subordinates defined as too 'bolshy' or too 'timid'.

Furthermore, as found with earlier interviews, the issue of timidity also emerges as an issue in itself in the interviews, particularly in relation to police women. This topic was raised by interviewers 15 times during the interviews. This emerges in the following examples.

I. "What about police women. Do you think we have gone too far?"

A. "Well yes. I think there is a case for a separate women police constables' department."

And

I. "What do you see as the role of women police constables?"

A. "Separate police women's department. They are best to deal with welfare. The men are best suited to action."

As with interviews for sergeant's rank then, the assumption of the interviewers about those seeking to become inspectors appears to involve some anxiety about whether women are likely to be as 'effective' as the men, which those seeking promotion seem expected to endorse. Furthermore, for board interviewers, the above concerns appear to be related in some way to the issue of preserving the police 'image' and keeping up 'respectable' appearances. This matter was introduced 13 times by interviewers. The issue is illustrated by the extract from one of the interviews for the position of inspector below :

I. "If you were an inspector travelling to work and you observed a policeman with his hat off and close to a policewoman what would you do?"



A. "Well, stop him! Tell him to put his hat on. Inform the inspector in charge of him."

The above appears to suggest then that since senior officers engaged on promotion boards seem very concerned that the police maintain a respectable public image then those aspiring to become inspectors must demonstrate their commitment by ensuring that subordinates conform. Such conformity precludes an overzealous approach.

I. "Young P.C. twelve months police service. He has been assaulted three or four times. What sort of views would that trigger in your mind?"

A. "Overzealous - but I should like to know the details."

I. "What would you do about it?"

A. "Observe him. Get him to adjust his approach."

According to the above then, would-be inspectors are expected to manage subordinates by preventing them embarrassing the police force, whether this be due to their appearance or the style of their approach.

Furthermore, the above concerns appear to lead the boards to focus on what the candidates think of police organisation and policy vis-a-vis the demands made upon them by different segments of the public; and in so doing perhaps hope simultaneously to reveal how aware the candidates are of such problems. This was a subject raised some 43 times by interviewers. Here then are the extracts of the interviews.

I. "How would you deal with three quarters of a million calls from the public?"

A. "Re-educate public - rescuing budgerigars is not policework."

And

I. "Do you agree with the resident beat officer system?"

A. "Yes."

I. "I don't"

A. "Must have experienced officers on the beat."

I. "What do you think are the functions of a resident beat officer?"

A. "Trust, communications."

I. "But the police are not 'social workers'!"

And

I. "What do you think of community policing - resident beat officers' work?"

A. "Necessary, but, in the last twelve months they have gone a little bit too far ... Not doing the job they should be doing. Where's it all going to end!? In the division where I work the resident beat officers forget they are policemen! To my mind the old image is being degraded. We are no longer 'crime fighters'.

And, finally,

I. "How do you see the role of the police and the public?"

A. "We should identify ourselves with the public."

I. "How do we deal with public order?"

A. "Collective action by the police."

I. "But what about the student actions by extremists?"

A. "The police are organised to deal with it. Today we have the Special Patrol Group and motorcyclists to get quickly through the traffic to help. We have a third force available."

The above suggests that as with the interviews of constables seeking promotion to sergeant, the senior officers on promotion boards for inspector play the 'devil's advocate' to uncover whether the applicants' views are really consonant with those held by senior officers. Secondly, since senior officers evidently give priority to maintaining

police morale by 'hard policing'(S.P.G. and C.I.D.), against those stereotyped as 'criminals' and 'extremists', it seems that candidates advocating 'softness' (community policing) appear to be offering responses less favoured by the boards. This seems to be related to the boards' view that a police 'leader' must be highly motivated to pursue those the police stereotype as 'wrong doers' in order to maintain police morale.

Summary of Domain Assumptions of those Selecting Inspectors

In sum then, the assumptions involved in the selection of inspectors appears similar to those also found with sergeants; with the rider that practical experience (tending to be longer) assumes an even higher importance, particularly when dealing with the issue of discipline. This is to say that since those wishing to become inspectors have already had experience of supervising subordinates as sergeants, one further expectation of senior officers is that in maintaining the downward pressure to catch those the police consider 'disrespectful', 'hooligans', 'villains' and 'unproductive' - as well as preserving the police 'image' - applicants will have sanctioned officers who have failed to conform. So not only are those seeking higher promotion assumed to adopt certain reservations about policemen, but also officers whose approach seems likely to upset many members of the public - on the grounds that they are too 'bolshy'.

For the above reasons then it seems that those wishing to become inspectors are also judged to be well motivated who demonstrate that they will take preventive measures by discriminating in their dealings with subordinates and also members of the public. This seems to be associated with the boards' view that those seeking promotion will be highly motivated to pursue those police perceive to be 'criminals'

and 'extremists' - on the grounds that this form of 'leadership' will maintain police morale.

### Three Interviews for the Position of Police Inspector

With the above in mind, my final task will be to seek to develop further the above assumptions of the promotion boards examined by an analysis below of the narrative of three sample interviews for the position of inspector from a number of promotion boards for this rank observed. Of the total of the seventeen interviews which I witnessed on both primary and central boards, twelve of the candidates were successful and five failed. The above figures include four candidates initially viewed by the board as borderline. Of these borderline candidates three were subsequently successful and one was unsuccessful.

Thus, once again, the three interviews which follow consist of examples of unsuccessful, successful and borderline candidates, the aim being to compare the findings so far with a more extensive view of longer interview transcripts. When this has been accomplished it is hoped that we shall then be in a position to conclude by comparing the findings on promotion with the claims of police professionals in this area, as well as those of their North American radical opponents.

### The Unsuccessful Candidate

First then, as with the sergeants' interviews, here are the comments of the board on the applicant's background before he entered the room.

"Details ... Detective Sergeant (...). Joined 1968.  
Posted (...) to 1974, then traffic at (...). 1975  
Regional Crime Squad. 1976 promoted to sergeant.

1977 ten week management course at (...) University,  
1977. Special Branch to August, 1978."

And now, with the candidate.

- I. "If you were promoted to inspector on a unit you would find different people with varying experience. How would you deploy them?"
- A. "Quite honestly, certain officers pick up things quicker. I should try to identify slower ones and rookies and put them with older, more experienced, personnel."
- I. "What about throwing young in service down in the deep end?"
- A. "Well there are opportunities now to exploit communications (radios)."
- I. "What are you going to do with this?"
- A. "I wouldn't throw youth in at the deep end."
- I. "But training has become more practical."
- A. "It may have done but I still wouldn't throw them in."
- I. "Say you are lumbered with a 23 year service man who is an alcoholic?"
- A. "Well if old C.I.D. man to my advantage. I would let him know that I would stand no bad example. One alternative would be to bring him into the police station so he could be an example. Failing that I would have to reprimand him personally."
- I. "But what if he transgresses still - drinking on duty, station bar, leaving his post?"
- A. "Discipline."
- I. "What instructions would you give sergeants?"
- A. "Well basically they run unit."
- I. "Would you as an inspector be present on parade?"
- A. "Yes but let sergeant read out orders. Only comment if major change in policy."

- I. "So if major incident up town who would you expect to go - say, at a dance hall?"
- A. "Well certainly I should go but hope others can use their own initiative."
- I. "A complainant says officer should modify the way he addresses the public. What would you do?"
- A. "Record as complaint regardless."
- I. "My view would be I should want the inspector to deal with it."
- A. "I should have to disagree with you ..."
- I. "If 15 officers parade, including 7 women police constables in (city) centre, how would you deploy?"
- A. "Er comparable with male officers ... er, public ..."
- I. "Would you send them out alone?"
- A. "If I had officers available I wouldn't send any out alone."
- I. "Would you send women out alone!?" (Interviewer's emphasis.)
- A. "Well, er, no ... but I would send them all out as police officers. It is tempting to be protective to policewomen which as a general rule is unfair."
- I. "Three final matters. What would your actions be towards an old detective sergeant drinking on duty?"
- A. "Report to Superintendent under discipline regulations."
- I. "Second. It seems you said earlier that individual officers are given much latitude. What is your general view of an inspector's role?"
- A. "Ensuring by observations, etc. that men are working."
- I. "Anytime when you should advise constables, or has it always got to be a report - such as casualness, slow response, etc.?"
- A. "Well if it doesn't fall under the discipline code ..."
- I. "There always is. There is always something you can catch them on." (Interviewer's emphasis.)

A. "Well ..."

I. "Supposing an officer is driving without lights but the complainant doesn't want you to report the officer?"

A. "Well ..."

And now the discussion while the candidate waited outside.

Chairman: "No initiative. He seems he isn't going to take much action in many cases. Impractical. No force of character. Wouldn't stand by decision. Deferred for twelve months."

And now, with the candidate.

"You have to come forward with a lot more drive. No clear ideas about how you would direct people. Must appear to have genuine interest. Command strong involved role. One expects an inspector to accept some responsibility over complaints. Deferred."

According to the above then, it seems that since interviewers are seeking people who will take the initiative in exercising authority as inspectors, the fact that, when pressured, this candidate was seen to procrastinate had the consequence that his motivation and interest were placed in doubt.

Moreover, since interviewers are evidently seeking those officers whose involvement is such that they will safeguard the 'interests' of their superiors, the fact that this candidate suggested that he would immediately resort to disciplining an experienced detective sergeant (close to retirement) appears to have been regarded as unimaginative if not an example of weakness. To resort to disciplining an officer who's experience and record has some merit, without first employing 'informal' sanctions - including 'pressure', closer supervision, as

well as arranging unpleasant tasks to get him to 'produce' - could be seen as counter productive to police morale. This is particularly the case when the subordinate's behaviour could be the result of mitigating circumstances or a temporary lapse.

Furthermore, since the above attitude of the board seems to be related to the suggestion that those seeking promotion should exercise their supervisory discretion by maintaining police morale whenever possible, by supporting the productive and 'crime fighters' while closely supervising those defined as 'ineffectual' and non productive, the fact that this officer said he would deploy women indiscriminately also seems to have been taken to indicate ignorance or carelessness vis-a-vis the concerns of senior police officers.

Finally, since the above issues appear to be related to senior officers concern to maintain police morale vis-a-vis their different public audiences, it seems that the above officer's lack of initiative - to take the opportunity to either deal with public complaints informally, or to categorically state in the interview that he would direct officers at a dance hall fracas, where there could be serious implication for the police 'image' - evidently had the consequence that he was judged to be too detached from the boards' interests, with the result that he was ruled out.

#### The Successful Candidate

By way of a comparison with the first candidate I now present the interview of the second officer whose details, read aloud by the Chairman, were as follows.

"Sergeant (...). 18 years service ... Married, one child. Four years service then passed exams to sergeant. Always in uniform branch. Great athlete. Played soccer for (... ) juniors."



And now with the candidate.

- I. "What kind of inspector would you be? ... I mean style of leadership?"
- A. "Well I would be a leader of the men, as I have been as a sergeant, but with overall authority on the unit."
- I. "You can mould the unit to your liking - right?"
- A. "Yes."
- I. "What do you think about all these complaints we keep receiving from sergeants about discipline?"
- A. "Well this is partly due to the ending of National Service ... Women are also difficult (to manage) .... I would like to see a little more discipline ... I think it's a personality job really."
- I. "Do you think you could do it?"
- A. "Well, yes, because of my experience."
- I. "If you were the Chief Constable today what sort of things would be worrying you?"
- A. "Bristol type things - Public Order."
- I. "Are we likely to be in the same position?"
- A. "No. We have more men."
- I. "Why has it taken you till now to pass your promotion exams?"
- A. "Well, I have been happy doing my job. I have also been actively involved in police sport."
- I. "I got the impression you were not keen on policewomen?"
- A. "They expose us to risk."
- I. "So do you think we did right in instituting equality in the police?"
- A. "We took too many policewomen on."
- I. "What do you think about the domestic problems on your division?"

- A. "Not a lot."
- I. "As an inspector what do you think you can do about it?"
- A. "Well (to stop domestic problems) change their shifts - but there is no way to stop it."
- I. "Do you agree with the Special Patrol Group?"
- A. "Most certainly!"
- I. "But what would you tell the public (about S.P.G.)?"
- A. "They're just ordinary policemen dealing with public order."

And now the discussion while the candidate waited outside for a decision.

- 1: "Plenty of commonsense. Good understanding of our problems."
- 2: I should like to see him on my division. Recommended."

In contrast to the first candidate then, the above officer seems to have been successful for the following reasons.

First, since senior officers evidently prefer those subordinates who have plenty of 'common sense' based on lengthy practical experience it seems that this officer's common sense allied to long police experience, as well as his success at police sport, were taken to be more important than the length of time it had taken him to pass his exams when dealing with his motivation.

Secondly, since board members tend to regard command as legitimated by 'strong', individual personalities, it seems that whereas the first candidate was seen as 'weak', this officer's suggestion that he thought the solution to subordinates' 'indiscipline' was a 'personality job' also weighed in his favour. Moreover, since senior officers also tend to associate indecisiveness and weakness in the police with women, the fact that this officer gave priority to athletics, as well as being anti policewoman all seems to have been

seen positively.

Furthermore, since there seems to be some anxiety on the part of senior officers that those appointed to command will seek to maintain police morale while simultaneously preserving police 'efficiency', the fact that this officer disapproved of domestic problems in the police which could undermine the police 'image' yet recognised that the way to correct such behaviour was to move personnel rather than discipline them, also seems to have been seen as a sign of his motivation and awareness.

Finally, since the above questions on police organisation seem to be associated with the policy of the police towards the public in general and police critics in particular, the fact that this officer not only supported 'strong' police methods, but was aware of the necessity to placate public criticism - by presenting the S.P.G. as ordinary policemen dealing with public order - also appears to have endeared him to senior officers; as a man who would support them in allaying public criticism.

#### The Borderline Candidate

Finally, then, I present the details of the last candidate considered here, which, once again, opens with the comments of the board before the candidate entered the room.

"Three 'O' levels, two 'A' levels, B.Sc. C.I.D. aid 1966, then central lock-up. Married. Two children. Two attempts at inspectors exam. One commendation for detecting crime. Promoted to sergeant with four and a half years service in. Joined police with a degree after a short teaching career."

And now with the candidate.

- I. "Tell me about yourself ... What are your leisure activities?"
- A. "Theatre, squash, piano, photography."
- I. "If promoted to inspector - on subject of decisions - what decisions would you not delegate?"
- A. "Obviously report/process decisions, that is recommendations."
- I. "Would you delegate minor discipline matters?"
- A. "Well sergeants do have power to caution but I would hope it would be joint decisions."
- I. "What about management style?"
- A. "Well, there are times to be autocratic and times to be democratic. At incidents one must be autocratic."
- I. "How much time have you spent on street duties?"
- A. "Well ninety per cent but sometimes I have had to be acting inspector."
- I. "I see from your record you applied to the MSc course at (...) University. When you didn't get it were you disappointed?"
- A. "Well, yes ... hope to do it in the future ... but it's the problem of money, doing it without support now."
- I. "Do you not think your interests would be best served in doing more practical work, rather than shutting yourself off for twelve months at University!?" (Interviewer's emphasis.)
- A. "Not really."
- I. "You have applied for Communications?"
- A. "Yes."
- I. "Did you find the transition from P.C. to sergeant difficult?"
- A. "No."
- I. "Have you ever had to report someone for a discipline offence?"
- A. "Yes a W.P.C. for being late on duty and beat officers for neglect of duty. The W.P.C. left."

- I. "Looking at the police in general and public interest - do you think we are ideally equipped?"
- A. "No, but one has to consider public acceptability. We don't want to use water cannon."
- I. "We might lose policemen if we don't! (Interviewer's emphasis.) How would you work W.P.C's if 6 out of 18 on your unit were W.P.C's?"
- A. "I think I would double them up at nights but let them patrol alone at other times."
- I. "You have applied twice for the MSc. course ... Still want to pursue it?"
- A. "Well, yes."
- I. "Do you accept the criticism of your division that you should have more experience outside, rather than being in Controller's Office?"
- A. (No reply) .....

And now the discussion.

- 1: "He is too hedgy."
- 2: "Not positive enough."
- 3: "I disagree, he has a hell of a lot of potential."
- 1: "Do you tend to agree that he needs more experience."

And now the Chairman addressing the candidate.

"Your Divisional and Sub-divisional Commander both agree you need more experience. Think about the Management MSc. course ... whether it's right for the police service. Perhaps it's better for you to concentrate on a police career."

According to the above then, the third officer considered appears

to have been deferred for the following reasons. First, even though there was some disagreement among the interviewers ultimately the past record of this officer together with his immediate supervisor's recommendations tend to have outweighed the applicants' academic achievements. Thus a resolution seems to have been reached that the applicant lacked adequate experience and interest; by seeking a quiet backwater in Communications and higher education rather than doing 'real' policework on the streets, learning from senior officers, catching 'wrong doers' and obtaining convictions. For these reasons he appears to have been regarded as ill equipped to exercise authority over subordinates effectively, for which he would need to get 'involved', gain respect and maintain morale.

Thus this officer's interest in applying for Communications, as well as his application to pursue a postgraduate course, appears to have been regarded as a form of avoidance, manifest in the Chairman's accompanying remark about whether he found the transition to sergeant difficult. So even though this officer was a graduate and had passed his promotion exams quite early in comparison to the second candidate, his continued interest in outside matters appears to have had the consequence that the board thought he was not sufficiently dedicated to maintain respect for senior officers' authority. And for the board, the above appears to be related to a failure on the part of this candidate to defer to their experience and share their confidence, such that he also seems to have been regarded as unlikely to collaborate in maintaining police efforts against a critical public. Thus, even though the above officer seems to have shown himself to be aware of senior officers' concerns - about officers who are deemed to be too 'bolshy', as well as too 'weak' (women) - by showing himself resistant to time serving he seems to have been perceived as intolerant of police officers in general.

Summary of Selection for Higher Police Rank

In sum then it is those officers whose work record and motivation is consonant with the 'rationality' of their senior officers - as well as their colleagues - that discipline and authority should be exercised over 'skivers', 'criminals' and 'extremists' and respect shown to the powerful and successful, who are more likely to be promoted. Given then that the police tend to associate the above with active time serving and a history of good arrests, rather than academic achievements and indirect experience, it is those officers who are prepared to subordinate all of their outside interests in pursuit of the above who are more likely to be rewarded.

Furthermore, since subordinating all of their outside interests is associated with acceptance of police 'commonsense' and prosecution of those groups the police define as disrespectful, it is those officers so committed who are seen to be able to lead by example. This is to say that it is those officers best able to maintain police morale by evaluating their colleagues according to the above criteria who are more likely to be promoted. This amounts to the suggestion that those officers are more likely to be promoted who are careful to reward or go easy on those officers who appear to make arrests (and provide information) while condemning other officers on the grounds that they are 'skivers'.

According to the above then senior officers expect that a would-be leader will applaud those subordinates who create the conditions to 'clear-up crime' while condemning other officers on the grounds that by their failure to 'keep up appearances' they are undermining the police 'image'. This includes those officers who show weakness towards the disrespectful petty offender, as well as those stereotyped as 'idle', 'layabouts' and 'criminals', which, for senior

officers, includes anxiety about increases in the number of policewomen. Given then that senior officers are anxious to preserve relations with 'respectable' and 'successful' members of the public by showing themselves to be 'efficient' those officers seeking advancement must ensure subordinates conform to the above. To this failing to 'produce' or show respect for such people as the powerful by being 'bolshy' are all seen to be opposed. In an organisation which tends to devalue individualistic tendencies and stresses the mundane then one of the few ways available to 'distinguish' oneself is to keep senior officers informed - by 'telling' on one's 'colleagues' who appear to differ.

Nevertheless the above tends to illustrate that the police collectively equate 'professionalism' with the cult of 'telling tales', arrest and the incarceration of certain people felt to lack respect for due authority by their 'immoral' way of life - to which those officers selected for advancement particularly are expected to subscribe. And since most officers do in fact succeed in getting through this process the above tends to demonstrate that subordinate officers' values are in fact consonant with their senior officers' view about the public, such that the collective culture of the police unites rather than divides.<sup>14</sup>

### Conclusion

In this chapter I have been concerned to advance further the empirical analysis of the contending views of police professionalism by examining the next stage of a police officer's career development, manifest in the process of police promotion; though an important subsidiary interest has been with lateral movement to policework as a detective involving criminal investigation particularly since such movement is greatly valued by the police themselves. The reason



for the above is that while senior officers tend to criticise lower ranking police officers for ongoing conflict with the public, some radicals blame police leaders. So my aim in this chapter has been to examine the meaning given to police professionalism by the police themselves by looking at how career development works in practice. Before concluding this chapter however, a few general remarks are necessary to place my specific findings in context.

In a general sense the above analysis indicates that (as in training) senior police officers (and their subordinates) expect that police officers will give priority to apprehending those people commonsensically assumed to be the greatest (most serious) danger to society - on the grounds that such action will not only 'cane' those the 'public' regard as 'evil' but also create positive publicity for the police and bolster police morale. With the above in mind it also appears that those subordinates are rewarded who are best able to tactically use informants, surveillance, police records and the law to their advantage - in the belief that people with the stigma of a criminal record, once publicly discredited, are more vulnerable and isolated from support for the 'worthy' to condemn.

A consequence of the above is that in mediating between the dominant definition of order, police concerns and different social audiences (classes), the individual officer is expected to share the above concerns such that they influence his/her judgement/evaluation of encounters with police publics and play an active part. However, since police socialisation places considerable pressure on all officers from the beginning of their careers to conform to occupational norms; in an occupation where the social network of police officers clearly tends to involve much more interaction with other officers, including local contact with senior officers rather than outsiders; where evaluation of other officers is assumed to be particularistic and prestige allocated by 'skill at work' (see above); where considerable pressure is placed on all officers to devalue expressive behaviour, strangeness, 'irrelevant' information; where the stress is placed on the routine and the mundane - ways of establishing a superior position seem few.

So far as advancement and promotion in the police is concerned my overall observations which I will underscore with a summary of my

detailed findings, are as follows. In an organisation where senior officers assume that their commonsense occupationally inflected version of the dominant ideology represents the 'public interest'; where the prime 'enemies' of society are evaluated by the 'seriousness' of their offences against the 'public interest'; police subordinates are evaluated by their contribution to eliminating 'serious' offenders (and in the case of sergeants, Inspectors and above their ability to identify 'unmotivated' subordinate behaviour or commend subordinates who accomplish the above).

In short those officers are likely to maintain ascendancy in an organisation rewarding respect for the definitions of the powerful and attacks (dehumanisation, denial of existence and condemnation of the condemners) on those groups police perceive as 'enemies', whose technique shows they identify with senior officers (conversion) either by pointing out the 'correct' way of doing things to others or by 'telling' on someone. Secondly, ascendancy seems to be achieved by time serving, 'active' police experience, making arrests and gaining convictions (one upmanship). Associated with the above seems to be the importance attached to one's place in the organisation (C.I.D., Community Relations, etc.) as well as one's private resources (e.g. informants). Finally, one further response to the police reward system of dehumanising, denying and condemning police 'enemies' is the individual officer's contribution to the maintenance of police morale by contributing to the appearance of the police as efficient (manipulation of norms). To this must be added the (obvious) necessity for those seeking promotion to sergeants and above to have passed the requisite exams.

With the above in mind and the fact that in the course of this chapter I have examined the selection of detectives and higher ranks by comparing the views of senior officers with experience of these areas

with the assumptions of those actually selecting candidates -- as well as looking at three examples of (unsuccessful, successful and borderline) interviews for detective, sergeant and inspector-- my specific conclusions are as follows.

Ascendency to the position of detective involves a method of moral persuasion that one is attuned to the 'reality' upheld by senior officers (conversion). This includes showing loyalty, respect and interest towards senior officers and their goals, rather than having divided loyalties (role conflict) to outsiders. This is an area where board members are particularly hard on female candidates.

Moreover, the above involves rendering one's behaviour 'rational' for senior officers (and oneself) by placing one's past and present conduct in the context of a loose collection of (commonsense) maxims which compelled their occurrence -- and by portraying the consequences for those deemed 'immoral' and 'workshy' members of society, who do not appear to comply with these maxims. In so doing the would-be detective renders the strange and unfamiliar familiar for senior officers and themselves. Thus those subordinates who appear best at defending senior officers' interest in supporting the 'authoritative' definition of social order, by virtue of their record of arrests and appearances at (Crown) court, tend to be preferred rather than coerced.

For example:

I. "Recent cases in crime?"

A. "Burglary after a chase."

And

I. "Seen to Crown Court?"

A. "Once."

I. "Not sure you're ready for C.I.D."

Thus senior officers' interest in prosecuting people deemed immoral provides the motivation for subordinates seeking to gain advantage to find out what is 'happening'. One-upmanship is therefore achieved by subordinates best able to 'exploit' their knowledge of the world of those stereotyped as 'failures', by pretending to 'respect' them while privately 'doing distance'. As a senior detective puts it at the beginning of the section on detectives (page 165).

"Somebody who's got a natural ability to talk to someone in the same language; finding common ground and 'exploiting' that common ground, obviously on the C.I.D. Somebody that can be 'trusted', because he's gonna be working without supervision ... in plain clothes ..."

The ability to pretend to agree with the norms of those stereotyped as 'immoral' while privately 'doing respect' to senior officers by looking for information and a 'lever' to pressurise such people to 'help' with arrests is therefore a critical requirement if one wishes to be 'trusted' out of uniform and achieve ascendance to detective. The above includes using the past records of such people on the grounds that a past reputation is a guide to the future; offering informants some kind of 'break' in the criminal process (agent provocateur), and 'massaging' the clear-up rate to bolster the image of the police (and oneself) as efficient operators. For example:

- I. "When did you last feed something to the criminal investigation department?"
- A. "Yesterday. When I visit anywhere I make a point to check on someone. If they have form (previous convictions) I give it to the collator."
- I. "Can informants commit minor crime?"
- A. "No."
- I. "Yes."

And on 'massaging' the clear-up rate and statistical manipulation.

- I. "There are a number of ways to clear up crime. Tell me what police orders say about offences taken into consideration?"
- A. "They have to be similar offences."
- I. "That's a very minor part actually ... What happens if a defendant refuses to have them taken into consideration?"
- A. "Write them off."
- I. "But no evidence."
- A. "You could go and interview him in prison. No fear of reprisals for him then so he may see fit to admit them."

The above quotations are pointers to the fact that ascendancy to the post of detective is more likely to be achieved by those who do not share what they have with their colleagues; who hoard their sources of information in the interests of making 'good' arrests and appearing to be a good 'thief taker' (valuation of private resources); that the emphasis is on 'self help' rather than helping others; seeing ascendancy in the police (as well as society) based on individual (intrinsic) 'qualities' rather than the dominant definition of order supported by the police - and seeing the 'disrespectful', 'rough', 'workshy' and disadvantaged as responsible for their own dilemmas, in isolation from wider social problems (assignment of responsibility).

Thus those constables are selected for the position of detective who 'do respect' towards their senior officers (and their colleagues), by taking independent action to arrest those the above stereotype as immoral, failures and criminals. This senior officers' reward because the pattern of behaviour indexed by the motivation and experience of would-be detectives is exceptionally clear to senior officers, as instances of the kind of action with which board members are already familiar, in that it can be connected with the normative order which they themselves uphold (avoidance of internal conflict). Given the

constraints of the police then those constables are likely to become detectives who appear best able to manipulate the rules for both their own and the organisation's ends. This they and their senior officers assume represents consensus.

However, whereas a detective constable is clearly expected to build a reputation for him/herself (and coincidentally for the police), by such practices as informing on 'suspect' members of the public, unlike would-be sergeants, they have no brief to 'distinguish' themselves by their ability to 'motivate' constables.

As far as the actual selection of candidates for the position of sergeant is concerned then, this research reveals that since acceptability tends to be associated with catching and convicting those individuals and groups whom the police collectively condemn, it is those officers who have more practical experience at catching those stereotyped as 'villains' who tend to be promoted. In an organisation tending to stress the mundane and routine it is therefore those individuals who by virtue of their place in the organisation, 'active' experience of gaining information, making arrests and getting convictions who, in part, tend to achieve one-upmanship. Secondly, and connected to the above, it is those officers who are able to fulfil the demands of their senior officers - by 'doing respect' for senior officers and 'doing distance' from their fellow constables - by ensuring police take a hard line with the 'rough' who tend to be preferred (conversion). This is an area where board members are particularly hard on those officers who appear to lack commitment and the character to control police constables (role conflict). For example:

I. "You seem to like being an R.S.S. ... Is it not a fact that since you were seriously hurt you have sought a quiet backwater?"

A. "Well no .. (...) is a quiet backwater, I prefer a busy station but ... "

- I. "But you're looking after yourself! Why are you doing it?"
- A. "Well I'm working on my own and don't like shifts ..."
- I. "You're trying not to get into any aggro?"
- A. "I don't agree."
- I. "When were you in Crown Court last?"
- A. "Well, soon ... I'm due to attend through lads fighting."
- I. "Do you honestly think you have the ability to be a sergeant?"  
(Interviewer's emphasis.)
- A. "I've thought about it ... yes."
- I. "I can think of a number of P.C's who can run you by your nose!?"
- A. "No ... I don't agree."

Third, since senior officers actually selecting subordinates for the position of sergeant expect that those appointed employ discipline and authority as a means to prosecuting the 'rough', it is those officers able to apply coercion to eliminate 'uncertainty' who tend to be promoted to sergeant. For example:

- I. "How do you treat the timid chap who does not report offenders?"
- A. "Tell him it's his job to do it."

Fourth, it is those would-be sergeants able to discriminate to ensure police 'efficiency' who tend to be promoted to sergeant. This includes a preference for those subordinates who share senior officers' anxiety about women police officers, who are viewed as threatening to police efficiency. This is to say that since the above is related to the imperative that those seeking promotion should exercise their supervisory discretion by assisting, if not rewarding, those who take a hard line with those defined as 'rough', while moving officers to more innocuous positions who appear to be 'weak' or inexperienced, it is those officers who subscribe to such practices who



tend to be preferred. Fifth, since board members are concerned that preventive measures are taken to preserve the police 'image', it is those officers who would condemn any subordinate whose behaviour or appearance is deemed likely to offend respectable members of the public who are more likely to be favoured. For example:

I. "How do you deal with an untidy officer?"

A. "Discipline. It galls me to see people going around without a helmet."

Doing 'respect' towards senior officers is therefore very important if one wishes to become a sergeant - which includes keeping senior officers 'informed'. For example:

I. "Okay, say you are a uniformed sergeant. In comes a detective whom you know. He tells you he has matrimonial troubles ... plus £5,000 in debt ... You point him in the direction of (police) benevolent fund - but, you're wrong. The detective constable is in 'big' trouble. You want to tell the Detective Superintendent. What would you do about it. He's (detective constable) an old friend."

A. "I would break confidence sir."

I. "As far as I'm concerned you gave the right answer."

In an organisation de-emphasising 'individualistic' tendencies then - in which senior officers are concerned to eliminate criticism, if not coercion, from the successful and powerful - ascendancy to the rank of sergeant is more likely to be achieved by those who have the 'natural' ability to talk to constables 'in the same language'; finding common ground and 'exploiting' that common ground. Thus ascendancy to the position of sergeant is achieved by those candidates who share their senior officers' mistrust of constables and 'do distance' by identifying and isolating police 'bad apples' in the interests of police

efficiency and appearing to be good sergeants (valuation of private resources); seeing advancement in the police based on 'personal qualities' rather than deference to the dominant rationality - and seeing the 'disrespectful', 'inexperienced', immature or ineffectual and 'untidy' officer(s) as responsible for conflict between the organisation and the public, rather than the dominant view of order commonsensically accepted by the police (assignment of responsibility). It is therefore those officers who are able to conform to the demands of the boards as well as maintaining the moral of subordinates, by ensuring police prosecute those deemed 'workshy' and immoral, who tend to be preferred. For example:

I. "If you were in charge and you had the choice to call the S.P.G. to incidents what would you do?"

A. "Oh yes with strikers."

And

I. "How do you see the role of resident beat officers?"

A. "Essentially he is an information unit in the community to gain information."

I. "Soft touch! How can we enforce the law if you have got a soft touch."

According to the above then, those constables tend to be selected for the position of sergeant who not only convince senior officers that by their past achievements and current motivation they give priority to prosecuting the 'rough' - but also that they have the 'personal' qualities to reward constables who do likewise while coercing those officers who seem 'inefficient'. This amounts to the conclusion that senior officers promote to sergeant when the candidate looks likely to safeguard their interest, do not promote when the past and future orientation of such people clearly conflicts with their

interests and look at a candidate's reputation and demeanour as well as using interrogation, when there is doubt. It is therefore those officers who appear to be best at manipulating the norms of the police (for example, informing on those constables who seem to be poor at prosecuting the 'rough' or by their appearance 'upset' respectable members of the public) who tend to be promoted. This senior officers assume represents the avoidance of internal police conflict and also the 'public interest'.

However, whereas sergeants clearly have a responsibility to maintain discipline over constables, they do not have responsibility for 'standing point' on other sergeants as well as assisting with the investigation of 'complaints'. As far as the selection of would-be police inspectors is concerned then my overall observations indicate that those individuals tend to be promoted who are even more committed to the normative order upheld by senior officers, which includes the assumption that 'bad applies' among police sergeants, as well as constables, create ongoing problems between the police and public.

Ascendency to the position of inspector then involves showing enthusiasm and loyalty towards the concerns of senior officers, backed by a personal record which indicates positive motivation. Secondly, since senior police officers expect that those aspiring to higher rank will (more than ever) subordinate their outside interests to the demands of the police, one further pre-requisite for promotion is 'active' police experience, gaining 'information', catching 'wrong doers' and getting convictions. For example:

- I. "How much information to the Collator do you provide?"
- A. "A little."

Furthermore, since those aspiring to become inspectors have

already had experience of supervising constables, one further expectation of interviewers is that they will have disciplined at least some subordinates who have failed to conform - while putting distance between themselves and their fellow sergeants who have been particularly indiscriminate or lax in the way they have done so. This is to say that those individuals deemed to have the 'personal' qualities (by virtue of their experience, place in the organisation and 'private resources') to do distance between themselves and sergeants tend to be promoted. Yet a further example:

I. "What style of inspector would you be? Describe to me the inspector who you have seen who you would wish to emulate."

A. "Well I think too many of the inspector's are too close to the sergeants. Some inspectors are too close to sergeants."

My observations suggest that it is those sergeants who are best able to 'do distance' between themselves and sergeants - by supporting those sergeants who ensure constables prosecute the 'rough' while being 'hard' on those who do not - who tend to be promoted (conversion). This is an area where senior officers are particularly hard on those officers who by virtue of their 'limited' experience, place in the organisation, outside ambitions or lack of 'character' or commitment, appear unable to control police sergeants (role conflict) or/and maintain police 'morale'. Thus, senior officers prefer would-be inspectors who discriminate in their treatment of subordinates on the (similar) basis of a subordinate's past experience, place in the organisation, ability to get information, make arrests and gain convictions (valuation of private resources of subordinates). This also includes an expectation that would-be inspectors share their senior officers concern to reduce uncertainty and risk and their anxiety about subordinates deemed to upset 'respectable' members of the public by being too 'bolshy', or, by their approach towards the 'rough', too timid. Once again, this includes a shared concern among senior officers

and successful candidates about women in the police and the assumption that they are inclined to undermine police 'efficiency'. For example:

- I. "What do you see as the role of women police constables?"  
A. "Separate policewomen's department. They are best to deal with welfare. The men are best suited to action."

Thus those would-be inspectors tend to be selected for promotion who share senior officers' respect for the dominant definition of order, while also tending to regard 'bolshy' or 'ineffectual' members of the lower orders as responsible for police problems with the public. This includes a joint concern among interviewers and successful candidates to preserve the police 'image' and keep up respectable appearances, a certain lack of which in some subordinates is also assumed to be responsible for souring police relations with the public. For example:

- I. "If you were an inspector travelling to work and you observed a policeman with his hat off and close to a policewoman what would you do?"  
A. "Well stop him. Tell him to put his hat on. Inform inspector in charge of him."

The assumption of both interviewers and successful candidates for the position of inspector then is that those aspiring for command must ensure subordinates conform. They further assume that a certain lack of conformity is responsible for public hostility towards the police (assignment of responsibility). This is to say, that advantage is achieved in the police by those prepared to urge subordinates to prosecute those police regard as 'rough', disrespectful and 'idle' on the one hand, while disciplining those subordinates who are assumed by their appearance or 'approach' to create uncertainty and intrusion for the police on the other.

Ascendency to high rank in the police is therefore achieved by those individuals able to 'distinguish themselves - in an organisation stressing vocational security, minimal change and hostility to 'outside interference' - by 'doing respect' to senior police officers and successful members of society, while 'doing distance' from those deemed to be 'beneath them'. This amounts to the conclusion that senior officers promote those subordinates who (self interestedly) demean 'inefficiency', seeing advancement based on conformity to 'upright social standards', respectability, self help, discipline, authority and dependence on tradition and the known; and police problems emanating from a minority of morally inferior individuals in both police and society - rather than the dominant definition of order, commonsensically, supported by the police (assignment of responsibility/avoidance of outside intrusion/internal conflict). For example:

- I. "What do you think of community policing ... resident beat officers' work?"
- A. "Necessary but in the last twelve months they have gone a little bit too far ... not doing the job they should be doing, where's it all going to end? In the division where I work the resident beat officers forget they are policemen. To my mind the old image is being degraded. We are no longer crime fighters."

The above suggests that it is those applicants who are best able to fulfil the demands of the police to minimise internal coercion and public accountability, by isolating 'deviants' in both the police and society who tend to be preferred; on the assumption that this represents the collective interests of the police and support for police morale. In short, it is those officers best able to 'rationally' adapt to the demands of the police, in the sense of generating plausible strategies for dealing with different audiences (e.g. the powerful and the 'rough') and plausible justifications for their actions, who tend to be promoted.

In conclusion then, the above reveals that the arguments of police professionals and radical criminologists about a significant difference in orientation between senior officers and their subordinates seem unrealistic when compared to the findings of this chapter.

The findings of this chapter contradict claims made by radical criminologists that senior police officers are conspiring with dominant groups, because senior officers genuinely believe that the police represent the moral framework of the people. I also propose that this study differs from the claims made in this area by some police leaders at the beginning of this chapter, i.e; that they are not showing favour to any one section of the community, because a feature of police promotion is that those officers tend to be promoted who are prepared to take tough action against poorer, marginal sections of society.

Finally, in contradiction to the radicals, far from senior officers conspiring to manipulate subordinate police officers, since most officers seeking advancement share their senior officers' belief that the police represent consensus, the above reveals that it is the relationship of police culture to the dominant definition of order and the law - rather than the 'personalities' of police managers or their subordinates - which unites the police against the poor, rather than divides.

Such a proposal however begs a review of the salient points so far in order that the implications for the debate on police professionalism can be properly examined. With this in mind, with such a task in the final chapter which follows, I shall endeavour to conclude. (15).

CHAPTER SIX

CONCLUSION



In order that this thesis can be properly concluded a few opening remarks are necessary to put the work in context. Since this study has been concerned to examine claims by senior police officers to professionalism at a time of economic crisis and when growing conflict exists between sections of people and the state it is with certain remarks relevant to the latter with which I shall begin.

It is becoming clear that at a time when we are witnessing economic crisis and growing tension the visibility of the state has increased. It has become increasingly an interventionist force, managing socio-economic relations where those traditionally responsible for such functions can no longer manage them. Increasingly the state has appeared to absorb all the pressures and tensions of economic and political conflict into itself. And because the state has assumed a more direct role of intervening in political and economic crises so progressively the forms of social antagonism appear more and more as a direct conflict between different social classes and the state itself. Progressively, the various crises take the form of a general crises of the state as a whole and rapidly reverberate upwards from their initial starting points to the higher levels of the legal and political order itself.<sup>1</sup>

In this new form of 'interventionist' state the securing of popular consent is more than ever its only basis of legitimacy. Thus at a time of economic crises and political tension, when the administrative power has moved progressively from parliament to the state itself, the state is assumed to have a far more autonomous role in the management of conflict than that represented by the powerful. Such a view implies that in a 'pluralistic' society the state's autonomy from parliament and the economically powerful is the basis

of its legitimacy, representing, as it is held to do, the moral values of the people. Consent is therefore said to depend on the fact that the large but competing entities will cancel out each other's influence. Furthermore, the suggestion is not that power has been effectively dispersed in modern 'democratic' mass societies but that the vast majority of people are united within a common system of values; and it is this consensus on values, rather than formal representation, which provides the cohesion which such complex modern states require. The dominant and powerful interests are therefore 'democratic', not because they are directly governed in any sense by the will of the people, but because they, too, must ultimately refer themselves and be in some way bound by this consensus. According to the above then, liberal consent and popular consensus are important because they are the foundation upon which the cohesion of the state and its legal authority finally depends.

Such a claim to legitimacy would appear to be consistent with campaigns being made by senior police officers to professionalism at a time of growing economic conflict, when the impartiality of the police is increasingly in doubt. At a time when the police are increasingly coming into conflict with the public then, this thesis has been concerned to test the validity of claims made by senior police officers to professionalism; central to which is the assertion that the police is an independent agency which it is the role of senior police officers to ensure. The more so since it is implied by police professionals that it is at the level of lower ranking police officers that poor standards are responsible for conflict with the public.<sup>2</sup>

Thus police professionals contend that the police must take their own precautions and this begins with selection. Senior police officers insist that though constables of the past have had difficulties

in coping with diversity, today better standards of recruitment are seeking to remedy such problems. Secondly, they further imply that in order to prevent recurring problems with the public emanating from the corruption, brutality or misguided loyalty of police subordinates, senior officers are concerned to take precautions which include proper training.

The above assumes that the orientation of senior police officers is significantly different from that of their subordinates, in that police leaders are properly selected and trained - yet all of the claims made by police professionals to reform the police fail to explain why such attempts are constantly subverted in reality. Indeed, an examination of the development of the police in the 20th century in Chapter One revealed not only a recurring concern with the standards of the police rank and file, but also with police leaders. Thus the claim by some senior police officers that problems between the police and the public emanate from a 'gap' between the poor standards of some subordinates and those of senior police officers is an assumption which ignores this kind of finding.

This then set the scene for what followed, where I was concerned to review the literature of those scholars who tend to be supportive of the claims of police professionals, which was followed by a review of the work of those writers at variance with the above. Finally, I presented my own view of the police. Thus Chapter Two began with an examination of the work of those sociologists of varying liberal persuasions which suggest that such problems as persist in relations between the police and the public tend to emanate from a 'gap' between the poor standards of police subordinates and the professionalism of their senior officers.<sup>3</sup> Secondly, I reviewed the work of those scholars who suggest that there is no gap between senior officers and their subordinates.<sup>4</sup> Third, the above was followed by a review of those radical

North American criminologists critical of both of the positions cited, on the grounds that they do not challenge the structure of power and privilege which lies behind the police system.<sup>5</sup> Thus as far as the radicals are concerned, despite appearances to the contrary, the political influence of the powerful members of society on the police is much closer than admitted by police professionals. The state is therefore seen as the monolithic product of an elite minority, who, by promoting themselves as disinterested, changed the class/occupational subculture of subordinate officers thereby 'engineering' police loyalty in the service of business values. One way this is being achieved is via police recruitment and training.

Thus the radicals suggest that the state functions as a mere tool for the domination of the dominant class and would thus deny even the possibility of examining the relative autonomy of the police vis-a-vis the dominant class. As a result the radicals seem unable to explain the support for the law to which working class people often subscribe, or how and why the law can, and does, sometimes intervene against the overt interests of a particular ruling class fraction. For this reason the radicals' view of the capitalist state as the 'executive committee' of the ruling class is not a particularly helpful one. It pinpoints the essential nature of the state but it obscures what is specific to the state under capitalism - the basis of its independence.

Given the inadequacies of the radicals' position I argued that the radicals' stance is too simple, too reductive for our purposes; since they are unable to explain how the police can appear to be impartial, yet still operate to assist the reproduction of an unequal social order; for the police this means law. Thus my position is that not only is there no gap between police ranks, but more importantly, if police behaviour appears to deviate from the

'rhetoric' of police professionalism it cannot be assumed by either senior police officers or radical criminologists that it does so despite the law. My view is that any alleged 'gap' between how the police should behave and how they do is not simply a by-product of poor recruits or training, or even the standards of senior officers creating a 'gap' between ranks; it exists in the law as defined by the judicial and political elites of the state. The so-called deviant subculture is made possible in the law; it is imposed via the scrutiny of recruits and the process of training and promotion.

In what followed then, I was concerned to test the above issues empirically and thereby the recurring claims of certain senior police officers and the establishment to have professionalised the police. This entailed an analysis of the suggestion that today the police are attentive to informal and subjective influences alike; that a new level of tolerance is abroad in police recruitment, training and promotion which I observed and subjected gatekeepers in these areas to systematic inquiry. On the other hand I also examined the assertions of the radical criminologists who imply that the professionalism of police leaders amounts to a legitimating myth in that police leaders are assumed to be 'scheming' to streamline the police in the service of the wealthy.

With the above in mind, in Chapters Three, Four and Five I examined the meaning given to professionalism by the police themselves, by looking at how police recruitment, training and promotion works in practice. My conclusions, supported by a brief reference to my observations, are as follows.

My first general observation is that senior police officers (and their subordinates) assume that success and power is based on 'learning to adjust' to the dominant definition of order, which they further

assume represents consensus. Furthermore, since the police stress that the basis of their authority is the law, which has its foundation in consensus, one consequence of becoming a police officer is acceptance by the individual officer that the normative order of the police represents responsible and reasonable behaviour. The police assume they are responsible, impartial and expert because they must attend to the objective facticity of their work. The police insist it is their duty to instil 'responsible' behaviour. The police work in the interests of the public. It is up to the public to support them.

Secondly, police socialisation stresses vocational security, routinisation, loyalty and obedience. The stress for appropriate police behaviour is on adjustment to the 'reality' and commonsense of the police, underwritten by the law, rather than innovation or personal whim. The police want personnel who will share their attitudes and perspectives of authority figures - the political and judicial elites of society - advocating severe penalties for those sections of the lower orders deemed 'football hooligans', the rough, muggers and the like, 'sponging off the dole'. The above tends to set the limits for rewards and punishments inside the police including the imperative that for the police, the ends justify the means.

The focal concern of the police then tends to be concerned with the differential apprehension, prosecution, conviction and punishment of the 'dangerous' sections of the lower classes in society.

The police assume the above represents the public interest. It is the individual officer's responsibility to do so. Problems with the public concerning apparent deviance by individual officers tends to be attributed to a minority of (usually) lower ranking (undersocialised, 'wrong headed or corrupt') police officers - who are assumed to be adopting 'different' standards from those of their superiors.

The police generally (and senior officers in particular) suggest that they cannot be held completely accountable for such behaviour - and that, from the police point of view, is how it should be. The accountability of the police as a whole thereby is diminished: The 'healthy' officer is 'impartial' - and removed from impossible demands. Senior police officers and their subordinates therefore assume that given the 'reality' of their work (police commonsense) - and their assumption that they represent consensus and the law's demands - it is with such 'impartial experts' that the professional management of policing can rightfully be left!

In general then, for the police the well adjusted officer is the officer who coincidentally, is in tune with the demands of the police; the officer who does not express 'role conflict'; the officer who takes for granted the organisational 'reality'.

With the above in mind my conclusions on police recruiting are that those candidates are selected who, by virtue of their unencumbered backgrounds and amenability to the demands of the police appear more likely to preserve the police image. This is to say that those candidates are likely to be preferred whose attitude towards established social standards and the prospective difficulties of policework is underwritten by an upbringing, family and style of life supportive of discipline and authority. This senior officers on interview boards, are committed to uphold. And this includes favouring those candidates opposed to showing weakness towards 'mean' people, or upsetting 'respectable', if not successful members of the public. The issue of 'role conflict' and motivation to deal with the 'rough' are issues where women particularly are pressed hard. They have to make that much more effort to convince senior police officers that they have the 'motivation' and 'strength of character' to subordinate all of their

outside interests (and 'romantic ambitions') to the demands of the police. They also have to make much more effort to convince senior police officers that they are able to deal with 'violent' and 'rough' sections of the public.

My analysis of police recruitment tended to contradict the claims made to ethical impartiality in this area by police professionals at the beginning of this thesis. The aim of the recruitment boards is to judge whether applicants' morality is amenable to maintaining the status quo, which senior police officers following their own (commonsense) assumptions tend to take for granted. So the assumption of the

radicals that senior officers are scheming to place the state in the hands of the business classes is also not tenable. Far from senior officers 'conspiring' to present themselves as impartial, they actually believe they are acting on behalf of the majority. The more so since those recruits that get in, and most do unless they are particularly careless in the interview, do not differ fundamentally in their interests from top police managers observed.

My conclusions on police training are more explicit. The maturity of recruits is measured by their 'adjustment' to what the police assume to be 'reality', rather than by recruits' previous accomplishments or imagination. New recruits tend to be regarded as irrational by the police and only when they begin to echo the police reality are they treated otherwise. On the other hand, the police training instructors assume the police are rational because they defer to 'objective' definitions of the worthy and unworthy. The instructors' duty is perceived to be imposing dominant definitions of respectability, discipline and authority on recruits. The centre is believed to represent the public interest. It is for individual recruits to do the same. Discipline and punishment are employed to gain the recruits' compliance by training centre staff. Remission only begins with acceptance of instructors' demands that the priority of the police



is to instil respect in those stereotyped as 'living off the Giro'; drinking in the pubs all day long; neglecting their kids; 'idle feckless thieving layabouts hiding behind gullible socialworkers'; 'those who want something for nothing' and 'the strong stealing from the weak'.

The above translation of where recruits' priorities lie tends to dominate in the classroom where instructors offer the police's commonsensical interpretation of the law. It is, however, a moral indignation that tends to be directed at the visible criminals, rather than the invisible criminals within bourgeois societies 'institutions of privacy'.<sup>6</sup> As Young puts it :

"The criminal is an enormously useful scapegoat - to put to use as a target for the sense of injustice of the powerless - and he is realistically a target in the sense that he often does act against class interests, yet unrealistically so in that his 'villainy' pales once set against that of the powers that be."  
(J. Young, 1978, p.80)

Thus armed with information and commonsense stereotypes about certain people and places (layabouts, Irish, blacks, for example) a recruit is instructed to be positively aggressive towards such people, such that for instructors the end comes to justify the means. To this classroom list for recruits must be added the instructors' statements that the above are being encouraged by social workers, defence lawyers and militants who are assumed to be condemning the police.

As far as higher training courses are concerned, my conclusions are that the expectations of all of the participants on the senior officers training courses echo those of trainers on basic courses; with the rider that the dominant focus of higher training is ensuring subordinates conform to such demands. This tends to be related to the anxiety of senior officers about the strengths and weaknesses of

different sections of the public to criticise the police - and maintaining police morale. In short, if subordinates wish to avoid coercion they must adopt a respectful approach towards 'respectable' and wealthy members of the public - while prosecuting those deemed dangerous and rough on the grounds that their immorality is serious so the police must exercise their discretion by 'targetting' them and taking them to court. This senior instructors and course participants commonsensically assume to be policing impartially.

The above therefore contradicts the claims made in this area to ethical impartiality by senior police officers. The aim of both basic and higher training is to ensure that all police officers are 'self motivated' to maintain the status quo; which instructors in constables' training and all participants in higher training tend to take for granted. This means that there is no significant difference in the socialisation of recruits and their senior officers which could justify the assumption that a 'gap' exists between ranks. On the contrary, discrimination is embedded in the rationality of such courses, which direct that acceptance of certain dominant assumptions assumed to be impartial are a condition of becoming a successful police officer.

Furthermore, the assumption of 'radical' criminologists that senior officers are 'scheming' to direct the practices of subordinates in the service of business values - via training - is again seen to be equally fallacious. On the contrary, as with recruiting, they actually believe they are acting on behalf of the (silent) majority. The more so since not only do senior officers undergoing training share the aims of their instructors, but, more importantly perhaps, the majority of recruits pass their training and do not appear to differ fundamentally in their orientation from their senior officers.

A consequence of police recruiting and training then is that in mediating between the primary definition of order, police occupational concerns and different social classes, the individual officer seems to be expected to share his senior officers (and peers) concerns, such that they influence his/her encounters with different police audiences and play an active part. However, since police socialisation instils in all officers from the beginning of their careers the necessity to conform to occupational norms; in an occupation which stresses 'solidarity' and devalues 'individualistic' tendencies, additional ways of establishing a superior position seem difficult.

Given the expectations of all officers as a result of their early socialisation in the police, my conclusions on advancement to higher rank are as follows. I begin with would-be detective constables.

Those officers are more likely to achieve the position of detective whose behaviour appears more 'rational' to senior officers (and themselves) - by virtue of their ability to gain information, make arrests and achieve court convictions (conversion to senior officers' ideology). This is an area where women candidates (once again) have to try that much harder to convince senior officers that they are as well motivated as the men, rather than having other distractions (e.g. romantic ambition s/role conflict). One-upmanship is therefore achieved by those best able to exploit those police tend to stereotype as 'failures' - by getting them to 'talk' or play agent provocateur - while privately 'doing distance' and 'doing respect' to senior detectives. Ascendance to the position of detective therefore seems more likely for those officers who conceal their sources of information (and activities) from their (uniform) colleagues in the interests of appearing to be a 'good thief taker' (valuation of private resources); the stress is on 'self help' rather than helping others; seeing the

disadvantaged and 'rough' as 'responsible' for their own dilemmas, in isolation from wider social problems, and seeing oneself as having 'exceptional qualities'. defending individuals (assignment of responsibility). This is assumed to be consonant with the collective reward system of the police and of paramount importance in projecting/manipulating a good police image.

Accepting the 'logic' of the above, and the fact that above the rank of detective, sergeants and inspectors (who must first pass exams) have a responsibility for controlling subordinates, my conclusions are as follows.

In addition to the requirements for a detective those officers seem likely to be promoted to sergeant who are able to 'do respect' to senior officers by having the personal qualities (commitment to the normative order of the police) to discriminate between those constables who conform (produce) while providing senior officers with a 'report' on those who do not. In short, ascendancy to the position of sergeant is more likely to be achieved by constables who can 'talk' to constables in the 'same language' - but also begin to 'do distance'. That is, share their senior officers' assumption that a 'minority' of 'bad applies' among constables (undersocialised, 'wrong headed' or corrupt) upset (respectable usually) members of the public and also police morale.

My conclusions on the selection of inspectors vary only in degree. In short, it is those sergeants best able to 'do respect' to senior officers (by virtue of their 'record' and normative orientation) by sharing their fellow officers' view that a minority of the public (the rough) are immoral and the chief target of the police; but also share the view of senior officers that 'bad applies' among sergeants as well as constables disrupt police morale and the police image, who tend to be promoted.

By extension, it is those applicants best able to convince senior officers (and themselves) that they can eliminate 'unmotivated' behaviour by citing 'bad apples' in the police and society as responsible for 'causing' police problems who tend to be preferred. This is assumed to represent support for police morale and the dominant definition of order which senior officers and those who are ascending tend to take for granted, (7).

Thus it is those officers who are best able to fulfil the demands of the police to minimise internal coercion and public accountability by citing 'bad apples' as responsible for police problems who tend to be preferred.

My conclusion on my empirical findings then is that senior officers (and aspiring subordinates) defer to the successful on the grounds that they embody traditional British values, while looking down on the failure and others (e.g. police 'bad apples') assumed to be morally inferior, which the rules must be mobilised to control.

In sum then, the suggestion that a gap exists between the orientation of senior police officers and their subordinates seem unrealistic when compared to the findings of this thesis, whether the authors are police professionals or radical criminologists. My conclusion is that there is no difference in the orientation of senior and junior officers, which the law makes possible and police 'common sense' endorses.



FOOTNOTES

INTRODUCTION.

1. For a leading example see J. Alderson (1979), particularly Chapter 7.
2. As a justification for my characterisation of the field into liberal/radical sociologies, see, for example Rosenberg D (N D) 'The Sociology of the police and sociological liberalism'. Rosenberg's paper on Anglo/American sociology on the police includes a critique of liberal and radical tendencies. Rosenberg argues that the mediation between individual personality structures, status politics, etc are not the essential explanations of police behaviour and are abstracted from the analysis of the functions of the state in civil societies found in the classical sociologies of Weber and Marx. He adds that 'A further hypothesis, which can be put forward as an explanation, is that it is the ideological integration of such a subaltern group into the dominant 'common sense' of capitalist societies in crises which explains their ideological attitudes.'
3. The relevance of studies of the police in North America is viewed as problematic because there is a different structure of accountability - yet one can still make the comparison because the police in North America have a similar mandate/organisational features, which have led some to talk of the Anglo-American policing tradition (Manning P K, 1977).
4. J Q Wilson (1968) for example.
5. Centre for Research on Criminal Justice (1977).
6. M E Cain (1979).
7. For example, see S. Hall et al (1978), Chapter 6.



CHAPTER I

1. J. Alderson (1979), Chapter 1.
2. Ibid., p.200.
3. Ibid., p.32.
4. Ibid., p.212.
5. Ibid., p.212.
6. Ibid., p.32. The recurring references to Alderson above have been deliberate, even though his views may now be anathema to many in the Association of Chief Police Officers, because a) his liberal position puts the case for unequivocal 'professional' leadership as forthrightly as anyone; b) the philosophy of the Chief Constable of the research force was widely regarded as close to that of Alderson in key respects.
7. Sir R. Mark (1978), Chapter 10.
8. T Jefferson and R Grimshaw (1982).
9. For examples of police history see T Boden (1978), T Critchley (1967) and T Bunyan (1977).
10. Report of the Commission on The Police Service of England and Wales and Scotland (1920) under Lord Desborough.
11. Recommended again by the Royal Commission on the Police, 1962.
12. Report of the Royal Commission on Police Powers and Procedure, 1929.

13. Ibid., paras. 16-17.
14. On District Conferences see, for example, T Critchley (1967),  
ibid.
15. T Critchley (1967), ibid.
16. T Critchley (1967), ibid.
17. Higher Police Training in England and Wales (1947).
18. Report of the Committee on Police Conditions of Service,  
Parts I and II (1949).
19. Interim Report of the Royal Commission on the Police (November,  
1960). Final Report (May, 1963).
20. Police Training in England and Wales (1961).
21. Police Training in England and Wales (1961), ibid.
22. Council on Higher Police Training (Senior Staff Course), 1967.
23. Three Working Parties on Police Manpower, Equipment and  
Efficiency, 1967.
24. Recruitment of People with Higher Educational Qualifications to  
the Police Service (1967).
25. Sir R. Mark (1979), p.49.
26. T Critchley (1967), pp.310-311.
27. Select Committee on Race Relations and Immigration. Session 1971-2

28. Police Recruitment and Wastage; Observations of 7th Report of Expenditure Committee (1975).
29. Royal Commission on Criminal Procedure: The Balance of Criminal Justice. Summary of the Report (1981).
30. Guardian, 24.4.81., p.4.
31. Lord Scarman (1981).
32. D.J. Smith and J. Gray (1983).
33. R. Bull and P. Horncastle (1983).
34. Guardian, 23.1.81.

#### CHAPTER 2.

1. M.E. Cain (1971).
2. See, for example, J. Young (1975).
3. K. Marx and F. Engels (1965).
4. A. Gramsci (1971), pp.161-2.
5. P. Cohen (1979).
6. D.J. MacBarnet (1978).
7. J. Van Maanen (1973), pp.407-16; and also J. Van Maanen (1975), pp.207-28.

8. S. Hall et al (1978) as an example. Chapter 6.

9. P. Carlan (1979).

### CHAPTER 3.

1. J. Alderson (1979).

2. Ibid., (1979).

3. Centre for Research on Criminal Justice (1977).

4. R. S. Bunyard (1978), particularly pp.196-203.

5. There are three ways to 'enter' the police though only one is considered here because it is the most common. The first form of entry upon attaining the age of 16 is as a cadet, but since their career development to the position of constable is also dependent upon their passing the selection (at 18%) considered here, cadet recruitment is not given separate treatment in this research. Secondly, though the police do annually recruit a small number of graduates specifically selected via an extended interview and 'special course' for rapid promotion, since they are a relatively insignificant numerical intake this procedure is also ignored. Third, direct entry considered here.

6. The force recruitment officer.

7. With the exception of data obtained while I was participating/observing the selection interviews and in the classroom (Chapter 4), all other quotations in this thesis are from tape recorded interviews obtained by systematic interviewing using semi structured questionnaires.

8. For examples of research attempting to validate the view that pre-employment histories of recruits is related to occupational performance, albeit with inconclusive results, see for example, R.J. Levy (1973), and Home office Police Research and Development Branch 'The Wastage Survey Report' No.16/69 (1969), pp.17-26.
9. For an example of aspects of police deviance in relations with minority groups, see A.J. Lee (1981): "The scum are those under the power of the police, supported by an apparent social consensus to 'let the police handle these people'. Any category of citizens who lack power in major institutions of their society...are liable to become police property..." (p.53).
10. For an exmple of yet another senior officer's assumed importance of the appearance of recruits see P. Collier (1976), pp.4-18, and on appearance of police in U.S.A. see, for example, J. Chwast (1965), pp.151-161.
11. On the tendency for police to respect employers see J. Chwast (1965).
12. Home Office Wastage Survey 16/69: No significant difference was found among those who achieved and those who did not or left the police prematurely who had been in the armed forces (page 24). The important point remaining being that those in charge of recruiting may nevertheless prefer those respecting discipline.
13. D. J. Bordua and A.J. Reiss (1972); "In many ways policing is a highly decentralised operation (necessitating) command as a basis for (legitimacy)." (my brackets).



14. On 'Domain Assumptions' see, for example, A.W. Gouldner (1973), particularly pp.31-35, where domain assumptions are 'assumptions about man and society which might include, for example, dispositions to believe that men are rational or irrational: that society is precarious or fundamentally stable; that social problems will correct themselves without planned intervention; that human behaviour is unpredictable...They are an aspect of the larger culture that is most intimately related to the postulates of theory...experiences and practices, and therefore differ with different ages or peer groups...in simple truth, all of these domain constituting categories derive from and function in much the same way as 'stereotypes'...' (pp.31-2).
15. Many people have written of the inconveniences of policework. See, for example, M. Banton (1964), p.198; MacInnes (1962), p.20; J.H. Skolnick (1975), pp.11, 42-48, 63-64, 65; W.A. Westley (1953), pp.34-41; C. Werthman and I. Piliavin (1967), pp.56-98.
16. On danger see J.H. Skolnick (1975), pp.45-67. On monotony, etc. see A. Reiss and D.J. Bordua (1967), pp.25-55.
17. On isolation see J.H. Skolnick (1968), pp.3-28.
18. J.H. Skolnick (1968).
19. J.H. Skolnick (1968); M. Banton (1964); W.A. Westley (1953) and J.Q. Wilson (1963), pp.189-216.
20. On the tendency for police 'experts' to stereotype certain individuals and groups see, for example, J.H. Skolnick (1975), p.46.
21. On the anxiety of police authorities towards women increasing in the police and tendency to stereotype women generally as

contradicting their stereotype of police see H. Toch (1965), p.25.

CHAPTER 4.

1. R.S. Bunyard (1978), pp.223-4.
2. R.S. Bunyard (1978), *ibid.*, pp.211-16.
3. The Training of Probationary Constables: Student Lesson Notes (1976).
4. Home Office Circular 94 (1973).
5. R.S. Bunyard (1978), pp.37-47 particularly.
6. Regina V. Commissioner of Police of the Metropolis. Ex p. Blackburn (1986) 2 Q.B. 118.
7. R.S. Bunyard, *ibid.*, pp.37-47 particularly.
8. See Appendix I for 'image' of Inspectors course curriculum.
9. Quotes are from tape recorded interviews with researcher.
10. On discretion, for example, see H. Goldstein (1963).
11. On discretion and 'common sense' see T. Jefferson and R. Grimshaw (1982), pp.82-117.
12. As an example: J.H. Skolnick (1975), pp.227-245.

13. R. Ayres (1968). And on awesome powers that police possess in their exercise of discretion to arrest; A.S. Goldstin (1960).
14. For examples of the importance of tactics re information gathering see, for example, J.Q. Wilson (1963). And also J.H. Skolnick (1975), pp.205-243.
15. R. Aytes (1968).
16. H. Goldstein (1963).
17. R.G. Weintraub and H. Pollack (1973).
18. For examples of the consequences of police training in suspicion and stereotyping see J.H. Skolnick (1975), pp.42-67. On tendency for police to use their legal right to use force against those seen as violent as justification for use of force see A.J. Reiss (1968).
19. J. Young (1973), pp.314-22.
20. H. Goldstein (1967), pp.1123-1146.
21. On police attitudes towards young people, particularly working class young people, see for example, N. Goldman (1963). Also I. Piliavin and S. Briars (1964), pp.206-214.
22. On violence and the police see W.A. Westley (1970). Also D. Burnham (1968); Toch H. (1965), pp.22-25.
23. For example, B.J. Terris (1967), pp.58-69. And A. Morales (1970), pp.52-6
24. For example of police dislike of intellectuals see J. Chwast (1965), pp.151-161.
25. On the orientation of police versus social workers see R.H. Walther, S.D. McCune and R.C. Trojanowicz (1970). See also J.H. Skolnick (1968), pp.3-28.
26. On hostility towards courts by police see J.H. Skolnick (1975), pp.227-228.
27. For similar studies pointing up the employment of discipline in police training to gain compliance to police values see, for examples, J. Van Maanen (1973), pp.407-18. And also on training J.H. McNamara (1967).
28. On expectation of deference in police see D.J. Bordua and A.J. Reiss (1966). On general explanation of 'significant others' as components of conservative ideology see Hall et al (1978), pp.140-141, particularly "Respectability ... is strongly connected with ideas of self help, and self reliance and of conformity to established social standards, standards set and embodied by 'significant others' ... those who stand above us in the social hierarchy."
29. On police attitudes to discipline for example see R. Reiner (1979) pp.6-7, 39, 63, 110, 119, 161, 187-93, 257.
30. On appearance see J. Chwast (1965), pp.151-161, particularly "At social functions of police groups one is quite impressed by orthodoxy



in dress, speech and manners..."

31. See for a definition of 'total institutions' E. Goffman (1973), particularly Chapter 1. "A basic social arrangement is that individuals tend to sleep, play and work in different places, with different co-participants under different authorities, and without an overall rational plan. The central feature of total institutions can be described as a breakdown of the barriers ordinarily separating these three spheres of life...these persons are... collectively regimented and march through the days activities in the immediate company of a batch of similar others."
32. On police and public see J.Q. Wilson (1963). And (1968).
33. J. Alderson (1979).
34. For examples of anxiety of senior officers vis-a-vis the public see, for example, B.J. Terris (1967) and J.Q. Wilson (1963).
35. For an excellent example of this phenomena see J.Q. Wilson (1968).
36. This is to say that dominant definitions of social order and the 'public interest', not necessarily the same thing as an achieved consensus, though it may be, tend to provide the basic rationale for police training.
37. On the wide powers police have to exercise discretion see D.J. McBarnet (1978).
38. On the tendency for police to exercise their discretion according to an occupational inflected version of the common sense of the dominant majority (as well as appeals to the national interest) see T. Jefferson and R. Grimshaw 1982).

39. So this research not only tends to contradict suggestions made by some police leaders, but also some sociologists who imply that problems with the public tend to emanate from the undersocialisation of lower ranking police officers. See for example S.D. Holdaway (1977), pp.119-37. Moreover, while police officers, or those engaged in basic training at least emerge from this analysis consistent with some of the findings of Cain on police stereotyping (M.E. Cain, 1971), at variance with Cain this research indicates that far from definitions about the ways which the 'rough' are defined being confined to (relatively low ranking) uniform beat men indoctrinating recruits on the streets, both senior and junior officers are actually trained to do so - where punishment is employed as a means to this end. Indeed a similar process of indoctrination assisted by the use of rewards and punishments to promote solidarity among police recruits is endorsed by the findings of J. Van Maanen (1973).
40. For examples of the above 'monitorialist' strand in education where Monitorialists "tended to speak a common language". The key phrases emphasised restraint: 'check upon delinquency'; enforcing the observance of 'religious and moral principles'; 'the laws of the school'; 'the Will of God'; accustom them to obedience under 'control and command'; or habit; 'many beneficial habits of an indelible nature'; 'steady habits of industry and integrity'; 'a right bias to their minds'. Or order (the product of habit and restraint); 'the children inured to habits of order and subordination and of a schoolroom'. See R. Johnson (1976). See also M.W. Apple (1979) "...in order to understand the relationship between curriculum and cultural and economic reproduction we would have to grapple more completely with the maintenance and control of particular forms of ideology with hegemony..how both historically

and currently certain normative conceptions of legitimate culture and values enter curriculum ..." (p.82). And, "Drawing upon the important work of both Williams and Gramsci, I argued at the very beginning of this book that control and domination are often vested in the common sense practices and consciousness underlying our lives as well as overt economic manipulation. Domination can be ideological as well as material." (p.123). "Because the designations, categories, and linguistic tools employed by educators, and especially by most members of the curriculum field of a behavioural persuasion are perceived by them to have both 'scientific' status and to be geared to 'helping' students, there is little or no realisation that the very language they resort to is ideally suited to maintain the bureaucratic rationality (and the concomitant effects of social control and consensus that has dominated schooling for so long a time." (p.143). "... the supposedly neutral language of an institution, even though it rests upon highly speculative data and may be applied without actually being appropriate, provides a framework that legitimates control of major aspects of an individual's or group's behaviour. At the same time, by sounding scientific and 'expert' it contributes to the quiescence of the public by focussing attention on its 'sophisticated' not on its political or ethical results. Thus historically outmoded and socially and politically conservative (and often educationally disastrous) practices are not only continued, but are made to sound as if they were actually more enlightened and ethically responsive ways of dealing with children." (p.144)

#### CHAPTER 5.

1. J. Alderson (1979), pp.213-4.
2. Home Office Research and Development Branch Report No.16/69, p.38.
3. There are now 9 ranks in the police service: Constable, Sergeant, Inspector, Chief Inspector, Superintendent, Chief Superintendent, Assistant, Deputy, and Chief Constable.
4. Home Office Research and Development Branch Report 16/69, p.51, on opposition to rapid promotion in police.
5. On promotion systems and selection in police including chances, see R.S. Bunyard (1978), pp.277-288.
6. Police Act, 1964, Section 5.
7. The above quotations and those used to introduce the sections which follow all represent tape recorded interviews.
8. The senior detective quoted above.
9. On 'domain assumptions' see A.W. Gouldner (1977), pp.31-35.
10. See for example J.H. Skolnick (1975), particularly Chapters 6, 7 and 8.
11. On attitudes of police authorities towards women in the police and tendency to stereotype women generally as contradicting their stereotype of police, see Toch H (1965), p.25.

12. On police attitudes to discipline for example see R. Reiner (1978) pp. 6, 7, 39, 63, 110, 119, 161, 187-93 and 257.
13. On appearance see J. Chwast (1965), pp.151-161.
14. One finding of this thesis therefore is that police managers reconcile the demand for efficiency with good police morale by mobilising collective police resentment against 'outsiders'. This finding therefore tends to reduce the assertion of E. Reuss Ianni and F.A.J. Ianni (1983) - that the problem of police management becomes critical as they attempt to reconcile improved police morale with greater productivity - to a somewhat false problematic. While allowing for variations described by these and other sub-cultural scholars, that variations exist, my findings tend to emphasise that the values of senior and junior officers are consonant with the police structure - which the above tend to leave unexamined. e.g. "From what we were 'told', this separation of structure..." (my italics) (1983, p.256). Nor are my findings consistent with the assertion by these writers that "the management level of operations finds its operational ethos not in the traditions of the job but in themes and processes of scientific management." (p.257). On the contrary my findings suggest that this does not touch operational policing. Indeed, as the above authors admit, "Since our study concentrated on the precinct level we did not systematically trace the social networks upon which the study is based beyond that level..." (p.258).
15. So this research tends to contradict suggestions made by some sociologists who imply that problems with the public tend to emanate from the standards of lower ranking officers. See, for example, S.D. Holdaway (1977). Secondly it also tends to contradict those sociologists who insinuate that the police are influenced in their orientation to policing by their 'strong background links

with the working class; it has a very fragile knowledge of or links with the upper orders'; R. Kinsey and J. Young (1982).

CHAPTER 6.

1. S. Hall et al (1978).
2. J. Alderson (1979).
3. M.E. Cain (1971); S.D. Holdaway (1977) and (1979); D. James (1979); M.R. Chatterton (1979); A. Weiderhoffer and A.S. Blumberg (1973); J.H. Skolnick (1968), pp.3-28.
4. J.Q. Wilson (1968).
5. J. Young (1975).
6. Centre for Research on Criminal Justice (1975).
7. Though the officers I observed undergoing training and selection only go to the rank of Inspector it should be noted that I talked to/observed on boards Chief Superintendents and Assistant Chief Constables. Their tape recorded interviews form part of this thesis. See, for example, the Methodological Appendix, Page 279 particularly.

APPENDIX I



## Methodology

This research is predicated upon a qualitative methodology; upon the need to be present, to experience and observe as well as simply discuss the problems under study. Only in this way can latent elements as opposed to more manifest ones be identified and analysed. For example with respect to studying the interview and training process in depth, to analyse the non verbal as well as the verbal communication taking place, the implicit assumptions as well as the explicit questioning and statements, the discrepancies between intentions and effects. In short, the complex social dynamics of interviewing and training in their entirety. Thus by the systematic analysis of the questions asked on interview boards and the statements uttered in training I sought to take account of the 'internal logic' of the situation; how senior officers and instructors acting as 'gatekeepers' in selection and training assign meanings to situations and the actions of others and react in terms of the interpretation suggested by those meanings; how these are weighted and their assumed relationship to desirable performance.<sup>1</sup> The above was informed by an analysis of the ideas of policing, the law and the development of the police institution, which I assumed could not be ignored in studying career development.

Stage one of the actual fieldwork involved my direct observation of several interview boards (recruitment, selection of detectives and promotion boards) and different training courses. In so doing I collected data to check on the frequency and distribution of the phenomena under study. I thereby collected the most frequently occurring questions by interviewers and utterances by training instructors which, when put together with other 'pieces of talk' I had already collected and had yet to collect were employed by me to formulate and classify major assumptions of police 'gatekeepers'.

An example of this method of 'reality production' is provided by the interpretation of questions put to applicants for the police by interviewers such as 'Tell me what your family think of us, the police, and your intention to join?'. On the basis of what I had already learned I understood the interviewer to be saying, 'It is important that you show respect towards upright social standards and this must be signified both by your background and style of life'.

Similarly other frequently occurring questions were interpreted as further expressions relevant to the context within which the interviewers perceive their work. This included the interviewers concern over whether applicants could manage the inconveniences of the job; how well prepared candidates were in relation to discipline; whether candidates' past record indicates they will be able to cope with 'mean' people, 'drunken Irishmen', blacks and those perceived as 'rough' in future; concern over the prospective 'weaknesses' of women in the police; the importance of keeping up 'respectable' appearances; showing respect for the successful and high ranking and mistrust of 'opposition'.

The above method was employed to generate ideas about the moral order of the police, tested by in-depth interviewing, using semi-structured questionnaires (see Appendix 2), as well as further observation. In short, the transformation of the assumptions mapped in interviews and training was achieved by discovering the ideological limits to 'getting in and getting on' in the police and the consequences for those who conform or fail to conform with these norms. Knowing something about the norms of the police revealed something of the kinds of motives I encountered in police socialisation. On knowing what kinds of motives were involved I was then able to see the meaning of professionalism in the areas of recruitment, training and promotion to the police themselves.

Gaining access to do research in the police is never easy but since the (Home Office linked) research followed in the wake of research being conducted in a large urban force by my supervisor, after submitting a proposal access was eventually facilitated from mid 1979 to late 1980. The force concerned (to which I had by chance been granted access to conduct exploratory research on recruitment and selection in 1976/7) was chosen because as one of the largest forces in England and Wales spanning town and country it seemed to incorporate a large range of policing problems.

However, working miles away from one's academic base presents certain difficulties. The regional training course for constables was selected on logistical and economic grounds, simply because it was closest (36 miles) from where I was living and about 6 miles



from the force. Having submitted a proposal to the Home Office (responsible for running such courses) permission was granted before any of the research began for me to attend the centre (though it was necessary for me to travel backwards and forwards each day) to observe the course and interview the instructors and their senior officers.

In the case of supervisors' training I participated in a regional course for newly promoted inspectors, the curriculum for which, like the constables' courses, is laid down centrally. This followed a few days spent at Bramshill Police College to get 'the feel' of higher police training, access to which was afforded by the Home Office. Access, as well as travel, to the inspectors' course was quite speedy, not least since by chance the home and local superintendence of this course was with the force in which my study of recruitment and promotion was already situated. The force therefore facilitated access to the inspectors' course with the approval from the Home Office.

The above connects with the problems of sampling. My areas of interest (observing the process of recruitment and selection, basic and higher training and promotion) made the task of selecting that which was of interest much easier. A relatively small group of officers are responsible for recruitment and selection and promotion at given times at force headquarters. Thus, for example, the force had one recruitment officer responsible for vetting, collating references and presenting applicants' files to the boards just prior to interviews. The boards for recruits usually consisted of a Chief Superintendent (Chairman) assisted by a Chief Inspector, both visiting on a rota basis. These officers set about interviewing about 7 applicants per day, once every 2 weeks. Sometimes 2 boards sat simultaneously in rooms adjacent to the Recruitment Office at Police Headquarters, but this was rare, not least since not many Chief Superintendents are available in the force. The Chairman most definitely ran the interview, put major questions and sometimes major criticisms. The Chief Inspector put questions only when invited by the Chairman and he, not his assistant, made the decision.

My coverage of promotion boards included selection from constable to detective constable, constable to sergeant and sergeant to inspector. The offer was extended for me to observe the selection

of higher ranks but limited time made it impossible to be in two places at once. Those seeking selection to the C.I.D. must appear before a board composed of a Detective Chief Superintendent and a Detective Superintendent held bi-weekly, followed by a trial period before a final decision. Those candidates seeking promotion to sergeant and inspector must pass both a primary and secondary board held on different dates. In the case of primary boards, they are chaired by a Chief Superintendent, assisted by two Superintendents. The same chairman consistently takes primary boards while his assistants attend on a rota basis. In the case of central boards they are chaired by an Assistant Chief Constable assisted by two Chief Superintendents. The same chairman consistently takes the central boards, while his assistants, like the officers on the primary boards, are usually but not exclusively divisional officers sitting on a rota basis. Depending on demand and supply these boards are held bi-weekly in rooms for the Personnel and Training Department situated again at Police Headquarters.

Permission was granted by the Chief Constable and his assistants for me to observe 25-30 interviews for each of the areas civilian to recruit, constable to detective constable, constable to sergeant, sergeant to inspector and insoector to chief inspector. Unfortunately, due to limited time and resources it was not possible for me to be present at the interviews of Chief Inspector or higher ranks, though the selectors involved have been interviewed extensively such that the 'rationale' for higher police rank should become clear.

As far as basic training for constables is concerned there are only 8 such training centres in England and Wales, each of which has a catchment area covering several police forces in that region. The course, which usually consists of about 160 recruits divided into 8 classes, is instructed for the most part by 2 sergeants allocated to each class. They, in turn, are monitored by an Inspector/course commander who reports on their performance to a Chief Instructor/ Chief Inspector. He, in turn, is answerable to a Superintendent (Assistant Commandant) who reports to the Commandant (Chief Superintendent). Finally, other specialist instructors address the recruits. For the most part they, too, are police officers who take periods of drill, physical training, self defence and parades each morning laid down in the (Home Office) curriculum (see

Appendix 2 for an abbreviated version of curriculum). In the event I was allowed to interview whom I wished and go wherever I wanted, but not to stay overnight on the centre. A list of instructors and classes was supplied. In the course of the study I visited several classes for comparison. I also chose a class at random from the list, followed the course in the classroom, during drill, parades and physical training - as well as outdoor 'practicals' - and interviewed the two class instructors at the end. I also interviewed in depth 7 more instructors chosen at random from the list, including two female sergeant instructors. The total number of instructors interviewed equalled 25 per cent of all sergeant instructors present at the centre. I also tape recorded an interview in depth with one course commander, as well as the Commandant. Fraternising with many more staff, attending social evenings, passing out parades and dinners and talks with recruits at discos on the centre were also on the agenda. Many notes were taken to round out the picture but are not included in the sample above. I have no reason to believe that my findings were unrepresentative of basic police training for constables.

In the case of supervisors' training, I observed a regional course for newly promoted inspectors, the curriculum for which is also laid down centrally. In an attempt to give every inspector the same chance as that formerly enjoyed by a few selected to attend Bramshill Police College, regional training centres were established. The newly promoted inspectors' course which last three weeks consisted of 12 newly promoted inspectors from different police forces in the region being instructed by three inspectors, two of whom were seconded from other neighbouring forces. They, in turn, are answerable to a chief instructor (chief inspector) who participates on the course along with a number of visiting speakers who usually consist of police officers from local forces giving talks on specialist topics, such as terrorism, as well as public order. All of the staff are answerable to a Chief Superintendent (training), who supervises the centre and ensures that course methods and content are appropriate to the curriculum laid down by the Central Police Planning Unit (Harrogate) in conjunction with the Home Office (see Appendix 2 for an overview). As with constables' training, I spent time in

the classroom on the course, interviewing two of the three inspector/instructors at the end. Fraternisation, talks with the other instructors and class members, dinners and social gatherings were also on the agenda, though time spent observing this course was proportionately less than with the constables, due to other research commitments. Finally, since there was only one course/class and only four instructors (including the Chief Inspector), interviewing two instructors meant interviewing 50 per cent of the instructors.

The above issues raise the question of problems mentioned by many scholars of gaining the co-operation of the police once access has been facilitated. Certainly problems were encountered. The distances involved, as well as the timetables of events sometimes running together created difficulties and so too did the poor communications system endemic to the police. The actual spatial dimensions of the work frequently made the task of building up rapport beforehand impossible, so knowledge of the field was all important. Here however I had an advantage. As a former police detective I probably encountered somewhat less difficulty in gaining the confidence of the majority (though not all) of the police officers in this research, where other scholars perhaps more deserving and probably more sympathetic have been less fortunate.

I began observations in early Spring, 1980 and interviewing commenced two months after. I completed the fieldwork in January, 1981. Officers were interviewed at police headquarters, divisional stations, the senior officers' training centre and regional training centre for constables some 30 odd miles away. The interviews were tape recorded and lasted for a minimum of 1 hour 20 minutes to 2 hours. I usually built up some rapport beforehand by being seen though some officers already knew me (either when I was a detective in the police or as a researcher some years before). I had already taken notes while observing interviews and instructors' comments in the classes. No one approached refused to be interviewed, with the proviso that it was spelt out beforehand to all concerned what the study involved. When I arrived at the training centres or boards the opportunity was extended for me to address all present on my research, which I did willingly. Interviewers, interviewees, instructors and their senior officers were advised in advance of the voluntary nature of the study and that no individual would be deliberately identified.

Analysis of the material was a lengthy process. My earlier direct observation of recruiting, training and promotion had enabled me to generate ideas about the moral order of the police. That is, knowing something about the norms of the police by means of interviewers and trainers' treatment of applicants, recruits and those applying for advancement, revealed something of the kinds of motives anyone would encounter in the settings of police recruitment, training and promotion. On knowing what kinds of motives are involved, further observation and systematic interviewing of interviewers and instructors enabled me to see the meaning of the activity I had encountered. A model thus emerged of the normative framework of the police at different levels and how this is generated and maintained. This revealed that both senior and junior police officers hold similar ideological concepts with which they translate human action under law. In short, they hold stereotypes about goodness and badness, which the law allows and the 'common sense' of the dominant majority endorses.

#### NOTES

1. For examples of this ethnographic method see D. Silverman and J. Jones (1976) and R. Fower et al (1979).

APPENDIX 2

Interview Schedule : Main topics and questions : Basic Police Training

How did you come to be an occupier of this position?

How did you learn your present job?

What is the purpose of the training course at (...)?

How does this relate to policework generally?

What is the function of legal instruction? The purpose of law, etc.?

How does this relate to police practicals?

What is the place in policework of common sense?

How does the training course seek to identify suspect motives?

What importance is given to facts and observation in policework?

What method should a recruit adopt in collating evidence?

How would you define a good/bad witness?

Do court outcomes influence arrest/process decisions?

How can the course help a recruit to assess individual public behaviour?

What is the role of local knowledge in policework?

Do some sections of the population cause police more problems than others?

How can this be taught?

Does danger in policework affect recruit training?

Has policing public order become easier for the police/the same/worse?

Where does this enter the course?

How does training function to maintain public support? (exercise of discretion?).

Is there a type of recruit who makes a good police officer? e.g. ex cadets, soldiers, older, younger, educated, uneducated, etc.

How do the recruits at (...) compare with your view of what is needed?

Do recruits work as hard as they used to?

Where does discipline fit in on the course? How does it function in police training?

Does discipline help in improving appearance, efficiency, etc.?

What part do negative sanctions (punishments) play on the course?

Is this in any way related to preparation for dealing with incivility or complaints from members of the public later on?

Are lessons on complaints against the police also to do with coping with public criticism?

How does training tackle the necessity for police unity?

To what degree does course discipline deter indiscipline?

How does this relate to lectures on welfare, social work and reformism?

How does the legal assumption of individual responsibility and equality before the law fit with the attitude of the courts, social services, etc. towards people being affected by mitigating circumstances?

In what way do the staff/student functions contribute to understanding between ranks?

What is the role of rewards on the course?

Interview Schedule : Main topics and questions : Inspector Training

- How did you become an occupier of this position?  
Briefly what does it comprise?  
How did you learn your present job?  
What is the purpose of the Training Course at (...)?  
How does this relate to policework generally?  
What is the function of management instruction?  
How do the lectures relate to the practical exercises?  
In what way does this relate to common sense in policework? (crime).  
How can the course help in tackling discontent? (laziness/morit).  
How can facts and observation help? (in identifying efficiencies/in P.C./Sgt).  
How is leadership relevant? (in dealing with different performances).  
What is the place of good communication/team spirit? (motivation?).  
Is this related to motivating people? (discipline).  
Why were public events studied on the course? (targets/tactics?).  
How would an Inspector deploy officers given his/her local knowledge? (different areas need different styles of policing?).  
How would knowledge of the local population help? Do some sections of the public cause police more problems than others?  
How would this enter the course? (records, special branch, firearms?).  
Does danger in policing affect Inspector Training? (preparation?).  
How does teaching public order help an Inspector to approach such problems? (has it become worse/same/better?).  
How does Inspector Training seek to maintain public support? (discretion?).  
Is there a type of officer who makes a good Inspector? (contented/discontented, etc.?).  
How do the students compare with your view of what is needed?  
Do they work hard enough? (value of course?).  
What do you see as being the purpose of teaching Inspectors about police discipline? (identifying indiscipline?).  
Does this help to improve efficiency? How defined in C.I.D./ investigation?  
Do negative sanctions play any part on the course?  
How does the course seek to prepare an Inspector to deal with public incivility? (role playing?).  
Does it prepare them to deal with complaints? (how?).  
Does the course assist an Inspector to unite subordinates? (how?)  
How does this relate to lectures on democratic management, etc.?  
How do lectures on treating all people the same - equality before the law - fit with talks about people being affected by mitigating circumstances? (treating according to culpability?).  
How do the social functions and leisure pursuits on the course contribute to understanding among students about the job of an Inspector?



How do you see the job of an Inspector fit into the overall goal of the police? (order maintaining/simple law enforcement?).

Interview Schedule : Main topics and questions : Police  
Recruitment. Selection of detectives and Promotion

Key: R = recruitment of constables only  
S = selection of detectives only  
P = promotion only  
R.S.P = all  
S.P = selection of detectives and promotion only

---

- RSP How did you become an occupier of this position?
- RSP Briefly what does it comprise?
- RSP Can (personnel) systems borrowed from industry assist in career development?
- R How would you define a good/fair/bad subordinate/constable?
- S How would you define a good/fair/bad detective (e.g. well educated, commonsensical, male, female, older, experienced etc.?).
- P How would you define good/fair/bad (1) sergeants;  
(2) Inspectors?
- SP How may this relate to a problem of blockage in upward movement in the police? How do you think this is dealt with?
- RSP What about the nature of the office of constable, e.g. independence? How might this affect the relationship between police supervisors and subordinates? (control, discipline, etc.). How might this affect selection decisions?
- RSP How may police personnel (personal) and other records assist in appointing the right people? How can they assist in judging their background? (domestic circumstances, outside interests, leisure pursuits or ability to conform, for example).
- SP Is appraisal relevant? How defined?
- R How does the Home Visits or other appraisals help in the interview?
- R Is a candidate's families' opinion of the police important?
- R In what way may a candidate's religious belief matter?
- RSP Is sport/fitness important? How defined? How does this relate to the problems of policing? (danger?).
- RSP How is the past experience of a candidate relevant? For example, their past educational, occupational record - and what they are doing now? Is this ever over-ruled?
- RSP How does academic performance relate to the importance of practical experience and common-sense?
- RSP Is an applicant's appearance relevant? Is this related in some way to an indication of their background or view of the interview?
- R Is there a type of recruit who makes a good police officer; ex cadets, soldiers, older, younger, educated, male, female, for example?
- R Are there any advantages to recruiting local people rather than people from outside?
- R Would local people get on better with their colleagues or not?

- RSP Is local knowledge important? How defined?
- R Is having contacts in the police important? (Motivation).
- RSP Why is there an interest in a candidate's experience of different types of people and situations? Relevance?
- RSP Are there any reasons given by candidates applying for the position which you prefer?
- P How do you judge a candidate who seeks to lead?
- P What leadership qualities are sought?
- R How do you judge a candidate who sees the job as a great responsibility? How defined?
- R How do you regard a candidate who is applying for the money? How defined?
- R Is a desire to work with people enough to make a good officer?
- SP How important is it to appoint people who can take criticism in the proper manner? Why is this so? How would you define the proper manner?
- RSP Why would you judge a candidate to be too timid for the job? How defined? (e.g. Talking too little? Attitudes towards public?)
- RSP How would you judge a candidate to be too aggressive/abrasive in their manner? (e.g. Talking too much? Attitudes towards public? Attitudes towards senior officers, junior officers?)
- SP What matters could one be overzealous with? What matters could one be deemed ineffectual with?
- RP What is the purpose of asking political questions?
- RP What is the purpose of asking candidates their views about the complaints procedure?
- RP Could two different answers to such questions be equally acceptable?
- SP In what way would a candidate's exercise of discretion affect your appraisal of him/her? (e.g. community service, gaining arrests).
- S: In what way does the above relate to questions to candidates about collating evidence, using records, going to court, etc.?
- P How should a candidate deal with a road accident involving a P.C. and civilian when there was an allegation of drunkenness against the police officer? Is there more than one acceptable answer?
- P What would be a typically unacceptable answer?
- P Under what circumstances could a candidate advocate that it was reasonable to disobey a lawful order?
- P What should a candidate say if he is told that an officer is spat on at a football match and an officer slaps the youth?
- P In what circumstances would violence be justified? When would it be unjustified?
- SP How would you define correct interpretation of the rules?
- SP How does this relate to real policework?
- SP How does this fit in with interviews?

- SP What is the significance of asking candidates what they think? Is this related to an interest in their commitment?
- SP In what way may comparisons of officers assist in judging them?
- SP What other means are available?
- SP Where does career counselling fit in in deciding on courses of action?
- SP What is the place of performance evaluation? How defined?
- SP What can this tell you about the individuals potential for advancement/promotion?
- SP How do you judge subordinate efficiency?
- RSP How does this relate to police professionalism?
- SP Would this be different for uniform as opposed to C.I.D.?
- SP What could the way in which individual officers organise their work tell you about them?

Overview of the curriculum of basic police training for constables

The training course for constables commences with assembly, registration, a talk from the Commandant and a police 'haircut' where necessary. This is followed during the first week (and every week of the course thereafter), with parades each morning. The first week also includes talks on police organisation, rank insignia, police regulations, the discipline code, saluting, marching - and the first period of drill, of which there are several each week during the 10 week course. Recruits are almost immediately instructed that they cannot leave the centre without permission, must patrol the perimeter at night when instructed to do so - and will be fined, reprimanded, given fatigues or other punishments if they appear to fail to conform to any camp regulation.

In addition to ongoing drill, physical training, saluting and marching, the second week includes the first weekly test on the previous week's instruction; talks and practicals on personal radios, the beat system, the importance of local knowledge, common sense and techniques of interviewing. The week continues with talks and practicals on how to write police reports, deal with the courts, Judges Rules, serving summonses and warrants and classify offences.

The regime continues in week 3 with parading and drilling, the weekly test on the previous week's work and also physical training. Lessons include instruction on arrest, dealing with prisoners, first aid and an introduction to police traffic law, as well as illustrations of police practice.

Week 4 again includes drilling, physical training and instruction, which again includes images of traffic law, along with rules about children and young persons, going to court and what to expect.

In addition to militarism and physical training, week 5 includes a junior stage (half way stage) test, talks about licensed premises, indecency, betting and gaming, sexual offences, the law on assaults, criminal damage; more instruction on report writing and first aid; instruction on the regulations applicable to dogs, revision and - marching with senior recruits on their 'passing out' parade.

The weekly test, morning parades, saluting, drilling and standing to attention in classes when spoken to, continues in week 6. This includes instruction from outside speakers on demonstrations and social problems in the assembly hall, and

instruction in classes on the law applicable to theft, firearms, practical illustrations on dealing with crashed aircraft and also giving evidence in court.

Week 7 again involves the test, drill and physical training, with additional talks on such matters as police records, surveying the scenes of crime, images of the law applicable to pedlars; talks on the causes and effects of crime, more practicals on court procedure and dealing with traffic.

The only variation to the above regime in week 8 are practicals on how to deal with road accidents, the law applicable to dangerous and reckless driving; talks on the habits of drivers and the social problems of traffic (by outside speakers); the law applicable to driving under the influence of drink or drugs; more first aid, group discussions and tutorials.

Week 9 includes police images and practices applicable to domestic disputes; homicide, more first aid; talks on public prejudice, community relations (outside speakers); instruction on sudden deaths and accident reports.

At the beginning of week 10 the recruits are given their final written test. The week also includes more talks in the classroom on court procedure, a visiting speaker from the Police Federation, tests in life saving - and drilling and marching in earnest; culminating in the course dinner and the 'passing out parade'.

Overview of the curriculum of higher police training for newly promoted Inspectors

Though saluting and marching and standing to attention in class are much less conspicuous in the Inspectors course - unless a very senior officer visits to give a talk - the theme of the course is discipline and mobilisation of subordinates against those groups assumed to be a threat to social order and the law.

The first day of the course commences with assembly, the issuance of course notes, an opening address from the training superintendent, talks on the duties and responsibilities of an Inspector - and an image of management and the individual.

The curriculum continues with lessons on motivation, police morale; an image of leadership and deployment; appraisal; the place of police welfare and practical exercises. The training of probationary constables, the role of discipline; how to deal with complaints about subordinates; public liaison (probation services, social services and local government, for example), are also the basis of discussion. Lessons also include the investigation of accidents, dealing with drinking and driving cases and case studies, using closed circuit television in the areas mentioned.

The mobilisation of subordinates against police targets also forms an important part of the course, underwritten, again, with practical exercises. For example: major incidents, terrorism, bombers, monitoring extremists, trade unionists and students and the strategic use of the Special Branch, records, computers, cameras, microphones, surveillance units - and firearms. In conjunction with the above tactical instruction includes how to raid and evacuate premises (including licensed premises and clubs) armed with the requisite information gained by the use of the above.

The only interruption to the above regime are practicals and talks by outside (usually police) speakers giving talks relevant to the above. The course, which is not examinable, concludes with a dinner and a submission by each student on the value of the course - in writing.

BIBLIOGRAPHY



- ALDERSON, J. (1979), Policing Freedom; Macdonald and Evans
- APPLE, M.V. (1979), Ideology and Curriculum; Routledge and Kegan Paul
- AYRES, R. (1968), 'Confessions and the Court', Yale Alumni Magazine.  
December, 1968.
- BANTON, M. (1964), The Policeman and the Community; Tavistock
- BORDUA, D. and RIBISS, A.J. (1966), 'Command, Control and Charisma: Reflections on Police Bureaucracy', American Journal of Sociology, 72, (July) 68-76.
- BORDUA, A. (1967), The Police: Six Sociological Essays. New York: J. Wiley.
- BOWDEN, T. (1978), Beyond the Limits of the Law: Pelican.
- BOX, S. and RUSSEL, T. (1975), 'The Politics of Discreditability: Disarming Complaints against the Police', Sociological Review 23(2) 315-46.
- BROGDEN, M. (1977), 'A Police Authority - the denial of conflict', Sociological Review 25(2) 325-49.
- BULL, R. and HORNCastle, R. (1983). An Evaluation of the Metropolitan Police Recruitment Training in Human Awareness Training. The Police Foundation.
- BUNYAN, T. (1976), The History and Practice of the Political Police in Britain, London: Quartet.
- BURNHAM, D. (1968), 'Police violence: A Changing Pattern', New York Times, 7 July 1968.
- CAIN, M. (1971) 'On the Beat'. In S. Cohen (ed.) Images of Deviance, London: Tavistock.
- CAIN, M. (1973), Society and the Policeman's Role, London: Routledge.
- CAIN, M. (1979), 'The General Practice Lawyer and the Client: Towards a Radical Conception', International Journal of the Sociology of Law, 7, pp.331-354.
- CARLAN, P. (1976), 'Control in a Magistrate's Court'. In C. Campbell and P. Wiles (eds.) Law and Society, Martin Robertson.
- CENTRE FOR RESEARCH AND CRIMINAL JUSTICE (1977), The Iron Fist and the Velvet Glove: an analysis of the U.S. Police.  
Centre for Research on Criminal Justice.

- CHATTERTON, M. R. (1976a), 'The Social Context of Violence'. In M Borland (ed.) Violence in the Family. Manchester University Press.
- CHATTERTON, M.R. (1976b), 'The Police in Social Control'. Cropwood Conference Paper in J. King (ed.) Control Without Custody, Cambridge: University of Cambridge Institute of Criminology.
- CHATTERTON, M.R. (1979), 'The Supervision of Patrol Work under the Fixed Points System'. In S.D. Holdaway (ed.) The British Police. Edward Arnold. Chapter 6.
- COHEN, P. (1979), 'Policing the Working Class City'. In M.D.C. Capitalism and the Rule of Law. Hutchinson: University Library.
- COLLIER, P. Deputy Commissioner, New Scotland Yard. Medico-Legal Journal, Decembr 1976, pp.4-18.
- CRITCHLEY, T.A. (1978), A History of Police in England and Wales. Rev. Edn. London: Constable.
- CHWAST, J. (1965), 'Value Conflicts in Law Enforcement', Crime and Delinquency, 11 April, 1965, pp151-161.
- FOWLER, R. et al (1979) Language and Control, Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- GOFFMAN, E. (1973) Asylums Penguin.
- GOLDMAN, N. (1963), 'The Differential Selection of Juvenile Offenders for Court Appearance. Paper presented to National Council on Crime and Delinquency, New York, 1963. In A. Neiderhoffer and A.S. Blumberg (eds.) (1973) The Ambivalent Force: Perspectives on the Police, 156-160. San Francisco: Rinehart Press.
- GOLDSTEIN, A.S. (1960), 'The State and the Accused: Balance of Advantage in Criminal Procedure', Yale Law Journal, 69, June, 1960, 1148-1199.
- GOLDSTEIN, H. ((1963), 'Police Discretion; The Ideal Versus the Real. Public Administration Review 23, Public Administration Review. September 1963.
- GOLDSTEIN, H. (1967), 'Police Policy Formulation: A Proposal for Improving Police Performance', Michigan Law Review, 65, April 1967, 1123-1146.
- GOULDNER, A.W. (1973), The Coming Crisis in Western Sociology, London: Heinmann.
- GRAMSCI, A. (1971), Selections from the Prison Notebooks, London: Lawrence and Wishart.

- HALL, S. et al (1978), Policing the Crisis, London: Macmillan.
- HIGHER POLICE TRAINING IN ENGLAND AND WALES (1947), Cmdd.7070  
London: H.M.S.O.
- HOLDAWAY, S.D. (1977) 'Changes in Urban Policing', British Journal of Sociology, 28(2), 119-37.
- HOLDAWAY, S.D. (ed.) (1979), The British Police, London: Edward Arnold.  
Introduction.
- HOME OFFICE (unpublished) Vastage Survey 16/69.
- HOME OFFICE (unpublished) Circular 94 (1973), Working Party on Police Probationer Training; First Report to the Police Training Council, 1973.
- H.M.S.O., (1976), The Training of Probationary Constables: Student Lesson Notes, London: H.M.S.O.
- INTERIM REPORT OF THE ROYAL COMMISSION ON THE POLICE, November, 1960.  
Cmd. 1,222, London: H.M.S.O.
- JAMES, D. (1979), 'Police-Black Relations: The Professional Solution' In S.D. Holdaway (ed.) The British Police, Edward Arnold, 66-82.
- JEFFERSON, T. and GRIMSHAW, R. (1981), The Organisation and Control of Policework: A Sociological Study Conducted within an English Country Force (Unpublished Report to the Home Office).
- JEFFERSON, T. and GRIMSHAW, R. (1982), 'Law, Democracy and Justice: The Question of Police Accountability.' In D.Cowell et al (eds.) Policing and Riots, Junction Books, 82-117.
- JEFFERSON, T. and GRIMSHAW, R. (1984), 'The Problem of Law Enforcement Policy in England and Wales: The Case of Community Policing and Racial Attacks', International Journal of the Sociology of Law, 1984, (12), 117-135.
- JOHNSON, J. (1979) 'Professions and Power'. London: MacMillan.
- JOHNSON, R. (1976), 'Notes on the Schooling of the English Working Class 1780-1850.' In Dale et al (eds.) Schooling and Capitalism. Routledge and Kegan Paul, 44-54.
- KINSEY, R. and YOUNG, J. (1982), 'Police Autonomy and the Politics of Discretion.' In D. Cowell et al (eds.) Policing and Riots Junction Books, 118-134.
- LEE, J.A. (1981), 'Some Structural Aspects of Police Deviance in Relations with Minority Groups'. In C.D. Shearing (ed.) Organisational Police Deviance (1981), pp.49-82, Butterworths, Toronto.



- LEVY, R.J. (1973), 'A Method for Identification of the High Risk Police Applicant.' In J.R. Snibbe and H.M. Snibbe The Urban Policeman in Transition, 25-52. Springfield: Thomas.
- MANNING, P.K. (1977), 'Police Work', Cambridge, Mass: M.I.T. Press.
- MARK, Sir Robert (1977), Policing a Perplexed Society, London: Allen and Unwin.
- MARK, Sir Robert (1978), In the Office of Constable, London: Collins.
- MARX, J. and ENGELS, F. (1965), The German Ideology, Lawrence and Wishart.
- McBARNET, D.T. (1978), 'The Police and the State: Arrest, Legality and the Law.' In A. Littlejohn et al (eds.) Power and the State. 1978, London: Groom Helm.
- MacINNES, I. (1962), Mr Love and Justice, New English Library.
- McNAMARA, J. (1967), 'Uncertainties in Policework; the relevance of Recruits' background and Training.' In D.J. Bordua (ed.) The Police, 163-252. New York: Wiley.
- MORALES, J. (1970), 'Police Deployment Theories and the Mexican-American Community', El Grito 4, No.1, 1970, 52-64.
- WEIDERHOFFER, A. and BLUBERG, A.S. (1973), The Ambivalent Force: Perspective on the Police, San Francisco: Rinehart Press.
- PILIAVIN, I. and BRIARS, S. (1964) 'Police Encounters with Juveniles', British Journal of Sociology, 70, September 1964, 206-214.
- POLICE ACT, 1964, Section 5. London : H.M.S.O.
- POLICE TRAINING IN ENGLAND AND WALES (1961), Cmnd.1450, London; H.M.S.O.
- POLICE RECRUITMENT AND WASTAGE: Observations of 7th Report of Expenditure Committee (1975), Cmnd.6016, Report Cmnd.8092, LONDON: H.M.S.O.
- PUNCH, M. (ed.) (1983), 'Control in the Police Organisation', The M.I.T. Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts.
- RECRUITMENT OF PEOPLE WITH HIGHER EDUCATION QUALIFICATIONS TO THE POLICE SERVICE (1967), London: H.M.S.O.
- REINER, R. (1978), The Blue Coated Worker: A Sociological Study of Police Unionism, Cambridge University Press.
- REPORT OF THE COMMISSION ON THE POLICE SERVICE IN ENGLAND AND WALES AND SCOTLAND (1920), under Lord Desborough. Part I, Cmnd.253. Part II, Cmnd.574, London :H.M.S.O.

- REPORT OF THE COMMISSION ON POLICE POWERS AND PROCEDURE, (1929).  
Cmd. 3297, London: H.M.S.O.
- REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON POLICE CONDITIONS OF SERVICE. Parts I and II (1949), Cmd. 7674, London: H.M.S.O.
- REISS, A. and BORDUA, A.J. (1967), 'Environment and Organisation: A Perspective on the Police'. In D.J. Bordua The Police: Six Sociological Essays, pp.25-55.
- REISS, A.J. (1968), 'Police Brutality: Answers to Key Questions', Trans-action : 5, 1968, Saint Louis, Missouri.
- REUSS-IANNI, E. and IANNI, F.A.J., (1983), 'Street Cops and Management Cops: The Two Cultures of Policing'. In M. Punch (ed.) Control in the Police Organisation (1983), pp251-274, The M.I.T. Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts.
- ROSENBERG, D. (MD), 'The Sociology of the Police and Sociological Liberalism': Oxford Polytechnic Working Paper.
- ROYAL COMMISSION ON THE POLICE, 1962. Final Report, Cmd. 3297, London: H.M.S.O.
- ROYAL COMMISSION ON CRIMINAL PROCEDURE: THE BALANCE OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE. Summary of the Report (1981), London: H.M.S.O.
- SCARMAN, LORD (1981), The Brixton Disorders. Cmd. 8427, London: H.M.S.O.
- SELECT COMMITTEE ON RACE RELATIONS AND IMMIGRATION. Session 1971-2. Police Immigrant Relations. Volume I HC, 171-1. London: H.M.S.O.
- SHARING, C.D. (ed.) 'Organisational Police Deviance, (1981), Butterworths, Toronto.
- SILVERMAN, D. (1976), The Theory of Organisation London: Heinmann Educational Books.
- SILVERMAN, D. and JONES, J. (1976), Organisational Work, London: Collier Macmillan.
- SKOLNICK, J. (1968), 'The Police and the Urban Ghetto: Research Contributions to the American Bar Foundation, No. 3, Chicago American Bar Foundation, 1968, 3-28. In Neiderhoffer and Blumberg (eds.) The Ambivalent Force, Rinehart Press.
- SKOLNICK, J. (1975), Justice without Trial, 2nd edition, New York: Wiley.
- SMITH, D.J. and GRAY, J. (1983), Police and People in London, Volume III (No. 620) and IV (No. 621) (1983), Policy Studies Institute.



- SNIBBE, J.R. and SNIBBE, H.M. (eds) (1973), The Urban Policeman in Transition, Springfield: Thomas.
- TERRIS, B.J. (1967), 'The Role of the Police.' In The Annals of the American Academy of Political Sciences, 374, November 1967, pp.58-69.
- THREE WORKING PARTIES ON POLICE MANPOWER, EQUIPMENT AND EFFICIENCY (1967), Home Office: H.M.S.O.
- TOCH, H. HANS (1965), 'Psychological Consequences of the Police Role', Police 10 (Sept-Oct, 1965) pp.22-25.
- VAN MAANEN, J. (1973), 'Observations on the Making of Policemen'. Human Organisation, 32 (Winter), 407-18.
- VAN MAANEN, J. (1975), 'Police Socialisation: a longitudinal examination of job attitudes in an urban police department', Administrative Science Quarterly, 20 (June), 207-28.
- WALTHER, R.H., McCune, S.D. and TRAJONOWICZ, R.C. (1970), 'The Contrasting Occupational Cultures of Policemen and Social Workers'. In Snibbe (eds.) The Urban Policeman in Transition (1973), pp.260-280.
- WERTHMAN, C. and PILIAVIN, I. (1967), 'Gang Members of the Police. In Bordua (ed.) The Police: Six Sociological Essays (1967), J. Wiley.
- WEINTRAUB, R.G. and POLLOCK, H. (1973), 'Acquitting the De Facto Guilty: Some Stop and Frisk Problems.' In Neiderhoffer and Blumberg (eds.) The Ambivalent Force, Rinehart: pp.256-265.
- WESTLEY, W.A. (1953), 'Violence and the Police', American Journal of Sociology, 59, July, 1953, pp.34-41.
- WESTLEY, W.A. (1970), Violence and the Police: A Sociological Study of Law, Custom and Morality, M.I.T. Press.
- WILLIAMS, R. (1961), Culture and Society, Harmondsworth, Penguin Books.
- WILSON, J.Q. (1963), 'The Police and Their Problems: A Theory'. Public Policy XII, 1963, Harvard University.
- WILSON, J.Q. (1968), Varieties of Police Behaviour, Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- YOUNG, J. (1973), 'The Myth of the Drugtaker in the Mass Media.' In S. Cohen and J. Young (eds.) The Manufacture of News (1973), pp.314-22, London: Constable.
- YOUNG, J. (1975), 'Working Class Criminology.' In I. Taylor, P. Walton and J. Young (eds.) Critical Criminology (1975), pp.63-94, Routledge.