Embedding Evidence Based Policing (EBP): A UK Case Study Exploring Organisational Challenges.

Abstract

This paper explores organisational challenges of embedding ‘Evidence Based Policing’ (EBP) in policing using a mixed methods design sampled across a range of ranks/roles. Key organisational constraints identified include limited awareness of/access to research, lack of resources and capability concerns, and challenges related to organisational culture. Challenges were disproportionately experienced by lower ranking officers who were not fully equipped to engage with EBP. Senior officers were not fully cognisant of these challenges. This paper argues for EBP to better identify its applicability across diverse roles and functions within policing and consider how organisational culture and leadership can reduce this inequity.

Introduction

The term Evidence Based Policing (EBP) was coined by Sherman (1998), although police utilisation of research evidence has a longer history (Knutsson, 2017). Several definitions of EBP exist, with a common thread that policing should adopt a systematic use of research and evidence to support and inform practice. Indeed, the debate around EBP tends to focus on the nature of ‘evidence; what form this should take, what counts as evidence; and, how this is best disseminated to policing (Sherman, 2015; Sparrow, 2016; Lumsden 2017; Wood et al., 2017; Fleming & Wingrove, 2017). Internationally EBP has emerged as a key driver of contemporary police reform. In the UK this is part of a broader professionalisation agenda with ambitions to make transformative change across the service, improve the quality of policing professionals, and embed EBP to inform day to day practice (Fleming & Wingrove, 2017).
The majority of EBP research examines the likely added value EBP can bring to policing, in understanding the use of a ‘what works’ agenda to support decision making, and police receptivity to EBP. However, only a paucity of studies specifically examine the challenges and organisational constraints associated with embedding EBP, particularly in the UK (Hunter et al., 2015; Fleming & Wingrove, 2017, Huey et al., 2021). Moreover, research generally reflects the views of senior officers (Hunter et al., 2015, Stanko & Dawson, 2016) with little consideration of the significant diversity of ranks and roles, and the heterogeneous nature of police organisations. A key gap explored in this paper is how perceptions and experiences of the challenges of embedding EBP vary by rank and role.

This research uses a mixed methods case study of one metropolitan UK police force. The findings are drawn from a wider study that more broadly explored the challenges and opportunities for embedding EBP in policing. The current paper focusses on identified organisational challenges. Findings from the wider study are beyond the scope of this paper and will be addressed in future publications, including: the range of sources used to inform decision making; officer and staff understanding of EBP; the role of police Analysts in EBP; and externally driven challenges associated with embedding EBP in policing.

The aim of this paper is to identify and critically examine what organisational constraints, as perceived and experienced by officers and staff, are the salient barriers to engaging with and embedding EBP. The key research questions are:

- What are the perceived and experienced organisational challenges to embedding EBP in the cases study force?
To what extent did these perceptions and experiences differ by police officer/staff rank and role?

The definition of EBP adopted for this study was posited by the College of Policing (CoP) (no date-a) alongside the publication of their Five-Year Strategy (2014); “In an evidence-based policing approach, police officers, staff and volunteers create, review and use the best available evidence to inform and challenge policies, practices and decisions”. In particular, the CoP emphasised the role of research evidence in policing, stating “the College will support the direct involvement of officers or staff in designing, undertaking or critically reviewing research for policing” (CoP, 2014, p.14) and stated that over the next five years, the growing evidence base would be directly embedded into standards and linked to selection and promotion processes (CoP, 2014). This aligns to the Policing Vision 2025 which states “those working in policing need to understand and use research evidence in practice” (NPCC, no date). The ambition is to make transformative change across the police service, which includes embedding evidence-based practice to inform day to day policing practice.

At the time of this study there were significant external pressures and expectations on police forces to ‘embed’ EBP. Examples include: the establishment of the CoP ‘What Works Centre for Crime Reduction’ Centre (WWCCR); the CoP EBP Maturity Model (CoP, no date-b); and the release of the Police Knowledge Fund (CoP, 2015). All of these were designed to embed an evidence-based approach in policing. It is acknowledged that for this study an assumption made is that EBP should be embedded in policing. This is the subject of a wider academic debate beyond the scope of this paper. However, an external expectation had clearly been placed upon the police service to ‘embed EBP’, and strong arguments have been proffered...
about why research evidence and EBP might be valuable to policing (Tilley & Laycock, 2017).

At the time of data collection, chief officers in the case study force expressed a desire and expectation for officers and staff to engage in EBP, and they established an EBP Steering Group. The aim was to embed a broad conceptual approach in which EBP guides decision making at all levels of the force. However, the expected mechanisms through which the force would achieve this were not explicitly documented.

**The organisational challenges of embedding EBP**

This section offers a brief literature appraisal of identified organisational challenges to embedding EBP categorised as: police awareness and understanding of EBP; the accessibility and quality of the research evidence; organisational capacity; individual motivation and capability to engage with EBP; the role of police leadership; and the relevance of police organisational culture and tacit knowledge.

**Understanding, Conceptualisation and Awareness of EBP**

A potential barrier to embedding EBP in policing is a lack of understanding of the term. Lumsden (2017) suggests EBP as a concept widely used in policing, acknowledged to have widespread potential benefit, but not well understood. Understanding practitioner knowledge about EBP is an important stage in translating research into practice (Telep & Somers, 2017). However, few UK studies have explored this in detail, and Lumsden (2017) acknowledged her small sample offered only a glimpse of officer understanding of EBP. A key finding of the
Telep and Somers study, a large survey across several US police agencies, was that there was significant variation in how EBP was understood by officers of different ranks.

**The quality and accessibility of the research evidence**

An identified challenge to embedding EBP is the accessibility, quality, and scope of research evidence. Bullock and Tilley (2009) draw from their extensive experience of Problem Oriented Policing (POP) to highlight likely parallels with EPB, including the limited evidence base available to police practitioners and the inaccessibility of the research evidence. This is supported by Hunter et al (2017) who reported over 50% of officers in a national survey stated there had been occasions where they had sought research evidence to inform policy but could not find it. Beyond access and availability, studies have found the appropriateness and format of available research evidence as an obstacle to implementing EBP (Lum et al, 2012; Hunter et al, 2017). Challenges include how appropriately evidence is presented to the police community, and difficulties for practitioners in digesting and interpreting this. Research evidence has been described as unclear and “full of jargon” (Hunter et al., 2015, p. 6). Hunter et al (2017) argue willingness to use research evidence is directly linked to relevance and interpretability. However, in attempts to address this, several police-academic partnerships have adopted a co-design approach to ensure police forces are integral to the production of research evidence (Murray, 2019; Mitchell, 2019).

**Capacity and Capability**

Organisational resource constraints, predominantly ‘capacity’ and lack of ‘time’ are frequently cited as a significant challenge to engaging with research evidence (Hunter et al., 2015; Fleming & Wingrove, 2017). Indeed, this has been described as a “luxury, ill-suited to the
‘treadmill existence’” of policing (Fleming & Wingrove, 2017, p. 211). A further identified challenge is the capability of police officers to interpret research evidence and to design and conduct meaningful evaluations of policing activity. Hunter et al, (2015) reported that officers held limited confidence in their ability to critically assess the quality of research evidence, with 81% of respondents in their national survey reporting that they had not received training or ‘support’ around the use of research evidence. Likewise, Lumsden and Goode (2016) found that only a small number of officers felt they had the necessary skills to evaluate interventions and critically appraise evidence.

**Police Leadership**

Leadership, and the support of the ‘chief officer team’ are viewed as essential components to embedding EBP (Hunter et al., 2015). Police leadership may legitimise and promote EBP, or alternatively cast it as a threat to the professional identity of experienced practitioners (Hunter et al. 2015, 2017; Lumsden, 2017). In the Human Relations (HR) sector, leadership is viewed as fundamental to successful evidence based-practice implementation (Briner, 2017). However, whilst senior police leaders create formal policies and guidance, frontline officers may resist, misinterpret, or even adapted these into something else (Panzarella, 2003; Wall, 1994). Successful translation, legitimacy, and the credibility of messaging can be a challenging for police leadership, especially considering the need to navigate a complex cultural environment.

**Police organisational culture and tacit knowledge**
Police occupational culture is complex with several tensions that pose significant challenges to embedding EBP. Organisational norms are a potential hindrance to embedding EBP, linked to a longstanding and limited lack of robust evaluation activity in policing, and a culture where police interventions are ‘doomed to succeed’ (Fleming and Wingrove, 2017). Pease and Roach (2017) argue that routine evaluation of everyday initiatives in policing is unusual and for most police forces, only large-scale (and often problematic) events tend to be evaluated, on a post hoc basis. Moreover, recently promoted senior officers are often keen to try new ideas of their own, rather than consolidating previous interventions, even if there is evidence that they are successful (Pease and Roach, 2017). Lumsden (2017) identifies ‘performance culture’ as a barrier to EBP, driven by external political pressures and targets from external bodies. Linked to this, Lum & Koper (2015, p. 13) argue that the philosophy and culture of policing to embrace EBP may require a “sea change in law enforcement culture” and fundamental changes in long standing practices deeply embedded within policing.

Several studies highlight how police officers favour using ‘professional experience’, or tacit knowledge, to inform decision making, linked to ‘collegially’ and a general lack confidence in research evidence (Lum et al. 2012; Hunter et al. 2015, 2017; Fleming 2015; Pease and Roach, 2017). Indeed, professional experience is heavily utilised and valued in police decision making (Hunter et. al., 2015, 2017) and there is growing consensus that tacit knowledge should be included in the conceptualisation of EBP (e.g., Fleming and Rhodes; 2016, Pease & Roach, 2017; Huey et al. 2021). However, when used in isolation as a source of decision making, there are a range of cognitive biases and weaknesses inherent in professional experience (Briner, 2009). Whilst professional experience can be viewed as an “intuitively obvious notion” and a “default position when all else fails” (Fleming and Rhodes, 2016 p.9), alternatively, it can be
viewed as a “craft” (Fleming and Rhodes; 2016), accumulated over time, based on specialist and experiential knowledge, on skills and judgements, gained from iterative and cumulative experiences of professional practice (Barends et al, 2014; Fleming & Rhodes, 2016; Willis and Mastrofski, 2016; Pease and Roach, 2017).

The inherent complexities of police organisational culture may impede any efforts to implement transformational change (Cockcroft, 2014). It is important to acknowledge police cultures are not static, and indeed multiple and fluid cultures are present (Cockcroft, 2012). Some elements of police culture are essentially embedded in police forces, whilst others are more fleeting and sporadic (Loftus, 2009). However, culture provides a basic sense of identity and values, and tells people who they are, how they should behave toward each other and how to feel good about themselves (Hatch & Schultz, 2004). Therefore, efforts to embed EBP should seek to better understand how police organisational culture is experienced at different ranks, and by the disparate roles and functions that exist.

**Methodology**

This paper uses a mixed methods convergent parallel research design, with triangulation of findings from qualitative and quantitative analysis. Data collection, comprising interviews, focus groups and an online survey were carried out concurrently during a single-phase. Interviews enabled individual officers’ opinions and experiences of EBP to be explored; focus groups facilitated discussion of a range of points of view with several different policing teams and functions; and the questionnaire enabled perceptions of EBP to be captured from a wider sample (Denscombe, 2010). Findings from the three data strands (survey, interviews, and focus groups) were synthesised during the interpretation phase to provide further understanding,
identify possible corroboration, or highlight conflicting results (Creswell and Plano-Clark, 2007).

Semi-structured qualitative interviews (N=25) and focus groups (N=5) were conducted with officers and staff with a diverse set of roles. Interview participants were selected using purposive sampling and included senior leaders from across the case study force (the majority at Superintendent, Chief Superintendent and Chief Officer rank). Individuals were chosen based upon their professional role. Care was taken to ensure a representative cross-section of ‘senior’ officers and staff from a diverse range of roles, whilst also ensuring relevance by including those who had experience with EBP.

Focus groups participants were selected through purposive sampling across different police ‘teams’ and/or functions to represent the heterogeneous nature of the force. Focus group One (N=9) included ‘Operations’ Superintendents and two Chief Superintendents. Focus group Two (N=8) represented the ‘Force Operations Planning department’ (four Constables and four Sergeants). Focus group Three (N=12) comprised a ‘Neighbourhood Team’ (one Special Constable, two PCSO’s, four Constables, four Sergeants and an Inspector). Focus group Four (N=16) represented Analysts (from the Corporate Analysis team, the Intelligence Analysis team, or from Basic Command Units (BCUs) and two Researchers, one Senior Analyst, one Business Analyst and the Head of Corporate Analysis. Focus group Five (N=6) represented the central Audit & Inspection Team and comprised of two supervisors and four auditors.

All officers and staff in the case study force were invited to participate in an online questionnaire, adapted from one used by the CoP in their evaluation of the What Works Centre.
for Crime Reduction Toolkit (Hunter et al., 2015). There were 356 valid responses, which exceeded response rates to previous comparable studies (Hunter et al, 2015, 2017; Palmer, 2011). The rank or grade of the respondents are shown in Table One. It is recognised that as the sample was self-selecting there may be some selection bias present in the findings, although the use of triangulation of multiple data sources enabled a validation of findings across each research design, reduced potential bias and increased the robustness of findings.

The qualitative data was coded iteratively using Braun & Clarke’s (2006) six steps identification, and focused around searching for repetitions, metaphors and analogies, similarities and differences, linguistic connectors (Ryan & Bernard, 2003). Descriptive statistics and Chi-square tests were used to analyse the survey data. Where the data was coded as categorical data, Chi-square tests were conducted to identify any associations, by comparing the proportion of counts in each category with the expected proportions and testing for significance.

Survey Sample characteristics

69% of respondents were male (N=245) and 31% female (N=111). 39% of respondents were aged 45-54, with just over a quarter (25.6%) aged 35-44 and just under a quarter (24.6%) aged 25-34, a minority were either aged under 24 (2.9%), or over 55 (8%). 34.1% of officers and staff did not provide their rank or grade (N=48). Just under one third of respondents (29.2%) were Constables, 16.5% Inspectors, and 14.6% Sergeants. Police staff comprised of 27.6% of the sample. The highest proportions of police staff grades in the sample were grade C and grade E (both accounting for 7.8%), followed by grade D (4.2%). For analytical purposes ranks and grades were further grouped together to produce six categories; ‘Senior’ police officers (Chief
Inspectors and ‘above’) (N=30); ‘Supervisory’ rank officers (Sergeants and Inspectors) (N=96); and ‘Operational’ officers (Constables and Special Constables) (N=96). ‘Senior’ police staff (grade G and ‘above’) (N=15); ‘Mid-grade’ police staff (grades E–F) (N=29); and ‘Junior’ police staff (grade A-D) (N=41). In summary, 86.3% of the police officers in the sample were ‘supervisory’ or ‘operational’ police officer ranks (43.3% and 43% respectively). 91.7% of police staff respondents were ‘mid- grade’ or ‘junior ‘grade (48.2% and 43.5% respectively).

Table One: Survey Participant Rank/Grade Breakdown (n=308)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank or Grade</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percentage of survey sample*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACC and above</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief Superintendent</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superintendent</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief Inspector</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspector</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>16.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sergeant</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constable</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>29.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Constabulary</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade A</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade B</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade C</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade D</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade E</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade F</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade G</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade H</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade I</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade J and above</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSO</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Excluding missing data for rank/grade (N=48)

The mean length of service of participants was 16.6 years, with a range of 1 year to 40 years (SD=8.9). Just under one third had 0 to 9 years ‘service’, one third had 10 to 19 years’ service and a further third had 20 to 29 years’ service. A small minority had over 30 years’ service. Respondents were asked what their highest level of educational attainment was. 38.6% reported
having a degree, 12.4% holding a Masters degree or Post-Graduate Certificate, and 10.1% currently studying for a qualification.

Methodological limitations of this paper include possible biases in the self-selection of respondents in the questionnaire and that those who chose to complete the survey may have a particular interest in the EBP agenda. The use of purposive sampling in the interviews and focus groups limits the generalisations that can be made to the wider case study force, and it is not clear using a single case study how generalisable the findings are to other UK forces or internationally. However, triangulation of findings from the mixed methods convergent parallel research design does increase the robustness of the findings, as does the confidence from the broad agreement found with previous albeit limited literature identified.

Findings & Discussion.

The key organisational challenges and constraints to embedding EBP identified in the analysis were: a perceived lack of capacity and resources; concerns relating to access, awareness, and capability; challenges relating to structure, leadership, and culture; and the role of ‘professional experience’ (or ‘tacit knowledge’). In addition, there were several cross-cutting themes that emerged. The first of which was that inequality existed in opportunities to engage in EBP, and that there were variances in the experience of organisational constraints, related to rank and role. adopt an approach. In addition, a set of external factors emerged as challenges to embedding EBP including: the changing nature of crime and demand; the impact of historic austerity measures on capacity; and perceptions regarding the scope and quality of the existing ‘evidence base’. A further important finding was the absence of a shared understanding of the concept of EBP within the case study police force, and nationally, which resulted in ambiguity and frustration amongst officers and staff. Detailed discussion of the external challenges, and
how EBP is understood and conceptualised, is beyond the scope of this paper and will be explored in future publications. It is appropriate to highlight that the internal organisational challenges identified and now discussed further do not occur in isolation, and are influenced by the wider context that policing operates in.

**Awareness & Access to Research Evidence.**

A key issue identified in the study was a lack of awareness regarding where to find sources of research evidence. Respondents were asked “do you feel that you know where to look to find research evidence?” (N=327), and just under half of participants responded positively (49.2%, N=162). Chi Square tests revealed significant differences by rank and respondents studying for a qualification. 85.7% of ‘senior’ officers responded positively compared to 48% of ‘supervisory’ rank officers, and 37.9% of ‘operational’ officers ($\chi^2 (4, N=221) = 22.82$, p <.001). 76.7% of respondents studying for a qualification they felt they knew where to look, compared to 46.1% who were not ($\chi^2 (2, N=299) = 10.29$, p <.001). Officers and staff highlighted searching for research as time consuming and uncoordinated. The most widely used ‘search mechanism’ was a ‘general web search’ (71.8% reported using it ‘at least sometimes’, followed by ‘In-house expert/colleague’ (65.3%)). Very few respondents were aware of additional sources available to speed up the search process. Several participants from the ‘Analysts’ focus group highlighted a lack of knowledge of what research evidence is, and they spent wasted time searching for evidence that did not exist. A further barrier cited was the lack of an internal ‘repository’ of relevant information, despite the force having recently created an internal ‘what works’ intranet page. Several interviewees were critical of its’ relevance and usefulness and limited coverage of key ‘business areas’.
A further constraint identified was a lack of access to research evidence. Just over one third of survey respondents (37.9%) reported that they had access to ‘academic journals/ sources of research evidence in their role’. This varied by rank and a significantly higher proportion of ‘senior’ officers reported access compared with ‘operational’ and ‘supervisory’ rank officers. When asked to respond to the statement they ‘do not have access to the research evidence’, ‘senior’ officers were likely to disagree (76.7%) compared to 20% of ‘supervisory’ rank officers ($\chi^2 (8, N=303) = 29.25, p <.001$). Less than a fifth (17.6%) of survey respondents agreed that ‘the organisation provides sufficient support and resources to implement evidence-based practice’. A higher proportion of ‘senior’ officers (36.6%) agreed with the statement, compared to ‘operational’ officers (10.5%) ($\chi^2 (8, N=220) = 20.05, p <.001$). Analysis of the Neighbourhood Team focus group revealed several constables, PCSOs and specials did not have access to the internet, a clear barrier given much of the available evidence is held outside of internal force systems. Participants generally accepted this as the norm and their immediate superiors (Sergeants and Inspectors) did not consider it to be problematic. These findings suggest that: ‘senior’ officers may not be aware of the lack of access to evidence-based resources experienced by lower ranking officers; the desire of senior officers to embed EBP approaches is not reflected in the approach of immediate supervisors; and lower ranking officers are not aware of the expectations on them to engage with EBP.

**Resources and Capacity.**

‘Time’, including how long it takes to locate, digest, and interpret research evidence, was the most widely cited organisational constraint to utilising research evidence, a finding replicated across the focus groups, interviews, and survey, and consistent with previous literature (Hunter et. al., 2015, Fleming & Wingrove, 2017, Lumsden, 2017). Whilst recognised as a challenge
by all ranks and roles, those of lower ranks/grades identified time as a greater barrier than higher ranking officers. A higher proportion of ‘operational’ officers (34.4%) reported they ‘strongly agreed’ lacking the time to engage with research evidence compared to ‘senior’ officers (16.7%) (χ² (8, N=221) = 10.65, p=.05). Whilst ‘operational’ officers and staff, in particular the Neighbourhood Team and Analysts, all highlighted a lack of time as their primary obstacle to engaging with EBP, it was not considered a major challenge by senior offices.

Time was highlighted as a barrier by the Analyst focus group, who recognised the considerable effort required to conduct empirical research and/or plan and conduct evaluations. This was replicated in a small proportion of interviews with those who had experience of working collaboratively with a local University. Whilst generally positive about this experience, several interviewees commented on the considerable ‘time’ investment required to conduct research. Those who been afforded time to engage in the research process on this occasion, held the view that this was likely ‘a one off’ and highly unlikely to become ‘business as usual’. In addition, the Analyst focus group had experience of supporting a Randomised Control Trial (RCT) and there was a strong consensus this was protracted and ‘resource intensive’. They highlighted the substantial time required to plan, gather data, and analyse the outcomes of operations, and that they were rarely afforded the time to do so, even when explicitly tasked by senior officers.

*Capability.*

Analysis of the survey and focus group data identified *capability* as an organisational constraint to embedding EBP. Less than a third (27.3%) of survey respondents reported having confidence in their ability to assess the quality of research. A higher proportion of ‘senior’ officers reported they felt capable of assessing the quality of research evidence compared with ‘operational’
Furthermore, analysis of the interviews and focus groups highlighted ‘senior officers’, in particular chief officers were more positive about EBP capability within the organisation than lower ranked officers and staff.

Less than one fifth (14.7%) of survey respondents reported having received any ‘formal training and/or support in the use of research’ and only one in ten (10.4%) had ‘ever received any formal training about how to identify or evaluate which strategies are effective at reducing crime’. Survey respondents were more likely to state that they would ‘identify officers who have used the tactics previously and seek their advice’ (73.8%), followed by ‘my previous experience with this tactic tells me it will work’ (71.6%) rather than ‘search for published works to inform the evaluation of activity’ (14%). This was supported by the interviews and focus groups, where no officers or staff reported receiving any training, except for a minority of Analysts. Further examination by rank revealed a higher proportion of ‘senior’ officers (26.7%) reported receiving training compared with ‘operational’ officers (6.4%) and ‘supervisory’ rank officers (9.4%).

It is difficult to assess the quality of this training. No senior officers referred to having received formal training. Many were exposed to research evidence through alternative routes such as conferences/seminars, and access to other sources (e.g., Home Office bulletins). 59.3% of ‘senior’ officers reported ‘sometimes’ using ‘Home Office’ information, in comparison to 25.3% of ‘supervisory’ rank officers and 13.7% of ‘operational’ officers ($\chi^2 (6, N=221) = 32.52$, $p < .001$). Similarly, 57.1% of ‘senior’ officers reported ‘sometimes’ using ‘CoP’ information, in comparison to 28.3% of ‘supervisory’ rank officers and 22.1% of ‘operational’ officers ($\chi^2 (6, N=222) = 20.11$, $p < .001$). 53.6% of ‘senior’ officers reported ‘sometimes’ using
‘Conferences/Seminars’, compared to 29.6% of ‘supervisory’ rank officers and 14.7% of ‘operational’ officers ($\chi^2(6, N=220) = 20.11, p < .001$). 54.7% of ‘operational’ officers reported ‘never’ using ‘Conferences/Seminars’, compared to 3.6% of ‘senior’ officers. A possible explanation is higher-ranking officers recognise these wider knowledge sources, beyond formal ‘in-house’ EBP training. Survey respondents who were ‘currently studying for a qualification’ had a greater awareness, understanding and engagement with research evidence and EBP. During interviews four ‘senior’ officers highlighted how their opportunity for postgraduate study had greatly enhanced their ability to engage with EBP.

**Leadership**

Analysis of the interviews and the Superintendents focus group identified a lack of ‘strategy’ linking research evidence creation and dissemination with force priorities Several interviewees discussed the need for strategic co-ordination of primary research with many highlighting the process *ad hoc*, and often not focused on force priorities. Police leadership should ensure a clear strategy and pathway for effective dissemination of research findings to those in the organisation tasked with improving policy and practice (Nutley 2002; Boulton, 2020). It was evident from the interviews and focus groups that there was no such mechanism in place. Consequently, officers and staff frequently engaged in a time-consuming process to identify relevant and externally available research. This was compounded by a lack of access to resources, for example ‘pay-walled’ academic journals, and in some teams even a lack of internet access. It was also clear from the Audit & Inspection Team focus group within force policies there was no direction or expectation from senior officers to integrate research evidence into the process.
The interviews and focus groups at the most senior level revealed the force was strategically committed to embedding EBP, and many regarded it a necessity. This was in part driven by external factors, for example austerity measure in place since 2010. It was recognised a knowledge gap existed around emerging crime trends, and a genuine desire was expressed for a ‘cultural change’ to improve evaluation. However, the survey and focus groups found officers and staff frequently reported a lack of support to engage in EBP, principally in terms of being equipped with the necessary resources. Further, a degree of ambiguity and frustration was evident regarding roles and responsibilities, and the expectations upon officers and staff to engage with EBP.

This study identified that specific procedures and processes about how to engage with EBP had not been effectively communicated. This hinders the development of a shared purpose and clear understanding of EBP (Silvesti, 2007). Analysis of the survey and focus groups revealed limited communication of definitions, procedures and processes, sources of research evidence and expectations. Officers and staff considered these all necessary to embedding EBP in force. To engender an organisational commitment to embedding EBP it is necessary for leadership to identify clear roles and responsibilities of staff. The study found several officers and staff who did not consider their role to include specific responsibility to engage with EBP. For example, in the Neighbourhood Team focus group, the CSO argued that he/she is ‘supposed to be out on the street’, visibly engaging with the community, rather than ‘sitting behind a computer’. Indeed, no officers or staff in this team thought it their responsibility to engage with EBP. This was replicated in the Operations Planning Team who strongly agreed EBP was not relevant to their team functionality. A clear barrier to EBP identified in this study, consistent with Fleming & Wingrove (2017), is a lack of information and clarity from leadership as to how EBP was
relevant to the multiple and disparate roles that exist within the organisation, and which roles had responsibility for engaging with research evidence and EBP.

Despite chief officers expressing their support for EBP, just over half (52.4%) of survey respondents agreed that ‘there is no organisational emphasis on the use of research evidence to inform decision making’, with nearly one third stating that they ‘neither agree nor disagree’ with the statement. Only one third (33.4%) of respondents agreed ‘evidence-based approaches are promoted by influential figures or leaders in my organisation’. This suggests chief officers had not fully communicated their support of EBP to the wider organisation. Staff also felt they had little say as how best to embed EBP. When asked “do you feel that you ‘have a voice’ if you have an idea about implementing a new tactic/strategy based upon research evidence?” 49.5% responded ‘yes’ (n=153) and 50.5% ‘no’. However, ‘senior’ officers and respondents who were ‘currently studying’ were more likely to respond ‘yes’; 86.7% of senior officers responded ‘yes’, compared to 23.9% of ‘operational’ officers ($\chi^2$ (2, N=217) = 43.53, p <.001).

**Organisational Culture**

Several obstacles were identified to embedding EBP directly linked to the organisational ‘culture’. For example, ‘swift action’ and ‘being seen to act quickly’ were perceived as engrained in the culture of the force. Three quarters (75.1%) of survey respondents agreed ‘decisions often have to be made quickly which makes it difficult to consider research evidence’. Only 10% of ‘Senior’ officers ‘strongly agreed’ with this statement compared to 33% of ‘operational officers’ ($\chi^2$ (8, N=221) = 27.94, p=.02). The Analyst focus group suggested this was closely related to the ‘tasking’ of Analysts and the frequent requirement to produce short term analysis within tight deadlines. They were rarely afforded time to engage
with the research evidence which restricted detailed analysis of a problem, and engagement with research evidence to support products. Similarly, the Neighbourhood Team focus group highlighted that direct line managers considered engagement with research evidence as a poor use of their time.

Most interviewees identified ‘culture’ as a barrier to conducting evaluations and facilitating organisational learning. Lack of evaluation was recognised at the most senior level of the organisation, and all the chief officers highlighted it as strongly embedded cultural norm within the organisation (and police service more widely). In the Superintendents focus group several participants conceded they had previously personally led operations without conducting meaningful evaluation. Paradoxically, they expressed significant frustration at this ‘cultural norm’ and a strong desire for change;…going forward we’ve got to be honest about that and actually use [the data… if the data shows that actually it hasn’t had the impact, we’ve got to be honest and say, “Well okay that didn’t work, we tried it, thanks very much”’. Everything is a success in the police, isn’t it, but we’ve got to start being honest now, haven’t we, and say, “We tried something, it hasn’t worked.” Otherwise, what’s going to happen going forward is we’re going to put pieces of work in place, we’re going to say there a roaring success. Other people around the floor are going to think they’re a roaring success and take them on board (Superintendent focus group participant).

At an operational level, participants of the Neighbourhood Team focus group did not perceive evaluation as important. Participants discussed a culture of ‘moving on to the next problem’ which appeared to be linked to the assumption that if the problem had ‘gone away’ the operation had succeeded. As earlier, this was exacerbated by the belief that engaging in EBP
would not be viewed as a ‘good use of time’; *Because you’re trying to manage your time, are you really going to sit down for an hour and put that hour aside to learn? In theory, I mean, you should do, but in reality, I think the answer would be no, because you’re not allowed the time. We’ve got other work priorities, every day, to deal with. If we were sitting in the office for an hour, we would definitely be questioned what we’re doing* (Superintendent focus group participant).

Participants of the Analyst focus group spoke at length about the lack of evaluation, with reference to the Scanning, Analysis, Response and Assessment (SARA) problem-solving model. A significant frustration for many Analysts who perceived evaluation as a key part of their role was that the organisation ‘very rarely bothered’ with the final A (Assessment). One exception here was the Operations Planning department who followed the CoP (2013) ‘National Debriefing Model’ guidance after every event they were responsible for. This involved conducting a detailed assessment of each operation which included a focus on aspects that did not ‘go well’, in line with previous research (e.g., Pease & Roach, 2017). This serves to illustrate the diversity of roles and associated working practices within the organisation and how sub-cultures may exist across these functions.

A consistent finding from interviews and focus groups across all ranks and roles was a cultural longstanding reluctance to admit failure within the force. Consistent with Lumdsen (2017), there was a strong consensus that “*you never ever hear of an unsuccessful police operation*… *there’s never been an unsuccessful policing operation!*…*is every trial doomed to success?”* (Chief Officer interview participant). However, there appeared to be a strong desire, particularly at higher ranks and amongst Superintendents in particular, to recognise and challenge this. Further probing of this reluctance to admit failure was linked to a perception
that police activity is sometimes driven by ‘personality’, especially at ‘senior’ and chief officer level. The Superintendents focus group highlighted operations and strategies as synonymous with individuals, linked to promotion processes. Therefore, the reluctance to admit failure appeared linked to a perception that success or failure is personal to individuals.

The role of Professional Experience

The final identified organisational challenge relates to ‘professional experience’, or tacit knowledge. In line with previous studies (e.g., Hunter et al., 2017) there was a heavy reliance on professional experience within the case study force. ‘Professional experience’ and ‘advice from colleagues’ were reported as the most frequently used and most useful sources of evidence. ‘Professional Experience or Judgement’ was found widely used and 90% of respondents stated they ‘sometimes’, ‘very often’ or ‘always’ use it to inform decision making. 97% of respondents reported they ‘sometimes’, ‘very often’ or ‘always’ use ‘Advice from colleagues’ to inform decision making. The next most frequently used source was ‘Local force guidance’ (87.8%) followed by ‘In-force Problem Profiles’ (48.7%). Other decision-making sources (e.g. Home Office reports/bulletins, CoP products, and POLKA) were utilised regularly by less than 48% of respondents. This strongly varied by rank and higher-ranking officers were more likely to use these sources. ‘Professional experience’ and ‘advice from colleagues’ were the most highly valued decision-making source, with 83.4% and 93.8% of survey respondents reporting that they found it to be either ‘somewhat ‘or ‘very’ useful. This compared to the perceived next most useful sources; ‘other forces’ at 52.9% and ‘Problem Profiles’ at 48.8%.

The frequent use of professional experience in decision making was also identified through
interviews and focus groups. At the most senior level the limits of professional experience were partially recognised, for example one of the chief officers stated that ‘professional experience does not always lead you in the right direction’. Few operational officers recognised possible cognitive biases associated with either their own professional experience or that of colleagues. Moreover, some officers and staff held a perception that EBP was opposed to or devalues professional experience. This supports the notion that there a perception amongst officers and staff that EBP can undermine officers’ professionalism and serve the needs of management rather than the front line (Williams & Cockroft, 2018). There was also a perception within the Operations Planning Team, that EBP was politically motivated; the government can then say "The evidence is if you do this, you don't need as many police officers." Is that the driver? (Operations Planning Team focus group participant).

Finally, there was a perception that ‘strong’ personalities within the organisation disproportionally influence decision making. Related to this was the view these individuals ‘hold on to their own assumptions’ and are reluctant to consider other sources to inform their decision making. As Lum et al. (2012, p. 81) found in their study of officer receptivity, although decision-makers are willing to change the status quo with new ideas, this is sometimes only the case if these ideas “do not go against their personal beliefs or daily routine”. Several interviewees alluded to a culture in which the organisation tended to repeatedly ‘do what they have always done’. This was reported by interviewees of varying ranks including some chief officers. Several interviewees and focus group participants also flagged the significance of hierarchy, including a chief officer who recognised that the hierarchical nature of the organisation was as a challenge to decision-making being ‘driven by the professional judgement of senior officers and staff’.
Conclusion & Recommendations.

This paper identified a range of organisational challenges to embed EBP in the case study force and demonstrates how officers and staff were not equipped to fully engage with research evidence and EBP. Senior officers, in particular chief officers, were more positive about the opportunity for staff to engage with EBP. They had limited appreciation of the organisational constraints and lack of opportunity identified by ‘operational’ officers and ‘junior’ staff to engage in EBP activity. This inequality extended to a range of organisational constraints including access to resources, capacity to engage in EBP, and opportunities to build capability. ‘Operational’ and ‘supervisory’ rank officers (and in some instances ‘junior’ and ‘mid-grade’ police staff) identified these organisational constraints more frequently, and/or more acutely, than ‘senior’ officers and staff.

Several organisational challenges to embedding EBP were linked to the ‘culture’ of the organisation, that, collectively, inhibit engagement with the research evidence and thus the opportunity to embed EBP more widely. A key finding was that despite senior officers generally expressing a desire to embed EBP, they did not fully recognise the challenges perceived in the wider organisation. Whilst senior officers were supportive of embedding EBP, they did not appear to recognise the inequality in opportunities to engage with EBP, or the range of challenges perceived by the wider police force.

A salient finding in this paper was the significance of role in relation to EBP. As Lumsden & Goode (2016, p.10) contended, police organisations tend to be regarded as ‘solidary and common-purposed’, whereas there are a diverse range of roles within police organisations (for example, neighbourhood policing, investigation, public protection, forensics, research & analysis, operations planning etc). The heterogeneity of ‘the police’ should be recognised in
policy and scholarly endeavours, when examining the potential utility of EBP and opportunities to embed it in police forces.

This paper also highlights the necessity to build the capability of officers and staff in relation to EBP, especially the skills to critically appraisal research evidence and other decision-making sources, including tacit knowledge. Professional experience is highly valued by police practitioners and should be a key component of any EBP decision-making model (e.g., Fleming & Rhodes, 2016, Briner, 2009), but the limits associated with it must be critically appraised, along with other ‘evidence’ sources.

This paper identifies several recommendations for policy and practice. The organisational constraints identified should be addressed to enable officers and staff to be better equipped to engage with EBP. Chief officer misconceptions about the extent to which officers and staff were engaging in EBP demonstrates an implied assumption identified - that embedding EBP would be realised via an assumed ‘osmosis’, directed top down via the existing command structure. This did not materialise on a consistent basis. Therefore, any future efforts to embed EBP in policing should include explicit guidance as to the processes by which EBP should be embedded within force, and the likely mechanisms to achieve this.

The research identified the need for the organisation to introduce a strategic approach to the collation and creation of research evidence and to develop the central repository of research, with the creation of a central ‘hub’ ensuring dissemination across the wider organisation. Moreover, it was clear that support for engaging with EBP should be more targeted at those who have had fewer opportunities to engage with EBP, in particular ‘operational’ officers and ‘junior’ staff. A clear recommendation was the need to build the capacity of officers and staff
with mechanisms such as training, exposure to external forums and access to sources of EBP, targeted to those ranks and roles where this had been particularly lacking.

There are cultural and leadership challenges to embedding EBP in the force. A recommendation is for senior leaders to recognise and address both the disparities in opportunities to engage with EBP, and the barriers perceived by lower ranking staff to do so. A range of mechanisms are required, to facilitate organisational enablers, including access to resources, capacity to engage and opportunities to build capability for officers and staff of all levels.

The ‘act swiftly and move on’ approach to policing is perhaps more difficult to address. However, efforts to better embrace robust assessment and evaluation of interventions across the organisation are needed. One recommendation is for senior officers to recognise and develop the role of force Analysts and enable greater emphasis on robust assessment and evaluation. A further recommendation from this study is the need to communicate and promote a shared conceptualisation of EBP across the force, explicitly acknowledge the role of experience-based policing as part of this conceptualisation, whilst ensuring the pitfalls of cognitive bias are recognised.

In addition to the practice and policy recommendations, there are several avenues for further research. One of the outcomes from the wider research study was an ‘Action Plan’ submitted to the case study force. The case study police force have embraced this plan and have subsequently implemented a wider EBP Strategy, and further research would provide an insight into progress that has occurred after the data collection period of this study. It would also be
desirable to see replicability of this study beyond the case study to examine the extent to which other police forces have identified and addressed organisational challenges to embedding EBP.

An area worthy of exploration, is how the wider body of knowledge around organisational learning can be applied to understand and respond to the organisational barriers identified in this study. Future research should also recognise the likely changes and developments that have occurred in the wider professionalisation (of policing) agenda in the UK, and other similar initiatives internationally. For example, in the UK the Policing Education Qualifications Framework (PEQF) has been rolled out nationally, and this occurred after the data collection period of this study. EBP is envisioned as a central strategy of the professionalisation agenda (Brown et al., 2018) and therefore future studies should consider the impact this has had on the challenges and opportunities to embed EBP in the police service.
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